IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE	Ε,)	Electronically Filed Apr 27 2022 03:10 p.m		
#1202642,)	Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Cou		
Appellant,)	CASE NO.: 83943		
v.		E-FILE		
STATE OF NEVADA,		D.C. Case No.: A-20-815382-W		
Respondent.)	Dept.: XXXII		
)			

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUMES 1 - 2

Appeal from denial of a Post- Conviction Writ of Habeas Corpus

Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County

TERRENCE M. JACKSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 000854 Law Office of Terrence M. Jackson 624 South 9th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 386-0001 Terry.jackson.esq@gmail.com

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Nevada Bar No. 001565 Clark County District Attorney 200 E. Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 (702) 671-2750 Steven. Wolfson@clarkcountyda.com

AARON D. FORD Nevada Bar No. 007704 Nevada Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701

Counsel for Respondent

Counsel for Appellant

MASTER INDEX Case No.: 83943

Document (file stamp date in parenthesis)	Volume	Page No.
[hearing date in brackets]		
Amended Superseding Indictment (03/18/2019)	1	023 - 026
Clerk's Notice of Nonconforming Document (05/19/202	<u>1</u>) 1	216 - 218
Court Minutes - All Pending Motions [1-21-2021]	1	213
Court Minutes - Petition for WHC [12-22-2020]	.a. 1	212
Court Minutes - Petition for WHC [10-21-2021]	2	281
Court Minutes - Sentencing [5-14-2019]	1	056 - 057
Court Minutes - Superseding Indictment [8-1-2018]	1	022
Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law & Order		
Heard [10-21-2021] (<u>12/01/2021</u>)	2	287 - 303
Guilty Plea Agreement (03/18/2019)	1	027 - 037
Indictment (05/09/2014)	1	06 - 08
Judgment of Conviction [Plea of Guilty] (05/16/2019)	1	058 - 060
Notice of Appeal [A-20-815382-W] (12/13/2021)	2	305 - <u>306</u>
Notice of Entry of Finding of Facts (12/6/2021)	2	304
Notice of Motion & Motion for Appointment of Counsel		
(05/22/2020)	1	061 - 062
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, PC (05/22/2020)	1	063 - 079

Reply to Response to Petitioner's Supplemental Petition for a		
Writ of Habeas Corpus (10/19/2021)	2	274 - 280
Reply to State's Opposition to Motion to Sever		
[2-24-2016] (<u>02/19/2016</u>)	1	051 - 57
Second Supplemental Notice of Witnesses &/or Expert Witness	ses	
(01/19/2017)	1	128 - 130
Sentencing Memorandum of Defendant (05/08/2019)	1	038 - 055
State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Discovery		
heard [3-30-2016] (<u>03/24/2016</u>)	1	079 - 93
State's Response to Defendant's Petition for WHC (Post-Convi	ction)	& Motion
for Appointment of Counsel (11/25/2020)	1	198 -211
State's Response to Defendant's Supplemental Petition for WHO	C (Pos	t-Conviction)
& Motion for Discovery (<u>08/18/2021</u>)	2	258 -273
Stipulation and Order (05/19/2021)	1	214 - 215
Superseding Indictment (08/01/2018)	1	001 - 021
Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (07/14/2021)	1	219 - <u>251</u>
Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (07/14/2021)	2	252 - 257
Transcripts Follow:		
Transcript - Jury Trial, Day 1 [3-18-2019] (11/18/2020)	1	080 - 197
Transcript - Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [10-21-2021]		
(01/03/2022)	2	282 - 286

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify I am an assistant to Terrence M. Jackson, Esquire; a person competent to serve papers, not a party to the above-entitled action and on the 27th day of April, 2022, I served a copy of the foregoing: Appellant Shan Jonathon Kittredge's Opening Brief as well as the Appendix and Index, Volumes 1 through 2 as follows:

[X] Via Electronic Service to the Nevada Supreme Court, to the Eighth Judicial District Court, and by U. S. mail with first class postage affixed to the Nevada Attorney General and the Petitioner/Appellant as follows:

STEVEN B. WOLFSON

Clark County District Attorney

steven.wolfson@clarkcountyda.com

AARON D. FORD

Nevada Attorney General

100 North Carson Street

Carson City, NV 89701

ALEXANDER G. CHEN
Chief Deputy District Attorney - Criminal
motions@clarkcountyda.com

SHAN J. KITTREDGE
ID# 1202642
S. D. C. C. - P. O. Box 208
Indian Springs, NV 89107-0208

By: /s/ Ila C. Wills
Assistant to Terrence M. Jackson, Esq.

ORIGINAL

IND 1 STEVEN B. WOLFSON 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 3 **ELIZABETH MERCER** Chief Deputy District Attorney 4 Nevada Bar #10681 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 5 6 Attorney for Plaintiff

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

AUG/0 1 2018

KIMBERLY ESTALA, DEPUTY

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Plaintiff.

CASE NO:

C-18-333335-2

11 -VS- DEPT NO:

XX

DEANNA PAGE, aka, Deanna Lee Page, #3063395 SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE,

#1779637

SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT

Defendant.

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

COUNTY OF CLARK

STATE OF NEVADA SS.

The Defendant above named, DEANNA PAGE, aka, Deanna Lee Page, SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE, accused by the Clark County Grand Jury of the crime(s) of CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (Category B Felony - NRS 200.380, 199.480 -NOC 50147); ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.380, 193.165 - NOC 50138); ATTEMPT ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.380, 193.330, 193.165 - NOC 50145); BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM (Category B Felony - NRS 205.060 - NOC 50426); ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.471 - NOC 50201); GRAND LARCENY AUTO (Category B Felony - NRS 205.228.3 - NOC 56014); POSSESSION OF STOLEN VEHICLE (Category B Felony - NRS 205.273.4 - NOC 56048); ASSAULT ON A PROTECTED PERSON WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

C-18-333335-2 SIND Superseding Indiciment 4787852

A.A. 001

w:\2018\2018F\106\67\18F10667-IND-(Superseding Kittredge)-001.docx

(Category B Felony - NRS 200.471 - NOC 50205); RESISTING PUBLIC OFFICER WITH USE OF A FIREARM (Category C Felony - NRS 199.280 - NOC 55104); and, OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON (Category B Felony - NRS 202.360 - NOC 51460), committed at and within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, on or between May 21, 2018 and June 8, 2018, as follows:

COUNT 1 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 21, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of JUAN DIAZ-SALAZAR, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of JUAN DIAZ-SALAZAR, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 2 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 21, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of ANDORIO RODRIGUEZ, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of ANDORIO RODRIGUEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 3 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 21, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of ROBERT RODRIGUEZ, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of ROBERT RODRIGUEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 21, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of ABIGAIL SALAZAR, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without

the consent and against the will of ABIGAIL SALAZAR, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 5 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 21, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 6 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 21, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter building, owned or occupied by ROBERTO'S TACO SHOP, located at 3400 South Hualapai Way, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, with intent to commit a felony, to wit: robbery, while in possession of and/or gaining possession of a firearm at any time during the commission of the crime and/or at any time before leaving the structure or upon leaving the structure.

COUNT 7 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 26, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously conspire with one another to commit a robbery, by the Defendants committing the acts as set forth in Counts 8 through 11, said acts being incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

COUNT 8 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 26, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of ELIBRADA GUIAO, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of ELIBRADA GUIAO, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 9 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 26, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of TRIXIE ARCINAS, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of TRIXIE ARCINAS, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 10 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 26, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of DIEGO MORA-GOMEZ, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of DIEGO MORA-GOMEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 11 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 26, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter a building, owned or occupied by PANDA EXPRESS, located at 1263 East Silverado Ranch, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, with intent to commit a felony, to wit: robbery, while in possession of and/or gaining possession of a handgun, a deadly weapon, during the commission of the crime and/or before leaving the structure, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 12 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 27, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of JENNIFER STRODE, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of JENNIFER STRODE, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 13 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 27, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of AZALEY GOMEZ, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of AZALEY GOMEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 14 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 27, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of ANETTE

MENZI, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of ANETTE MENZI, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 15 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 27, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of MADISON SERWICKI, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of MADISON SERWICKI, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 16 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON.

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 27, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of MADISON SERWICKI, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of MADISON SERWICKI, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm

COUNT 17 - ATTEMPT ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 27, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously attempt to take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of GERALDIN GALLEGO-CORAL, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of GERALDIN GALLEGO-CORAL, by entering her place of employment with a firearm, brandishing the firearm, and demanding U.S. Currency, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 18 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about May 27, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter building, owned or occupied by DUNKIN DONUTS, located at 409 East Silverado Rancho Boulevard, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, with intent to commit a felony, to wit: robbery, while in possession of and/or gaining possession of a firearm at any

time during the commission of the crime and/or at any time before leaving the structure or upon leaving the structure.

COUNT 19 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously conspire with one another to commit a robbery, by the Defendants committing the acts as set forth in Counts 20 through 25, said acts being incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

COUNT 20 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of JORGE HERNANDEZ-GARCIA, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of JORGE HERNANDEZ-GARCIA, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 21 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of SANDRA AMADOR-HERNANDEZ, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of SANDRA AMADOR-HERNANDEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring,

commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 22 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: ROBERT GALBRAITH, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by pointing a firearm at him in a threatening manner during the commission of a robbery, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 23 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: KENNETH IRWIN, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by pointing a firearm at him in a threatening manner during the commission of a robbery, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this

crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 24 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: LARRY WEISS, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by pointing a firearm at him in a threatening manner during the commission of a robbery, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 25- BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter a building, owned or occupied by ROBERTO'S TACO SHOP, located at 2230 West Horizon Ridge Parkway, Henderson, Clark County, Nevada, with intent to commit a felony, to wit: robbery, while in possession of and/or gaining possession of a handgun, a deadly weapon, during the commission of the crime and/or before leaving the structure, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 26 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously conspire with one another to commit a robbery, by the Defendants committing the acts as set forth in Counts 27 through 31, said acts being incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

COUNT 27 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of MARIA SOLIS, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of MARIA SOLIS, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 28 – ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of VICTOR DELGADILLO-GARCIA, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of VICTOR DELGADILLO-GARCIA, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3)

A.A. 010

15

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout. **COUNT 29 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON**

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: HARRISON L.N.U., with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by pointing a firearm at him in a threatening manner during the commission of a robbery, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 30 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: ALVARO MENDOZA, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by pointing a firearm at him in a threatening manner during the commission of a robbery, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 31 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter a building, owned or occupied by ROBERTO'S TACO SHOP, located at 10430 Bermuda Road, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, with intent to commit a felony, to wit: robbery, while in possession of and/or gaining possession of a handgun, a deadly weapon, during the commission of the crime and/or before leaving the structure, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 32 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about June 1, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter building, owned or occupied by KHOURY'S MEDITTERANEAN RESTAURANT, located at 9340 West Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, with intent to commit a felony, to wit: robbery, while in possession of and/or gaining possession of a firearm at any time during the commission of the crime and/or at any time before leaving the structure or upon leaving the structure.

COUNT 33 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about June 1, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of DON GIULIANO, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of DON GIULIANO, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

27 ///

28 ///

COUNT 34 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about June 1, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of JOY SHLASINGER, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of JOY SHLASINGER, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm.

COUNT 35 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about June 2, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously conspire with one another to commit a robbery, by the Defendants committing the acts as set forth in Counts 35 through 38, said acts being incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

COUNT 36 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about June 2, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of JENNFIER HUGHES, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of JENNFIER HUGHES, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 37 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of KEYMARI PAXTON, or in his presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of KEYMARI PAXTON, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit:

a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendant and/or SHAN KITTREDGE aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendant and/or SHAN KITTREDGE acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 38 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about June 2, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter a building, owned or occupied by ALBERTSON'S, located at 5975 West Tropicana Avenue, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, with intent to commit a felony, to wit: robbery, while in possession of and/or gaining possession of a handgun, a deadly weapon, during the commission of the crime and/or before leaving the structure, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendant and/or SHAN KITTREDGE aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendant and/or SHAN KITTREDGE acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 39 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about June 7, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously conspire with one another to commit a robbery, by Defendants committing the acts as set forth in Counts 40 through 42, said acts being incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

COUNT 40 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about June 7, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the

person of DENISE PRATT, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of DENISE PRATT, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 41 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about June 7, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: GUY FRANSEN, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firerm, by pointing the firearm at said GUY FRANSEN and threatening him during the course of a robbery, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 42 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM

Defendants SHAN KITTREDGE and DEANNA PAGE, did on or about June 7, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter a building, owned or occupied by ALBERTSON'S, located at 2500 South Fort Apache, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, with intent to commit a felony, to wit: robbery, while in possession of and/or gaining possession of a handgun, a deadly weapon, during the commission of the crime and/or before leaving the structure, the

Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 43 - GRAND LARCENY AUTO

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE did, on or between May 24, 2018 and May 25, 2018, then and there willfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and intentionally, with intent to deprive the owner permanently thereof, steal, take and carry away, drive away or otherwise remove a motor vehicle owned by another person, having a value of \$3,500.00, or greater, in the possession of RAVEN RUTSHAW, to wit: an Infiniti, bearing Nevada License No. 189AUC. COUNT 44 – POSSESSION OF STOLEN VEHICLE

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE did, on or between May 24, 2018 and June 8, 2018 willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously possess a stolen motor vehicle wrongfully taken from RAVEN RUTSHAW, to wit: an Infiniti, bearing Nevada License No. 189AUC, which Defendant knew, or had reason to believe, had been stolen; the value of the vehicle being \$3,500.00, or more.

COUNT 45 - ASSAULT ON A PROTECTED PERSON WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did, on or about June 8, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: J. EMERY, a protected person employed as a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Officer, while J. EMERY was performing his duties as a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Officer, which Defendant knew, or should have known, that J. EMERY was a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Officer, with use of a deadly weapon, to

wit: a firearm, by pointing said firearm at the said Officer J. EMERY in an attempt to escape from law enforcement.

COUNT 46 - ASSAULT ON A PROTECTED PERSON WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE did, on or about June 8, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: S. MCNULTY, a protected person employed as a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Officer, while S. MCNULTY was performing his duties as a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Officer, which Defendant knew, or should have known, that S. MCNULTY was a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Officer, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by pointing said firearm at the said Officer S. MCNULTY in an attempt to escape law enforcement.

COUNT 47 - ASSAULT ON A PROTECTED PERSON WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did, on or about June 8, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: N. BACHMAN, a protected person employed as a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Officer, while N. BACHMAN was performing his duties as a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Officer, which Defendant knew, or should have known, that N. BACHMAN was a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Officer, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a vehicle, by attempting to strike the said Officer N. BACHMAN with his said vehicle.

COUNT 48 - RESISTING PUBLIC OFFICER WITH USE OF A FIREARM

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about June 8, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously resist, delay, or obstruct Officer(s) J. EMERY and/or S. MCNULTY and/or R. Hart, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, public officers in discharging or attempting to discharge any legal duty, to wit: by pointing a firearm athe the said Officer(s) J.

I.	EIVIER 1 and/or 5. MCNOL 1 1 and/or R. Hart, in an effort to free from the officers, Defendant
2	using a firearm or Defendant removing, taking, or attempting to take or remove a firearm from
3	the person of, or the immediate presence of, the public officer in the course of such resistance
4	obstruction or delay.
5	DATED this Serday of July, 2018.
6	STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark Count, District Attorney Nevada Bar #001 65
8	ELIZABETH MERCER Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #10681
10	ENDORSEMENT: A True Bill
11	
12	Tweelo roply
13	Foreperson, Clark County Grand Jury
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
. 3.	
2728	

- Names of Witnesses and testifying before the Grand Jury: 1 AMADOR-HERNANDEZ, SANDRA - ROBERTOS 2230 W. HORIZON RIDGE PKWY. LV. NV 89052 3 EMERY, JOSEPH - LVMPD 4 FARRELL, PATRICK – HP #1267 5 FRANSEN, GUY - c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101 6 GIULLIANO, DON - KHRYS MEDITERRANEAN 9340 E. SAHARA AVE, LV, NV 89117 7 GOMEZ, DIEGO - PANDA EXPRESS 1263 E. SILVERADO RANCH, LV, NV 89183 8 GUIAO, ELIBRADA - PANDA EXPRESS 1263 E. SILVERADO RANCH, LV, NV 89183 9 HAASMANN, YUL – INTERPRETER 10
- 11 HINER, TANYA HP #2278
- 12 HUGHES, JENNIFER ALBERTSONS 5975 W. TROPICANA AVE, LV, NV 89118
- 13 JAPPE, DEREK LVMPD #9992
- 14 NELSON, JASON LVMPD
- 15 NELSON, JASON LVMPD #6825
- 16 PENNY, BLAKE LVMPD DETECTIVE
- 17 PRATT, DENISE ALBERTSONS 5975 W. TROPICANA AVE, LV, NV 89118
- 18 RUTSHAW, RAVEN c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 19 SALAZAR- DIAZ, JUAN ROBERTOS, 3400 S. HUALAPAI, LV, NV 89117
- 20 SNODGRASS, THEODORE LVMPD #13701
- 21 SOLIS, MARIA ROBERTOS TACO SHOP 10430 BERMUDA RD, LV, NV 89183
- 22 STRODE, JENNIFER DUNKIN DONUTS 409 E. SILVERADO RANCH, LV, NV 89183
- 24 Additional Witnesses known to the District Attorney at time of filing the Indictment:
- 25 AMEZCUA, MARISSA c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 26 ARCINAS, TRIXILE PANDA EXPRESS 1263 E. SILVERADO RANCH, LV, NV 89183
- 27 | CALVANO, NATHAN HP #1339

28 CARDENAS, ELIAS – LVMPD #6826

- 1 CARILLO, CARMEN ROBERTOS 10430 BERMUDA RD, LV, NV 89183
- 2 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS HPD
- 3 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS HPD COMMUNICATIONS
- 4 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS HPD RECORDS
- 5 DAVILA, LOUIS c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 6 DAVILA, REBECCA c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 7 DAVILA, RENEE c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 8 DELGADILLO-GARCIA, VICTOR ROBERTOS TACOS SHOP 10430 BERMUDA RD,
- 9 LV, NV 89183
- 10 DIAZ, VON JON c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 11 GALBRAITH, ROBERT c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 12 GALLEGO-CORAL, GERALDINE c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 13 GARCIA, JORGE ROBERTOS 2230 W. HORIZON RIDGE PKWY, LV, NV 89052
- 14 GOMEZ, AZALEY DUNKIN DONUTS 409 E. SILVERADO RANCH, LV, NV 89183
- 15 GOMEZ, BARBARA c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 16 GUARD OF KEYMARI PAXTON c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 17 KRIMM, JESSICA c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 18 KRIMM, JESSICA c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 19 MARINO, PEDRO ROBERTOS 2230 W. HORIZON RIDGE PKWY, LV, NV 89052
- 20 MENDOZA, ALVARO ROBERTOS 10430 BERMUDA RD, LV, NV 89183
- 21 MERCADO, MARTIN c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 22 MEZEI, ANETTE c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 23 MURDOCH, DEAN c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- NORA, LILIA PANDA EXPRESS 1263 E. SILVERADO RANCH, LV, NV 89183
- 25 PAXTON, KEYMARI ALBERTSONS 5975 W. TROPICANA AVE, LV, NV 89118
- 26 RODRIGUEZ, ANDORIO ROBERTOS, 3400 S. HUALAPAI, LV, NV 89117
- 27 RODRIGUEZ, JORGE c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
- 28 RODRIGUEZ, REBEL ROBERTOS 2230 W. HORIZON RIDGE PKWY, LV, NV 89052

1	SALAZAR, MATTHEW - c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
2	SERWICKI, MADISON - c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101
3	SHLASINGER, JOY – KHRYS MEDITERRANEAN 9340 E. SAHARA AVE, LV, NV
4	89117
5	SMITH, SAMUEL – LVMPD #6424
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	18AGJ018A-B/18F10667X/18F10803X/18F05609X/cl-GJ
26	LVMPD EV# 1805263789;
27	1805311580; 1806022578; HPD 1811622
28	(TK1)

C-18-333335-2

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

August 01, 2018

· C-18-333335-2

State of Nevada

VS

Shan Kittredge

August 01, 2018

11:00 AM

Superseding Indictment

HEARD BY:

Villani, Michael

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 11D

COURT CLERK: Estala, Kimberly

RECORDER:

Vincent, Renee

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT.

Laura Jean Rose

Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada

Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES

Russell Walker, Grand Jury Foreperson, stated to the Court that at least twelve members had concurred in the return of the true bill during deliberation, but had been excused for presentation to the Court. State presented Grand Jury Case Number 18AGJ018B to the Court. COURT ORDERED, the Superseding Indictment may be filed and is assigned Case Number C-18-333335-2, Department XX.

State requested a warrant, argued bail, and advised Deft is in custody. COURT ORDERED, \$200,000.00 BAIL, with House Arrest; SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT WARRANT ISSUED, and matter SET for Arraignment. .

COURT FURTHER ORDERED, Exhibits 1b, 32-42 to be lodged with the Clerk of the Court; Las Vegas Justice Court case no. 18F10803X DISMISSED per the State's request.

I.W. (CUSTODY)

08/02/18 9:00 A.M. INITIAL ARRAIGNMENT (DEPT X)

Printed Date: 8/3/2018

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

August 01, 2018

ORIGINAL

FILED IN OPEN COURT STEVEN D. GRIERSON **AIND** 1 CLERK OF THE COURT STEVEN B. WOLFSON 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 3 **ELIZABETH MERCER** Chief Deputy District Attorney 4 Nevada Bar #10681 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 5 C-18-333335-2 6 Attorney for Plaintiff AIND Amended Indictment 7 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 9 THE STATE OF NEVADA. C-18-333335-2 10 Plaintiff. CASE NO: **DEPT NO:** 11 XX-VS-SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE, 12 #1779637 AMENDED SUPERSEDING 13 Defendant. INDICTMENT 14 15 STATE OF NEVADA 16) ss. COUNTY OF CLARK 17 The Defendant above named, SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE, accused by the Clark 18 County Grand Jury of the crime(s) of CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (Category 19 B Felony - NRS 200.380, 199.480 - NOC 50147); ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY 20 WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.380, 193.165 - NOC 50138); and RESISTING 21 PUBLIC OFFICER WITH USE OF A FIREARM (Category C Felony - NRS 199.280 -22 NOC 55104), committed at and within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, on or between 23 May 21, 2018 and June 8, 2018, as follows: 24 COUNT 1 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY 25 did on or between May 21, 2018, and June 7, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and 26 feloniously conspire with DEANNA PAGE, aka Deanna Lee Page, to commit a robbery, by 27 the Defendant and DEANNA PAGE, aka Deanna Lee Page committing the acts as set forth in

28

2 herein.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

COUNT 2 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did on or between May 21, 2018, and May 26, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of JUAN DIAZ-SALAZAR and/or ANDORIO RODRIGUEZ and/or ROBERT RODRIGUEZ and/or ABIGAIL SALAZAR and/or ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ and/or ELIBRADA GUIAO and/or TRIXIE ARCINAS and/or DIEGO MORA-GOMEZ, or in their presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of JUAN DIAZ-SALAZAR and/or ANDORIO RODRIGUEZ and/or ROBERT RODRIGUEZ and/or ABIGAIL SALAZAR and/or ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ and/or ELIBRADA GUIAO and/or TRIXIE ARCINAS and/or DIEGO MORA-GOMEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

Counts 2 through 4, said acts being incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth

COUNT 3 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did on or between May 27, 2018, and May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of JENNIFER STRODE and/or AZALEY GOMEZ and/or ANETTE MENZI and/or MADISON SERWICKI and/or JORGE HERNANDEZ-GARCIA and/or SANDRA AMADOR-HERNANDEZ and/or MARIA SOLIS and/or VICTOR DELGADILLO-GARCIA, or in their presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of JENNIFER STRODE and/or AZALEY GOMEZ and/or ANETTE MENZI and/or MADISON SERWICKI and/or JORGE HERNANDEZ-GARCIA and/or SANDRA AMADOR-

9

14

13

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28 HERNANDEZ and/or MARIA SOLIS and/or VICTOR DELGADILLO-GARCIA, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed. Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did on or between June 1, 2018, and June 7, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of DON GIULIANO and/or JOY SHLASINGER and/or JENNFIER HUGHES and/or KEYMARI PAXTON and/or DENISE PRATT, or in their presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of DON GIULIANO and/or JOY SHLASINGER and/or JENNFIER HUGHES and/or KEYMARI PAXTON and/or DENISE PRATT, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 5 - RESISTING PUBLIC OFFICER WITH USE OF A FIREARM

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about June 8, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously resist, delay, or obstruct Officer(s) J. EMERY and/or S. MCNULTY and/or R. Hart, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, public officers in discharging or attempting to discharge any legal duty, to wit: by pointing a firearm athe the said Officer(s) J. EMERY and/or S. MCNULTY and/or R. Hart, in an effort to flee from the officers, Defendant

using a firearm or Defendant removing, taking, or attempting to take or remove a firearm from the person of, or the immediate presence of, the public officer in the course of such resistance, obstruction or delay. DATED this 18¹⁴ day of March, 2019. STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 #12473 BY Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #10681 18AGJ018A-B/18F10667X/18F10803X/18F05609X/llm/GCU LVMPD EV# 1805263789; 1805311580; 1806022578; HPD 1811622

A.A. 026

(TK1)

ORIGINAL

1 **GPA** STEVEN B. WOLFSON 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 3 ELIZABETH MERCER Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010681 4 200 Lewis Avenue 5 Las Vegas, NV 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 6 Attorney for Plaintiff 7 **DISTRICT COURT** CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 ġ THE STATE OF NEVADA, 10 Plaintiff, 11 -VS-12 SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE, #1779637 13 Defendant. 14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FILED IN OPEN COURT STEVEN D. GRIERSON CLERK OF THE COURT MAR 18 2014

C-18-333335-2 **Guilty Plea Agreement** 4823381

CASE NO:

C-18-333335-2

DEPT NO:

XX

GUILTY PLEA AGREEMENT

I hereby agree to plead guilty to: COUNT 1 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (Category B Felony - NRS 200.380, 199.480 - NOC 50147); COUNTS 2 through 4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony -NRS 200.380, 193.165 - NOC 50138); and COUNT 5 - RESISTING PUBLIC OFFICER WITH USE OF A FIREARM (Category C Felony - NRS 199.280 - NOC 55104), as more fully alleged in the charging document attached hereto as Exhibit "1".

My decision to plead guilty is based upon the plea agreement in this case which is as follows:

Both parties stipulate to a total term of imprisonment of eighteen (18) to forty-five (45) years in the Nevada Department of Corrections.

I agree to the forfeiture of any and all weapons or any interest in any weapons seized and/or impounded in connection with the instant case and/or any other case negotiated in whole or in part in conjunction with this plea agreement.

I understand and agree that, if I fail to interview with the Department of Parole and Probation, fail to appear at any subsequent hearings in this case, or an independent magistrate, by affidavit review, confirms probable cause against me for new criminal charges including reckless driving or DUI, but excluding minor traffic violations, the State will have the unqualified right to argue for any legal sentence and term of confinement allowable for the crime(s) to which I am pleading guilty, including the use of any prior convictions I may have to increase my sentence as an habitual criminal to five (5) to twenty (20) years, life without the possibility of parole, life with the possibility of parole after ten (10) years, or a definite twenty-five (25) year term with the possibility of parole after ten (10) years.

Otherwise I am entitled to receive the benefits of these negotiations as stated in this plea agreement.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE PLEA

I understand that by pleading guilty I admit the facts which support all the elements of the offense(s) to which I now plead as set forth in Exhibit "1".

As to Count 1, I understand that as a consequence of my plea of guilty the Court must sentence me to imprisonment in the Nevada Department of Corrections for a minimum term of not less than one (1) year and a maximum term of not more than six (6) years. The minimum term of imprisonment may not exceed forty percent (40%) of the maximum term of imprisonment. I understand that I may also be fined up to \$5,000.00. I understand that I am eligible for probation for the offense to which I am pleading guilty. I understand that, except as otherwise provided by statute, the question of whether I receive probation is in the discretion of the sentencing judge.

As to Counts 2 through 4, 1 understand that as a consequence of my plea of guilty the Court must sentence me to imprisonment in the Nevada Department of Corrections for a minimum term of not less than two (2) years and a maximum term of not more than fifteen (15) years plus a consecutive term of one (1) year to ten (10) years for the weapon enhancement. The minimum term of imprisonment may not exceed forty percent (40%) of

//

the maximum term of imprisonment. I understand that I am not eligible for probation for the offense to which I am pleading guilty.

As to Count 5, I understand that as a consequence of my plea of guilty the Court must sentence me to imprisonment in the Nevada Department of Corrections for a minimum term of not less than one (1) year and a maximum term of not more than six (6) years. The minimum term of imprisonment may not exceed forty percent (40%) of the maximum term of imprisonment. I understand that I may also be fined up to \$10,000.00. I understand that I am eligible for probation for the offense to which I am pleading guilty. I understand that, except as otherwise provided by statute, the question of whether I receive probation is in the discretion of the sentencing judge.

I understand that the law requires me to pay an Administrative Assessment Fee.

I understand that, if appropriate, I will be ordered to make restitution to the victim of the offense(s) to which I am pleading guilty and to the victim of any related offense which is being dismissed or not prosecuted pursuant to this agreement. I will also be ordered to reimburse the State of Nevada for any expenses related to my extradition, if any.

I understand that I am eligible for probation for the offense to which I am pleading guilty. I understand that, except as otherwise provided by statute, the question of whether I receive probation is in the discretion of the sentencing judge.

I understand that I must submit to blood and/or saliva tests under the Direction of the Division of Parole and Probation to determine genetic markers and/or secretor status.

I understand that if I am pleading guilty to charges of Burglary, Invasion of the Home, Possession of a Controlled Substance with Intent to Sell, Sale of a Controlled Substance, or Gaming Crimes, for which I have prior felony conviction(s), I will not be eligible for probation and may receive a higher sentencing range.

I understand that if more than one sentence of imprisonment is imposed and I am eligible to serve the sentences concurrently, the sentencing judge has the discretion to order the sentences served concurrently or consecutively.

//

I understand that information regarding charges not filed, dismissed charges, or charges to be dismissed pursuant to this agreement may be considered by the judge at sentencing.

I have not been promised or guaranteed any particular sentence by anyone. I know that my sentence is to be determined by the Court within the limits prescribed by statute.

I understand that if my attorney or the State of Nevada or both recommend any specific punishment to the Court, the Court is not obligated to accept the recommendation.

I understand that if the offense(s) to which I am pleading guilty was committed while I was incarcerated on another charge or while I was on probation or parole that I am not eligible for credit for time served toward the instant offense(s).

I understand that if I am not a United States citizen, any criminal conviction will likely result in serious negative immigration consequences including but not limited to:

- 1. The removal from the United States through deportation;
- 2. An inability to reenter the United States;
- 3. The inability to gain United States citizenship or legal residency;
- 4. An inability to renew and/or retain any legal residency status; and/or
- 5. An indeterminate term of confinement, with the United States Federal Government based on my conviction and immigration status.

Regardless of what I have been told by any attorney, no one can promise me that this conviction will not result in negative immigration consequences and/or impact my ability to become a United States citizen and/or a legal resident.

I understand that the Division of Parole and Probation will prepare a report for the sentencing judge prior to sentencing. This report will include matters relevant to the issue of sentencing, including my criminal history. This report may contain hearsay information regarding my background and criminal history. My attorney and I will each have the opportunity to comment on the information contained in the report at the time of sentencing. Unless the District Attorney has specifically agreed otherwise, the District Attorney may also comment on this report.

WAIVER OF RIGHTS

By entering my plea of guilty, I understand that I am waiving and forever giving up the following rights and privileges:

- 1. The constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, including the right to refuse to testify at trial, in which event the prosecution would not be allowed to comment to the jury about my refusal to testify.
- 2. The constitutional right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury, free of excessive pretrial publicity prejudicial to the defense, at which trial I would be entitled to the assistance of an attorney, either appointed or retained. At trial the State would bear the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt each element of the offense(s) charged.
- 3. The constitutional right to confront and cross-examine any witnesses who would testify against me.
- 4. The constitutional right to subpoena witnesses to testify on my behalf.
- 5. The constitutional right to testify in my own defense.
- 6. The right to appeal the conviction with the assistance of an attorney, either appointed or retained, unless specifically reserved in writing and agreed upon as provided in NRS 174.035(3). I understand this means I am unconditionally waiving my right to a direct appeal of this conviction, including any challenge based upon reasonable constitutional, jurisdictional or other grounds that challenge the legality of the proceedings as stated in NRS 177.015(4). However, I remain free to challenge my conviction through other post-conviction remedies including a habeas corpus petition pursuant to NRS Chapter 34.

VOLUNTARINESS OF PLEA

I have discussed the elements of all of the original charge(s) against me with my attorney and I understand the nature of the charge(s) against me.

I understand that the State would have to prove each element of the charge(s) against me at trial.

I have discussed with my attorney any possible defenses, defense strategies and circumstances which might be in my favor.

All of the foregoing elements, consequences, rights, and waiver of rights have been thoroughly explained to me by my attorney.

I believe that pleading guilty and accepting this plea bargain is in my best interest, and that a trial would be contrary to my best interest.

I am signing this agreement voluntarily, after consultation with my attorney, and I am not acting under duress or coercion or by virtue of any promises of leniency, except for those set forth in this agreement.

I am not now under the influence of any intoxicating liquor, a controlled substance or other drug which would in any manner impair my ability to comprehend or understand this agreement or the proceedings surrounding my entry of this plea.

My attorney has answered all my questions regarding this guilty plea agreement and its consequences to my satisfaction and I am satisfied with the services provided by my attorney.

DATED this day of March, 2019.

AGREED TO BY:

#12473

Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010681

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL:

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I, the undersigned, as the attorney for the Defendant named herein and as an officer of the court hereby certify that:

- 1. I have fully explained to the Defendant the allegations contained in the charge(s) to which guilty pleas are being entered.
- 2. I have advised the Defendant of the penalties for each charge and the restitution that the Defendant may be ordered to pay.
- 3. I have inquired of Defendant facts concerning Defendant's immigration status and explained to Defendant that if Defendant is not a United States citizen any criminal conviction will most likely result in serious negative immigration consequences including but not limited to:
 - a. The removal from the United States through deportation;
 - b. An inability to reenter the United States;
 - c. The inability to gain United States citizenship or legal residency;
 - d. An inability to renew and/or retain any legal residency status; and/or
 - e. An indeterminate term of confinement, by with United States Federal Government based on the conviction and immigration status.

Moreover, I have explained that regardless of what Defendant may have been told by any attorney, no one can promise Defendant that this conviction will not result in negative immigration consequences and/or impact Defendant's ability to become a United States citizen and/or legal resident.

- 4. All pleas of guilty offered by the Defendant pursuant to this agreement are consistent with the facts known to me and are made with my advice to the Defendant.
- 5. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the Defendant:
 - a. Is competent and understands the charges and the consequences of pleading guilty as provided in this agreement,
 - b. Executed this agreement and will enter all guilty pleas pursuant hereto voluntarily, and
 - c. Was not under the influence of intoxicating liquor, a controlled substance or other drug at the time I consulted with the Defendant as certified in paragraphs 1 and 2 above.

DEFENSE

Dated: This ____ day of March, 2019.

Ilm/GCU

A.A. 033

ATTY. NAME

1 2 3 4 5	AIND STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 ELIZABETH MERCER Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #10681 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500			
6	Attorney for Plaintiff			
7 8		CT COURT NTY, NEVADA		
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,			
10	Plaintiff,	CASE NO:	C-18-333335-2	
11	-VS-	DEPT NO:	XX	
12	SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE,			
13	#1779637	AMENI	DED SUPERSEDING	
14	Defendant.		NDICTMENT	
15 16 17	STATE OF NEVADA SS. COUNTY OF CLARK The Defendant above named SHAN IC	DNATHON KITTRFI	DGE accused by the Clark	
18	The Defendant above named, SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE, accused by the Clark County Grand Jury of the crime(s) of CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (Category)			
19				
20		Felony - NRS 200.380, 199.480 - NOC 50147); ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY EAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.380, 193.165 - NOC 50138); and RESISTING		
21	PUBLIC OFFICER WITH USE OF A FIF			
22				
23	NOC 55104), committed at and within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, on or between			
24	May 21, 2018 and June 8, 2018, as follows:			
25	did on or between May 21, 2018, and June 7, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and			
26				
27	feloniously conspire with DEANNA PAGE, aka Deanna Lee Page, to commit a robbery, the Defendant and DEANNA PAGE, aka Deanna Lee Page committing the acts as set forth			
28	H	ama Dee I age commin	uing the acts as set forth in	
	EXH	B w. 12018 DISPN 1066	A.A. 034 7/18F10667-AIND-(Superseding_Kittredge)-001 dock	

Counts 2 through 4, said acts being incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

COUNT 2 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

did on or between May 21, 2018, and May 26, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of JUAN DIAZ-SALAZAR and/or ANDORIO RODRIGUEZ and/or ROBERT RODRIGUEZ and/or ABIGAIL SALAZAR and/or ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ and/or ELIBRADA GUIAO and/or TRIXIE ARCINAS and/or DIEGO MORA-GOMEZ, or in their presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of JUAN DIAZ-SALAZAR and/or ANDORIO RODRIGUEZ and/or ROBERT RODRIGUEZ and/or ABIGAIL SALAZAR and/or ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ and/or ELIBRADA GUIAO and/or TRIXIE ARCINAS and/or DIEGO MORA-GOMEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 3 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did on or between May 27, 2018, and May 31, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of JENNIFER STRODE and/or AZALEY GOMEZ and/or ANETTE MENZI and/or MADISON SERWICKI and/or JORGE HERNANDEZ-GARCIA and/or SANDRA AMADOR-HERNANDEZ and/or MARIA SOLIS and/or VICTOR DELGADILLO-GARCIA, or in their presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of JENNIFER STRODE and/or AZALEY GOMEZ and/or ANETTE MENZI and/or MADISON SERWICKI and/or JORGE HERNANDEZ-GARCIA and/or SANDRA AMADOR-

HERNANDEZ and/or MARIA SOLIS and/or VICTOR DELGADILLO-GARCIA, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did on or between June 1, 2018, and June 7, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: U.S. Currency, from the person of DON GIULIANO and/or JOY SHLASINGER and/or JENNFIER HUGHES and/or KEYMARI PAXTON and/or DENISE PRATT, or in their presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of DON GIULIANO and/or JOY SHLASINGER and/or JENNFIER HUGHES and/or KEYMARI PAXTON and/or DENISE PRATT, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants aiding or abetting and/or conspiring by Defendants acting in concert throughout.

<u>COUNT 5</u> - RESISTING PUBLIC OFFICER WITH USE OF A FIREARM

Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, did on or about June 8, 2018, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously resist, delay, or obstruct Officer(s) J. EMERY and/or S. MCNULTY and/or R. Hart, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, public officers in discharging or attempting to discharge any legal duty, to wit: by pointing a firearm athe the said Officer(s) J. EMERY and/or S. MCNULTY and/or R. Hart, in an effort to flee from the officers, Defendant

1	using a firearm or Defendant removing, taking, or attempting to take or remove a firearm from
2	the person of, or the immediate presence of, the public officer in the course of such resistance,
3	obstruction or delay.
4	DATED this day of March, 2019.
5	STEVEN B. WOLFSON
6	Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001,565
7	BY W. N. 12473
8	ELIZABETH MERCER Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #10681
)	
)	
]	
2	
3.	
1	
5	
5	
7	
3	
)	
)	
1	
2	
3	
1	
5	18AGJ018A-B/18F10667X/18F10803X/18F05609X/Ilm/GCU
5	LVMPD EV# 1805263789;
7	1805311580; 1806022578; HPD 1811622
.	(TV1)

Electronically Filed 5/8/2019 10:09 AM Steven D. Grierson **CLERK OF THE COURT**

MEMO 1 YAMPOLSKY & MARGOLS 2 MACE J. YAMPOLSKY, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 01945 JASON R. MARGOLIS 3 Nevada Bar No. 12439 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 4 Telephone: (702) 385-9777; Fax: (702) 385-3001 Attorneys for Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE 5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,)		
	Case No.	C-18-33335
Plaintiff,)	Dept. No.	XX
vs.)		
SHAN KITTREDGE,)	Sentencing Dat	
Defendant.	Sentencing Tin	ne: 8:30 a.m.

SENTENCING MEMORANDUM OF DEFENDANT SHAN KITTREDGE

COMES NOW, Defendant SHAN KITTREDGE, by and through his counsel of record MACE J. YAMPOLSKY, ESQ., of the law firm YAMPOLSKY & MARGOLIS, and hereby files the foregoing Sentencing Memorandum for the Court's consideration in advance of the scheduled sentencing hearing herein.

DATED this 8th day of May, 2019.

YAMPOLSKY & MARGOLIS

/s/ Jason R. Margolis, Esq. MACE J. YAMPOLSKY, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 001945 JASON R. MARGOLIS, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 012439 625 South Sixth Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Defendant KITTREDGE

1

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION AND BACKGROUND FACTS

Shan Jonathon Kittredge was born in Albuquerque, New Mexico on May 23, 1980. Mr. Kittredge and his sister Taura were raised by both parents and had a relatively pleasant childhood—save for the fact that Shan was sexually abused by an uncle from age 5 to age 6. Mr. Kittredge never reported the abuse and does not in any manner seek to excuse his criminal conduct by means of the abuse excuse. He simply knows that, on some subconscious level, this event has contributed to his struggles with depression and drug abuse throughout his adult life as he never worked through the ramifications of the abuse. For several years, it was not entirely clear that Shan was suffering from this depression and emotional hollowness—he graduated high school, completed a two year Associates Degree, and had established himself in a trade—Mr. Kittredge was a fairly successful plumber for five years. Unfortunately this stability was not to last.

While Shan had experimented with drugs during his teenage years—as do most teenagers, he did not develop a drug addiction until his early twenties. Mr. Kittredge drank at parties in high school and college, and managed to do so largely without any adversity. Mr. Kittredge first tried marijuana at the age of 10, but never developed a habit for the drug and has used it and alcohol only intermittently, and without any incident, for most of his life. At the age of 15, however, Mr. Kittredge was introduced to cocaine. He feels he became addicted almost immediately and but for a lack of funds, he likely would have succumbed to an ever-growing addiction to that drug.

Thankfully, following nearly a decade of relatively consistent use of cocaine, Mr. Kittredge was able to kick the habit entirely, right around the same time his lengthy criminal history begins. Mr. Kittredge was first charged in Nevada with misdemeanor Obstruction of an Officer in 2003 and his cocaine use ceased in 2004. Sadly for this story and for the Kittredge family, Shan did not simply kick cocaine and begin to live a healthier life—instead he replaced his now dormant cocaine dependency with a quickly growing and exponentially more devastating methamphetamine addiction. It was around this time, in 2003 and 2004, when Shan was 23 and 24 years old that he began to commit the types of serious offenses for which he is

being sentenced today.

Mr. Kittredge has been addicted to drugs for twenty years. He was addicted to cocaine. He was then addicted to methamphetamine. In 2006, due to what was likely a combination of latent mental illness which was exacerbated by prolonged narcotics abuse, Mr. Kittredge was diagnosed with Schizophrenic Manic Disorder; Clinical Depression; Post Traumatic Stress Disorder; and Generalized Anxiety. Mr. Kittredge has never received mental health treatment and realizes how instrumental this might have been.

Yet, he continued to self-medicate with increasingly terrible consequences—his addiction(s) grew and the crimes he would resort to committing to obtain money for more drugs became more serious. He was unable to maintain any level of consistent employment because his addiction grew to the point that he could hardly function without substantial amounts of opiates. Finally, in the coup de grace, Mr. Kittredge became addicted to heroin shortly after his 30th birthday and he has spent much of the past decade becoming steadily more addicted, less capable of regulating his own behavior and emotions, and has become someone entirely different than the son, brother, and father that his family knew and loved. Shan became a shell of himself.

Mr. Kittredge has two children—a thirteen year old daughter who resides with her mother in New Mexico and a son who will be four years old on May 30th of this year. Mr. Kittredge has largely missed his son's entire life in a drug fueled haze or incarceration and he is ashamed and despondent at his failure as a father. Despite his love for his children, Shan has spent much of their lives engaging in a prolonged pity party of self-sabotage. Rather than face and address his failures in life he has continued to religiously abuse drugs to numb the pain away. Clearly, it has not worked. Mr. Kittredge's life has been steadily crumbling, and has been doing so at an accelerated pace, with every passing day since he began to use heroin at age 30 or 31. Mr. Kittredge is a sick man. It is anathema to justice to blame the sick for their illness—but in the case of men like Shan, men who self-medicate and voluntarily intoxicate themselves with dangerous drugs—we tend to show them no quarter in the criminal justice system. This is shameful.

Mr. Kittredge does not believe he is an alcoholic—he does, however, acknowledge that he has a serious substance abuse problem. This problem led him to burglarize cars and to steal things—to obtain money to feed his chemical dependency. Ultimately, this led to retail robberies at gunpoint in order to ensure that he could obtain enough money to feed his burgeoning drug and gambling addictions. Mr. Kittredge has been forthright with both undersigned counsel and the prosecution about his drug dependency and has acknowledged that he was under the influence at the time of the instant offense(s). In fact, Mr. Kittredge has not committed any crimes whatsoever in which he was not under the influence of heroin, methamphetamine, cocaine, or some combination thereof.

This is not an excuse—Mr. Kittredge understands—but counsel hopes an understanding of this dependency may help to serve as an explanation of sorts. Mr. Kittredge desperately wants to be at liberty so that he can establish a meaningful relationship with his son. Mr. Kittredge has largely had no contact with his son, whom he shares with his former girlfriend Deanna Page. It may be instructive for this court to know that Ms. Page was Mr. Kittredge's partner in crime—she was initially believed to be a codefendant, but has received a great deal of leniency in return for her cooperation against Shan. Ms. Page is also deeply addicted to drugs and has lost rights to the couple's son, who was born addicted to opiates. Mr. Kittredge's mother Sophie Kittredge has been raising his son since his birth while also working full time into her golden years. It is unfair and Shan knows it. He needs to be there for his son, for his mother, for his family and friends—but he has forfeited that chance with selfish and ill-fated decisions designed to satiate his need for heroin.

Mr. Kittredge is going to spend at least 18 years in prison. He will not be free during his son's childhood, won't attend any little league games or graduations, and for this he feels terrible and immensely angry with himself. That said, Mr. Kittredge and his family plead with this Honorable Court for understanding and compassion. He did terrible things, endangered and frightened many good, law-abiding, and hard-working people and he has no excuse. He is very sorry and only wants the chance to know his son before his son has no need for him anymore.

Suffice it to say, this broken and battered man is remorseful, and wants nothing more

than an opportunity to continue to see the light of day and his loved ones before he is a senior citizen. His drug dependency will be a lifelong struggle for him and he need look no further than the mirror or at younger versions of himself to realize that.

For the first time in his life, Mr. Kittredge has acknowledged he has a problem and has taken action to address it. Of course, most folks don't need to be shot several times and damnnear executed by law enforcement officers in order to see the proverbial light. Shan did. This has been the longest, most healthy, and most productive period of Mr. Kittredge's adult life and it is a damn shame that it took having bullets still lodged in his face and being in critical condition for weeks for him to get the message. Whatever the ultimate sentence, intensive drug treatment is respectfully requested.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTS RELATED TO THE OFFENSE

Currently, Mr. Kittredge is incarcerated and has been so since his release from the hospital following the officer-involved shooting that led to his apprehension. During a drug fueled span of approximately three weeks, from May 21, 2018, through June 8, 2018, Mr. Kittredge, along with his girlfriend and mother of his young son, Deanna Page, committed a series of armed robberies at convenience stores, fast food restaurants and other retail establishments. The general tenor of the robberies involved Mr. Kittredge entering the businesses, approaching a clerk or manager with a visible firearm, and instructing the employees to open the cash drawers. Mr. Kittredge would then take the money, dumping the remaining contents of the drawers on the ground, and would then flee to a waiting car driven by Ms. Page.

In all, Mr. Kittredge committed eight robberies and Ms. Page was the getaway driver for at least four of them. Mr. Kittredge robbed a Roberto's Taco Shop on May 21, 2018; a Panda Express on May 26, 2018; a Dunkin Donuts on May 27, 2018; two different Roberto's Taco Shop locations on May 31, 2018; Khoury's Mediterranean Restaurant on June 1, 2018; a local Albertson's grocery store on June 7, 2018; and finally a different Albertson's location on June 8, 2018. On June 8, 2018, Mr. Kittredge was stopped from committing any further robberies when

he was shot multiple times and left within an inch of his life following his apprehension by a group of officers who had been surveilling him. The nearly fatal offer involved shooting of Mr. Kittredge took place outside a crowded gas station midday and it is a minor miracle that both Mr. Kittredge survived, and nobody else sustained significant injury in the chaotic exchange.

Ms. Page, in large part due to her lesser criminal record and role in only half of the charged robberies, was offered a very favorable plea agreement provided she offered truthful testimony about her involvement. On January 31, 2019, Ms. Page pled guilty to Count 1, Conspiracy to Commit Robbery, a Category B Felony Offense, as well as Counts 2 and 3, both robberies, both Category B Felony Offenses. Sentencing in her case is set for approximately two weeks after Mr. Kittredge's sentencing—on May 30, 2019 in this very judicial department.

Mr. Kittredge has agreed to plead guilty to Counts 1, 2 through 4, and Count 5—this means that Mr. Kittredge has entered guilty pleas to a lone count of Conspiracy to Commit Robbery, a Category B Felony Offense; three (3) counts of Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon, a B felony offense, and a single count Resisting a Public Officer with a Firearm, a Category C Felony Offense. The Guilty Plea Agreement (hereinafter "GPA") further provides that the District Attorney may appropriately seek to impose either the Small or Large Habitual Criminal sentence in light of Mr. Kittredge's extensive criminal record—however the parties have stipulated to a sentence within the range of 18 to 45 years in the Nevada Department of Corrections. Given that Mr. Kittredge's youngest son, who has resided with his mother Sophie Kittredge since birth, is yet to turn four years old, counsel and Mr. Kittredge's family earnestly plead for a sentence as near to the eighteen-year minimum penalty contemplated by the parties.

Mr. Kittredge knows his past history does not make the Court inclined to think any leniency will make a difference, but the reality is that Mr. Kittredge has never taken his drug dependency seriously, has never received treatment for his addiction(s), and as a result, was doomed to repeat the same self-destructive patterns he developed in his early twenties. When Mr. Kittredge is sent to the Nevada Department of Corrections he will make it his life's mission to get clean and will avail himself of any and all applicable drug treatment programs. As Mr. Kittredge's family repeatedly avers, this young man is sick and has been for nearly two decades.

His thought processes and decision making may well be irreparably damaged but without significant and extensive drug treatment over a prolonged period of time, we will never know. It is beyond question that Shan will do a great deal of time in prison—his family and undersigned counsel merely pray for the opportunity to get Shan the treatment he has so desperately needed for so long, in hopes that this stint in prison can be a productive one—and can be Mr. Kittredge's last one.

Mr. Kittredge has a very large and supportive family here in Las Vegas, and a few other supporters remaining near Albuquerque, New Mexico. A representative of the family composed a concise but very informative two page letter to the Court in hopes that your honor would consider the same before rendering sentence in Shan's case. A true and accurate copy of this letter is attached to this memorandum as Exhibit "A". In large part, the family bemoans the deleterious effects Shan's prolonged history of drug abuse have had on his character, cognitive ability, and his decision-making ability. In sum, the Shan they know and love is not the same man terrorizing the Las Vegas Valley. The family misses the Shan they knew and desperately long for the day when this Shan returns. Essentially, it is very critical to Shan's family and to undersigned counsel that this Court knows this man is more than the collection of crimes he committed over three weeks in the summer of 2018.

In addition, Mr. Kittredge's mother Sophie and sister Taura, both of whom reside in Las Vegas and have regular contact with not only Shan but are raising his son, have written letters of support and pleas for leniency for your consideration. Counsel will not endeavor to excerpt or paraphrase much of that here, but counsel has rarely felt the pain of two women as palpably as in these missives. Both Mr. Kittredge's mother and sister, but most especially his mother Sophie, have been crushed by Shan's inability to right his ship and both fear for the loss Mr. Kittredge's son will feel if he never gets to know his father. As Sophie writes in her letter, attached hereto as Exhibit "B", "there is nothing like the father-son relationship." Mr. Kittredge genuinely wants to know his son and while he realizes the degree to which he will not is of his own making, he still throws himself before the mercy of the Court in sincere hopes that if he cannot be there for his son's high school graduation, maybe he can be there for his wedding and/or college graduation.

Finally, Mr. Kittredge's sister Taura has written the Court asking for understanding and compassion in the sentencing of her brother. She and the family were devastated when he was in critical condition, barely clinging to life, and while she too condemns her brother's actions in committing the crimes for which he is pleading guilty, she is also alarmed at just how callously and seemingly without a second's hesitation Sergeant Emory and other responding officers were ready to end his life. The family is well aware of Mr. Kittredge's warts but he did not deserve to be at the center of a firestorm while officers radioed "finish him," as he was motionless slumped over the steering wheel. All that aside, what Sophie and Taura most want is a chance for Shan to be a father to his young son. That is it, and that is all. Taura's letter on his behalf is attached hereto as Exhibit "C".

In reviewing and defending this case counsel has had ample opportunity to ask himself, and Shan, what exactly it was he was thinking in that gas station parking lot on June 8, 2018. To a distant, third-party observer, playing back the video in real time, it almost looks as if Mr. Kittredge was trying to commit what is known colloquially as "suicide by cop." By virtue of many conversations, counsel has come to conclude that Shan just wasn't thinking at all. He was basically in a heroin fueled haze and the synapses that ought to have been firing quite clearly weren't. It would be instructive perhaps to determine what if any effect Mr. Kittredge's long spanning drug abuse has had on his brain, but given the trauma he sustained due to the multiple gun-shot wounds to the head he suffered, counsel does not know that we will ever be able to know much for sure. Mr. Kittredge may not deserve a compassionate or lenient sentence in this Court's estimation, based on the series of robberies, the long criminal record, and the seemingly constant string of petty and not so petty offenses—we humbly ask for this compassion and leniency anyway.

We do so because, although Shan is sorry for what he has done and his history gives your honor some substantive reasons to disbelieve this man's mea culpa, a sentence far in excess of the presumably two decades Mr. Kittredge will spend in prison will not only punish him. Such a sentence would really serve to punish his daughter, his son, his mother, his sister, the people that love and care about him. Shan will be nearly or more than 60 years old when he is released from

prison, and that is even if he is sentenced on the low end of the range. This family is begging this Honorable Court for a chance for this man to see his family again outside the confines of a cage. If your honor is not inclined to do it for Shan, please give a bottom of the range sentence serious though for the betterment of his family, his children, and the other innocent people that will be harmed by Shan's prolonged absence from their lives.

Shan is not a career criminal, in the classic sense, he is just a desperate and wayward drug abuser. Thankfully, nobody was hurt, shot, or otherwise severely injured, save for Shan himself. This man is a father, a son and a brother. He will have a great deal of time within which to square himself and his life away, putting away the things that have cost him most of the first twenty years of his adult life.

DATED this 8th day of May, 2019.

YAMPOLSKY & MARGOLIS

/s/ Jason R. Margolis, Esq.
MACE J. YAMPOLSKY, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 001945
JASON R. MARGOLIS, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 012439
625 South Sixth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Defendant KITTREDGE

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of YAMPOLSKY & MARGOLIS, and that on the 8th day of May, 2019, I served a true and accurate copy of the foregoing, **DEFENDANT SHAN KITTREDGE'S SENTENCING MEMORANDUM**, via the electronic filing system upon the following interested parties:

Elizabeth Mercer
Chief Deputy District Attorney
E-Mail: elizabeth.mercer@clarkcountyda.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

Office of the District Attorney motions@clarkcountyda.com

/s/ Theresa J. Muzgay
An employee of
YAMPOLSKY & MARGOLIS

Exhibit "A"

Exhibit "A"

Date: 04/29/2019

To: Judge Eric Johnson of the Eighth Judicial District Court

From: Family representatives of Shan Kittredge

Your Honor,

We have waited patiently to put out a statement since the events occurred, back on June 9th of 2018, with the officer involved shooting that led to Shan's apprehension. A lot has transpired since the incident took place and Shan's sentencing is quickly approaching. We are writing so that we can express our feelings of the events and further add clarity to Shan's drug addictive past as to add value to his life and to humanize Shan as a person. We will keep our statement brief and to the point out of respect for the courts time.

To begin, we are grateful that Shan is alive and has been recovering; although, he has endured some very serious injuries including facial paralysis. Healthcare professionals say he will have lifelong injuries to deal with and, currently, has two bullets lodged within his cavities. As expected, we were shocked to hear what transpired and how it was truly handled, on both sides. To begin with, Shan's family members were not allowed to see him until June 21st, twelve days after the initial shooting took place and only given his health status updates by Metro, but at their leisure. Having a loved one fighting for his life with no family support was a hard reality for us. We have the upmost respect for law enforcement and all first responders. We have friends in the LV Metro police department and family member's throughout the U.S. that are law enforcement officers and first responders. We also understand that everyone is innocent until proven guilty and that Shan made some very serious mistakes. With that being said, we feel the apprehension process was completely mishandled by Metro Detectives and the task force who was conducting surveillance for two weeks prior to taking Shan into custody. We have been approached by advocates groups against police negligence pertaining to unreasonable and excessive force which was inflicted by Metros Joseph Emery, et al. These counselors and advocate groups feel Emery and all metro officers on site that night had other multiple apprehension avenues they could have pursued, mainly, that Emory acted as Judge, Jury, and Executioner. The horrific video is a testament which truly shows the task force didn't have a proper plan in place when they felt their "window of opportunity" had presented itself. To simply put it, hearing the amount of shots, hearing the suspect is slumped over, and then to hear someone radio in, "finish him", as two more shots, at point blank range, are fired. The task force had an amazing amount of resources allocated for the apprehension process, and they didn't utilize those resources effectively. The press conference that followed was staged to fully discredit Shan and to validate Metro Polices actions, mainly Emery's. We are truly grateful that no one else was injured in any events that involved Shan and we look forward with moving things along with the advocate counseling groups against Emory. We have waited and have not met with any news media outlets as wait for the completion of Shan's sentencing.

There is no denying the severity of the crimes that took place and we don't want to make Shan a victim of those actions. Shan's criminal past always involved narcotic related crimes. The main reason for that is clear, Shan is an addict, who eventually graduated to the worst drug addiction of them all, heroin abuse. The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) describes heroin as highly addictive. People who regularly use heroin often develop a tolerance, which means that they need higher and/or more frequent doses of the drug. Those abusive drugs physically alter the way the brain works by sending abnormal messages through out the brain. Opiate abuse is one of the most powerful diseases that plague the world. Unfortunately, Shan never received the proper care to treat his complex addiction. Shan has lived a life of drug misery and will continue to further be incarcerated for his recent actions. Shan is a son, father, brother, an uncle, and due to his illness was out casted by many due to his addiction issues. The root of the problem never was resolved which could have led to Shan living a life without crime and drug abuse. Shan is not alone in this fight, heroin addiction turns people of all walks of life, i.e., doctors, housewives, priests, etc., to do acts they would have never done before just so they can feed their addiction disease. But it takes personal commitment and the will to change, and systematically other suppressive drugs to mitigate the opiate addiction. This will not go away overnight and Shan's lifetime battle with his disease will continue to carry on. We are hoping to aid him as he serves his time and fights this disease, our efforts from this letter is to add value to Shan as human being that made mistakes. We want Shan to have a relationship with his son, whom is being raised by our family; Shan's son was born addicted to opiates due to drug use by the mother during pregnancy. The mother has no relationship with Shan's son and is fighting her own personal demons. The mother made a deal with the State to be a key witness against Shan not for theirs son's sake but for her own, and currently is free in the Vegas Valley. She carried out similar crimes but since she was needed as a witness received leniency by the state in order to prove their case. But that is other subject matter that will be further looked into by the advocate team.

We hope you don't see us as being greedy by asking for contingencies, we just want Shan safe as possible while incarcerated, appointed proper health treatment for his injuries and for his addiction. Also, we hope that Shan is placed close to the Vegas Valley were we may visit frequently and often to ensure that family bonds are maintained and healed and that his son gets to know who is father is, the good with the bad.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Respectfully,

Shan's family.

Exhibit "B"

Exhibit "B"

	Honorable Judge Eric Johnson
	Don't Eric Tolonson
	this letter air letter for you to read
	this letter prior to Sentencing Tam the mother of Shan T. Kittredge Tom Olandina Mittedge
	TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT
	- nave some compassion for shan Tikilling
	are Perious which happened all in
	- Ithe matter of 2 Meeks to those
	- Few Meeks Shan was on herein
	Krystal L. Page that shan and Deanna
	Moure 50 bad She was shooting himus
Marie Land Control	MITH THE CITY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY O
	Deanna L. Page is Free and shan Will be
	- Juding to Prison. Studies have shown
	Some deterioration of the brains white
	affect decision making abilities.
	the ability to regulate behavior once o
	person has heroin use disorder. Seeking and using the drug becomes their primary
	Company volumes - Cherry Wallings

	purpose in Life.
	Shan has a son that will be
	Hylars old on May 30, 2019.
	The mother of his Son is Deanna L. Page. I have had custody of his Son Since
	he Mas born. Down a L. Page do as it want
	her at birth becomes he was born
	a ddicted to drugs. I will be taking.
	Care of him till Shan comes home. From Prison.
	Place Find a place in your
	Shan T Kittredop a Lesser Sentencing
	So he can be there for his son
	There's Rotthing Indontine Forthur Som
	relationship, as a boy grows up.
	Some Research Fully
	Sonokatulogo
197	그는 그를 받아 남자는 그는 있는 것이 하는 이 가는 이 가는 이 가는 사람에 했습니다. 그를 확했다는 것이 하면 함께 생각했다. 그는 이 한쪽을 받아 있는 이 생각을 모고 있는데 얼마를 받아 되었다.

Exhibit "C"

Exhibit "C"

	April 29th, 2019
	Dear Judge Eric Johnon,
	case: Shan J. Kittredge vs State of Nevada
	I am writing to you regarding case
	then Tongthan Kittered par my brother. I am
	lasting of you to lower his sentence the has been
-	surfained with life long injuries that occurred on
	June 9 2019 and is having suttering of pain
The state of the s	due to what accurred, and is still needing medical
= }	neassity to which the court has not given him
	the medial atention he seeks and deserves.
	Ishan has a 3 yr. old son with Deanna thegirl
	who was involved with the crimes also. Due
	all
	Care at our mother Sophie Kittredge who is
	a senior citizen and still working tell time.
	Because no one else wants to care for this
	third I would all the court to the Thirdy I through
7. Visit 196	the apportunity to have a lessor sentence to
<u> </u>	he able to raise his son. I would here this
<u> </u>	would give Than and his son a reconnection
	to be there for one another from a father
<u> </u>	The second to God A DONA Atel
	to son, I would tell to show is
	If they had to be apply to the the
	Son's adolescent life. My wasage to heart
	you Judge to though the spend years
	At his life improved that you may
1	
	leuser his sentencing
	- Will Marchelle Town V. Heredon (SISTE)
	I hank you, perfectivity Jacon montore the LUNG Still

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

May 14, 2019

C-18-333335-2

State of Nevada

vs

Shan Kittredge

May 14, 2019

08:30 AM Sentencing

HEARD BY:

Johnson, Eric

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 12A

COURT CLER

COURT CLERK: Skinner, Linda

RECORDER:

Calvillo, Angie

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Elizabeth A. Mercer

Attorney for Plaintiff

Mace J. Yampolsky

Attorney for Defendant

Shan Jonathon Kittredge

Defendant

State of Nevada

Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES

Upon Court's inquiry, Mr. Yampolsky and Defendant advised there are no issues pursuant to the Stockmeier decision. By virtue of his plea and by Order of this Court, DEFENDANT KITTREDGE ADJUDGED GUILTY of COUNT 1 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (F); COUNTS 2-4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F) and COUNT 5 - RESISTING PUBLIC OFFICER WITH USE OF A FIREARM (F). Statements by Ms. Mercer. Matter submitted by Mr. Yampolsky. COURT ORDERED, in addition to the \$25 Administrative Assessment fee and the \$3.00 DNA Collection fee with the \$150 DNA Analysis fee being WAIVED as previously imposed, DEFENDANT SENTENCED to the Nevada Department of Corrections as follows:

COUNT 1 - a MINIMUM term of TWENTY-EIGHT (28) MONTHS with a MAXIMUM term of SEVENTY-

TWO (72) MONTHS;

COUNT 2 - a MINIMUM term of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS with a MAXIMUM term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS MINIMUM and a MAXIMUM term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS for Use of a Deadly Weapon, Count 2 to run CONCURRENT with Count 1;

COUNT 3 - a MINIMUM term of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS with a MAXIMUM term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS MINIMUM and a MAXIMUM term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS for Use of a Deadly

Weapon, Count 3 to run CONSECUTIVE to Count 2;

COUNT 4 - a MINIMUM term of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS with a MAXIMUM term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS MINIMUM and a MAXIMUM term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS for Use of a Deadly Weapon, Count 4 to run CONCURRENT with Count 3;

COUNT 5 - a MINIMUM term of TWENTY-FOUR (24) MONTHS with a MAXIMUM term of SIXTY (60) MONTHS, to run CONSECUTIVE to Count 3 with 156 days credit for time served.

Defendant to pay \$4,153.37 RESTITUTION (\$2,802 to be paid jointly and severally with co-defendant) in the following amounts: \$400 to Panda Express, \$300 to Duncan Donuts; \$331 to Roberto's Taco Shop; \$100 to Khoury's Mediterranean Restaurant and \$3,022.37 to Albertson's.

Printed Date: 5/15/2019

Page 1 of 2

Minutes Date:

May 14, 2019

Prepared by: Linda Skinner

AGGREGATE TOTAL SENTENCE is EIGHTEEN (18) YEARS to FORTY-FIVE (45) YEARS.

BOND, if any, EXONERATED.

NDC

Printed Date: 5/15/2019
Prepared by: Linda Skinner

Page 2 of 2

Minutes Date:

May 14, 2019

Electronically Filed 5/16/2019 9:39 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

JOCP

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Plaintiff.

-VS-

SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE #1779637

Defendant.

CASE NO. C-18-333335-2

DEPT. NO. XX

JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION (PLEA OF GUILTY)

The Defendant previously appeared before the Court with counsel and entered a plea of guilty to the crimes of COUNT 1 – CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 199.480; COUNTS 2, 3, & 4 – ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165; and COUNT 5 – RESISTING PUBLIC OFFICER WITH USE OF A FIREARM (Category C Felony) in violation of NRS 199.280; thereafter, on the 14th day of May, 2019, the Defendant was present in court for sentencing with counsel MACE YAMPOLSKY, ESQ., and good cause appearing,

27

28

THE DEFENDANT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED guilty of said offenses and, in addition to the \$25.00 Administrative Assessment Fee, \$4,153.37 Restitution (\$2,802.00 to be paid Jointly and Severally with Co-Deft) in the following amounts: \$400.00 to Panda Express, \$300.00 to Dunkin' Donuts, \$331.00 to Roberto's Taco Shop, \$100.00 to Khoury's Mediterranean Restaurant, \$3,022.37 to Albertson's and \$150.00 DNA Analysis Fee including testing to determine genetic markers (waived if previously collected) plus \$3.00 DNA Collection Fee, the Defendant is sentenced to the Nevada Department of Corrections as follows: COUNT 1 - a MAXIMUM of SEVENTY-TWO (72) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TWENTY-EIGHT (28) MONTHS; COUNT 2 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS for the Use of a Deadly Weapon, CONCURRENT with COUNT 1; COUNT 3 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS for the Use of a Deadly Weapon; CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 2; COUNT 4 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS for the Use of a Deadly Weapon, CONCURRENT with COUNT 3; and COUNT 5 - a MAXIMUM of SIXTY(60) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TWENTY-

ERIC JOHNSON	
ERIC JOHNSON	/*************************************
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	(

FILED

MAY 2 2 2020

CLERK OF COURT

3

1

2 .

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

2122

23

2425

26

2728

IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK

SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE, Petitioner.

Vs.

STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent(s) Case No. Dept No.

A-20-815382-W Dept. XX

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

COMES NOW. Shan Kittredge in Proper Person and moves this court for its order allowing the appointment of Counsel.

This Motion is made and based upon the accompanying

DATED: This 1st day of April

Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

____. 2020.

Petitioner in

Stoper Person.

The Court must appoint Counsel where the Complexities of a Case are Such that denial of Counsel would amount to a denial of due process. Brown V. United States, 623 F. 2d 54, 61 (9th Cir 1980) and/or where a person is of Such limited education as to be incapable of presenting his Claims in Such a way that the Court Can afford him a fair hearing. SEE Howkins V. Bennett, 423 F. 2d 948 (8th Cir 1970) Petitioner Shan Jonathon Kittredge alleges that the issues in this Case are Complex and that petitioner is unable to adequately present the Claims Without the Assistance Of Counsel. Shan Janathan Kittredge hereby respectfully requests that the Court appoint Counsel for the above mentioned reasons.

DATED THIS Let day of April , 2020

Respectfully Submitted by

Shan Jonathon Kittledge.
Petitioner/In Propia Persona
Post Office Box 208, SDCC
Indian Springs, Nevada 89070



IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK

SHAN JONATHON KUTTREDGE;	A-20-815382-W Dept. XX
Petitioner,	}
VS.	Case No. C. 18-333335-2
STATE OF NEVADA	Dept. No. XX
The second secon	Docket
Respondent(s).	

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST-CONVICTION)

INSTRUCTIONS:

- (1) This petition must be legibly handwritten or typewritten signed by the petitioner and verified.
- (2) Additional pages are not permitted except where noted or with respect to the facts which you rely upon to support your grounds for relief. No citation of authorities need be furnished. If briefs or arguments are submitted, they should be submitted in the form of a separate memorandum.
- (3) If you want an attorney appointed, you must complete the Affidavit in Support of Request to Proceed in Forma Pauperis. You must have an authorized officer at the prison complete the certificate as to the amount of money and securities on deposit to your credit in any account in the institution.
- (4) You must name as respondent the person by whom you are confined or restrained. If you are in a specific institution of the department of corrections, name the warden or head of the institution. If you are not in a specific institution of the department within its custody, name the director of the department of corrections.
- (5) You must include all grounds or claims for relief which you may have regarding your conviction; and sentence.

APR 19 200

A.A. 064

Failure to raise all grounds I this petition may preclude you from filing future petitions

1

I	8. What was your plea? (Check one)
2	(a) Not guilty
3	(b) Guilty
1	(c) Nolo contendere
	9. If you entered a guilty plea to one count of an indictment or information, and a not guilty ple
5	to another count of an indictment or information, or if a guilty plea was negotiated, give details:
7	
,	10. If you were found guilty after a plea of not guilty, was the finding made by: (check one)
	(a) Jury
	(b) Judge without a jury
	11. Did you testify at trial? YesNo
	12. Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?
	Yes No
	13. If you did appeal, answer the following:
	(a) Name of court:
	(b) Case number or citation:
	(c) Result:
	(d) Date of appeal:
	(Attach copy of order or decision, if available).
	14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not:
	15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you previously
	filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or
	federal? Yes No V
i i	

ŀ	16. If your answer to No 15 was Yes, give the following information.
2	(a) (1) Name of court:
3	(2) Nature of proceedings:
4	I — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
5	(3) Grounds raised :
6	
7	
8	(4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion?
9	YesNo
10	(5) Result:
11	(6) Date of result:
12	(7) If known, citations of any written opinion or date of orders entered pursuant to each
13	result:
14	(b) As to any second petition, application or motion, give the same information:
15	(1) Name of Court:
16	(2) Nature of proceeding:
17	(3) Grounds raised:
18	(4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion?
19	Yes No
20	(5) Result:
21	(6) Date of result:
22	(7) If known, citations or any written opinion or date of orders entered pursuant to each
23	result:
24	(c) As to any third or subsequent additional application or motions, give the same
25	information as above, list them on a separate sheet and attach.
26	
27	
28	andre de la companya de la companya La companya de la co

1	(d) Did you appeal to the highest state or federal court naving jurisdiction, the result or actio
2	taken on any petition, application or motion?
3	(1) First petition, application or motion?
4	Yes No
5	Citation or date of decision:
6	(2) Second petition, application or motion?
7	Yes No V
8	Citation or date of decision:
9	(e) If you did not appeal from the adverse action on any petition, application or motion,
10	explain briefly why you did not. (You may relate specific facts in response to this question. Your
11	response may be included on paper which is 8 ½ x 11 inches attached to the petition. Your respons
12	may not exceed five handwritten or typewritten pages in length).
13	
14	
15	17. Has any ground being raised in this petition been previously presented to this or any other
16	court by way of petition for habeas corpus, motion or application or any other post-conviction
17	proceeding? If so, identify:
18	(a) Which of the grounds is the same:
19	
20	(b) The proceedings in which these grounds were raised:
21	
22	(c) Briefly explain why you are again raising these grounds. (You must relate specific facts
23	in response to this question. Your response may be included on paper which is 8 ½ x 11 inches
24	attached to the petition. Your response may not exceed five handwritten or typewritten pages in
25	length)
26	
27	
8	5

1	18. If any of the grounds listed in Nos. 23(a), (b), (c), and (d), or listed on any additional pages
2	you have attached, were not previously presented in any other court, state or federal, list briefly wha
3	grounds were not so presented, and give your reasons for not presenting them. (You must relate
4	specific facts in response to this question. Your response may be included on paper which is 8 ½ x
5	11 inches attached to the petition. Your response may not exceed five handwritten or typewritten
6	pages in length).
7	
8	19. Are you filing this petition more than one (1) year following the filing of the judgment of
9	conviction or the filing of a decision on direct appeal? If so, state briefly the reasons for the delay,
10	(You must relate specific facts in response to this question. Your response may be included on
11	paper which is 8 ½ x 11 inches attached to the petition. Your response may not exceed five
12	handwritten or typewritten pages in length).
13	
14	
15	20. Do you have any petition or appeal now pending in any court, either state or federal, as to the
16	judgment under attack?
17	Yes No
18	If "Yes", state what court and the case number:
19	
20	21. Give the name of each attorney who represented you in the proceeding resulting in your
21	conviction and on direct appeal: Mace Yampolsky, Esa
22	
23	
4	22. Do you have any future sentences to serve after you complete the sentence imposed by the
5	judgment under attack?
6	Yes No If "Yes", specify where and when it is to be served, if you know:
7	
8	6
- 1	to the control of the

Summarize briefly the facts supporting each ground. If necessary, you may attach pages stating additional grounds and facts supporting same.

(a) GROUND ONE: Defendant/Petitioner's Counselor was ineffective And his Guilty Plea was unknowingly and unintelligently signed

3

4

5

6

7

28

23. (a) SUPPORTING FACTS (Tell your story briefly without citing cases or law): In June of 2018 petitioner (was shot by (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police who was in alliance with Major Violators Unit) Nine times two of those shots were to the head. Petitioner Complained to his Attorney that because of the injury to his head he did not Clearly or intelligently understand what his Attorney Mr. Mace Yampolsky was trying to explain to him concerning a Guilty Plea the Assistant District Attorney was offening. Petitioner was confused and unable to think Clearly. Petitioner offers as evidence that he could 15 16 not think Clearly and intelligently the Court Minutes lated January 17 8th 2019. In the above named document petitioner can be seen in in Courtroom 12A explaining that he has sent several inmate Kites i.e. reduest seeking medical attention but was unable to get any medical attention. Someone being shot twice in the head is a miracle to be alive any laymon or Professional Knows or Should Know that questioning Someone who was Shot not once, but twice in the head is under great strain mentally physically as well as spiritually. The injury to petitioner's head was extremely serious and the medication he received was not sufficient to overbear his will to resist the questioning, his injuries impaired his rational faculties. Counsel was also ineffective because he failed to explain to the.

1	23. (b) GROUND TWO: Continued from page 7
2	Court that petitioner needed more time (because of his sorious
3	head injuries) to clearly, knowingly and intelligently understand the
4	offer the Strate was presenting as a Guilty Plea Agreement.
5	23. (b) SUPPORTING FACTS (Tell your story briefly without citing cases or law):
6	Petitioner was prejudiced by this because had he been in his
7	right State or Compos Mentis he would not have signed whatever
8	document Coursel placed before him and proceeded to a jury trial.
9	Any Medical or Psychology Doctor will attest to the fact that petition
10	Should not have been place under duress to make a serious dec-
11	is ion refter the trauma festitioner Suffered after being shot in the
12	head. This is Axiomatic, no argument can contravert what any
13	human Could or Should know. That is that, any one getting short
14	twice in the head Should never be signing not only a plea Agree-
15	ment but any Agreement for that matter.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	8
- 11	under the control of

CERTFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAILING

2	1, Shan Jonathan Kithredge, hereby certify, pursuant to NRCP 5(b), that on this 1
3	day of Apri , 2020, I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing, "Petition For Writing
4	Of Habeas Corpus
5	by placing document in a sealed pre-postage paid envelope and deposited said envelope in the
6	United State Mail addressed to the following:
7	
. 8	Steven D. Gnierson Clerk of The Court
9	Las Vegas, NV. 139155-1160
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	CC:FILE
18 19	DATED: this 1st day of 2020.
20	DATED: tills 157 day 01 22020.
21	
22	Ali Rropria Personam
23	Post Office Box 208, S.D.C.C. Indian Springs, Nevada 89018
24	EN FORMA PAUPERIS:
25	
26	
27	
28	12

A.A. 071

AFFIRMATION Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

	The undersigned does hereby affirm that the prece	dlng <u>Petition for</u>
	Writ of Habeas Corpus	
	(Title of Document)	
filed in	in District Court Case number <u>C 18 333335-</u>	2
d c	Does not contain the social security number of any	person.
	-OR-	
п с	Contains the social security number of a person as r	equired by:
	A. A specific state or federal law, to wit:	
	(State specific law)	
	-or-	
	B. For the administration of a public program for a federal or state grant.	or for an application
Sim	1/	1/20
S <u>har</u>	nan Jonathon Kittredge	<i>Date</i>
TIHE	Pro'se	

1	WHEREFORE, Shan J. Kittredge, prays that the court grant Petitioner Kittredge
2	relief to which he may be entitled in this proceeding.
3	EXECUTED at Southarn Desert Correctional Center
4	on the 1st day of April . 2020.
5	
6	(C:
7	Signature Cof Petitioner
8	<u>VERIFICATION</u>
9	Under penalty of perjury, pursuant to N.R.S. 208.165 et seq., the undersigned declares that he is
10	the Petitioner named in the foregoing petition and knows the contents thereof; that the pleading is
11	true and correct of his own personal knowledge, except as to those matters based on information and
12	belief, and to those matters, he believes them to be true.
13	
14	Signature of Petitioner
15	
16	
17	Atttorney for Petitioner
18	
19	
20 20	
77	
77	
7	andre de la companya de la companya Companya de la companya de la compa
,,	
7	
8	
0	

EXHIBIT-A

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

January 08, 2019

C-18-333335-2

State of Nevada

VS

Shan Kittredge

January 08, 2019

8:30 AM

Motion

HEARD BY: Johnson, Eric

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 12A

COURT CLERK: Linda Skinner

RECORDER:

Angie Calvillo

REPORTER:

PARTIES

PRESENT:

Mercer, Elizabeth A.

State of Nevada Toddre, Frank A, II Yampolsky, Mace J. Attorney

Plaintiff Attorney

Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Statements by Mr. Yampolsky including that Defendant has sent several kites, however, has been unable to get any medical attention. Upon Court's inquiry, Mr. Toddre advised he was just made aware of this issue and requested the matter be continued so that he can speak with the medical personnel. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED TWO (2) WEEKS.

CUSTODY (COC-NDC)

... CONTINUED 1/24/19 9:00 AM

PRINT DATE:

12/05/2019

Page 5 of 6

Minutes Date:

August 21, 2018

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

January 24, 2019

C-18-333335-2

State of Nevada

VS

Shan Kittredge

January 24, 2019

9:00 AM

Motion

HEARD BY: Johnson, Eric

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 12A

COURT CLERK: Linda Skinner

RECORDER:

Angie Calvillo

REPORTER:

PARTIES

PRESENT:

Merback, William J.

Attorney

State of Nevada

Plaintiff

Yampolsky, Mace J.

Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Frank Toddre from the Nevada Department of Corrections also present. Court noted it appears Defendant is being treated. Mr. Yampolsky concurred but advised he is waiting for an MRI and X-rays. Following colloquy, COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED.

CUSTODY (COC-NDC)

PRINT DATE:

12/05/2019

Page 6 of 6

Minutes Date:

August 21, 2018

A.A. 076

	CERTFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAILING
	I, Shan Kittnedge, hereby certify, pursuant to NRCP 5(b), that on this 1
	day of April 2020, I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing, "MOTION
	FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL "
4	by placing document in a sealed pre-postage paid envelope and deposited said envelope in the
(United State Mail addressed to the following:
7	
8	STEVEN D. GRIERSON Clerk Of Court
9	LAS VEGAS, NV. 89155-1160
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	CC:FILE
18	
19	DATED: this gray of, 2020.
20	
21	X #1202692
22	/In Propria Personam Post Office Box 208, S.D.C.C. Indian Springs, Nevada 89018
23	Indian Springs, Nevada 89018 IN FORMA PAUPERIS:
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	grander i de la companya de la comp

AFFIRMATION Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding MOTION FOR

A DOLLAR OF COMME
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL (Title of Document)
filed in District Court Case number
Does not contain the social security number of any person.
-OR-
Contains the social security number of a person as required by:
A. A specific state or federal law, to wit:
(State specific law)
-01-
B. For the administration of a public program or for an application for a federal or state grant.
Signature 4/1/20 Date
Shan Kittnedge Print Name
Title

SDCC P.O. Box 208

Indian Springs N.V. 89070

To: Steven D. Grier son/ Clerk of Court 3rd Flor 200 Lewis Ave. 3rd Flor Las Vegas N.V. 89155-1160

A TOPPOSE OF THE PARTY OF THE P

Who commercian

A.A. 079

Electronically Filed 11/18/2020 10:28 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

.

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25 DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Plaintiff,

VS.

SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE,

Defendant.

CASE #: C-18-333335-2

DEPT. XX

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ERIC JOHNSON, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MONDAY, MARCH 18, 2019

RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING: JURY TRIAL – DAY 1

APPEARANCES:

For the State:

SAMUEL S. MARTINEZ ELIZABETH A. MERCER

Chief Deputy District Attorneys

For the Defendant:

MACE J. YAMPOLSKY, ESQ. JASON R. MARGOLIS, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: ANGIE CALVILLO, COURT RECORDER

A.A. 080

1	[Las Vegas, Nevada, Monday, March 18, 2019, at 10:33 a.m.]
2	[Outside the presence of the prospective jury]
3	
4	THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Shan Kittredge, case
5	number C333335. Counsel, go ahead and make your formal
6	appearances for the record.
7	MS. MERCER: Good morning, Your Honor. Elizabeth Mercer
8	and Samuel Martinez for the State.
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Mace Yampolsky and Jason Margolis on
10	behalf of Mr. Kittredge, who is present in custody. Also seated at
11	Counsel's table is Kaitlyn Stella. She's a paralegal in my office. She'll
12	be assisting during the trial.
13	THE COURT: Okay, very good. All right. Well it's my
14	understanding we have the jury out there. And you've all been provided
15	with the random list, is that correct?
16	MS. MERCER: That's correct, Your Honor.
17	MR. MURPHY: Correct.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Anything we need to talk about before we get
21	started?
22	MS. MERCER: Your Honor, I don't know – did we ever make
23	a record about the offer that was conveyed in this case?
24	THE COURT: I don't remember a record being made.
25	MS. MERCER: Okay. I don't think we ever got to the specific

details of what charges he would plead to, but the State had made an offer of to Mr. Kittredge some time ago of a stipulated term of imprisonment 20 to 50 years. I asked Mr. Yampolsky to visit with his client and let me know if his client was amenable to some sort of negotiation near that range, and then never heard anything back. So I'm assuming that we were just so far apart that it wasn't worth having any further discussions, but if we could just confirm that with Counsel for the record for appellate purposes.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Yampolsky, is her representations consistent with your understanding?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: That's correct. We discussed it with Mr. Kittredge and we weren't close. And as a matter of fact, I had a brief discussion with Ms. Mercer, but we weren't going to be able to agree, so --

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kittredge, I don't want you to discuss anything that was between you and your attorneys. But do you recall being discussed -- having a discussion with them relating to this offer?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And your attorney's representing that you don't have any -- you didn't feel that you were anywhere close to where you would be willing to accept an offer, and so negotiations were not pursued. Do you concur with that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Does the State want anything

further in terms of a record?

MS. MERCER: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Now, I don't know if anybody here has done a trial? We'll seat --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well not in here.

MR. MARTINEZ: Not in here.

THE COURT: Not in here, I know. But, I mean, a trial in front of me, sorry. I got a lot of years of experience with trials sitting here in the courtroom. We'll seat 10 in the back; 10 in the second row, and then four up here. I don't refer to them by badge numbers. I refer to them by seat number or their name. If you want to refer to them by badge number, you can. But I just find the badge numbers confusing, so I always refer to them by name or seat number.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And how do you go?

THE COURT: One is over here.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: One is all the way to the left in the back?

THE COURT: Right, I look at it for me. I'm going across, so one to 10; 11 to 20, and 21 to 24.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Twenty-one, 22, 23, 24, okay.

THE COURT: And so the alternates will come out of 21 through 24. So if you waive anything, that doesn't move anybody into an alternate position. So alternates will come out of 21 through 24; I'll give you each one preempt as to that 21 through 24, and then you get your four preempts as to 21 through -- don't move -- I'll ask questions for a couple hours, don't move to dismiss anybody for cause in front of the

jury, we'll have sidebars; we'll have breaks.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

THE COURT: And at that point in time, I'll give you an opportunity if you see somebody you want to dismiss; you can dismiss -- or move to dismiss for cause.

MR. MARTINEZ: So just take note of it, and we'll --

THE COURT: So just take note of it, and we'll deal with it in the back. When we do remove anybody whether it's for cause or scheduling or whatever it may be, I don't make everybody get up and move down. We'll just take the next one in the gallery. So at a break, we get rid of Juror 2; Juror 10; Juror 15, and Juror 23. The next one will take over two; the next one will take over 10; the next one will take over 15, and the next one will take over 23.

Does everybody understand that?

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes.

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

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Okay. Pretty similar to how they did it over in federal court.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Except you will let us talk, right?

THE COURT: Yeah, I'll let you ask questions, yeah. After, like I said, I'll get through my list of questions. I will give the State a chance to give a brief summary of the case. Do you want me to just have — say, the Defense will now introduce itself and any additional

1

.

4

5

6 7

8

10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah, that's fine.

THE COURT: Or do you want me -- I'll give you an opportunity if you want to state a defense; you have to state a short summary of your defense.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, no, I usually -- you know, basely introduce myself and say, you know --

THE COURT: All right. Well I just didn't want to put you on the spot by saying now the defense will give -- introduce themselves and give a short summary. And then you look at me and say, well I really didn't want to. I don't want to put you on the spot like that, so I'm letting you --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- letting you adjust on it.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I'll just introduce myself.

THE COURT: Okay, that's fine.

[Court and Clerk confer]

MS. MERCER: Your Honor, for scheduling purposes, do you anticipate that we'll get to witnesses today. We have three tentatively lined up for 2:30, but --

THE COURT: You know, if we can get a jury picked, yeah. I'll want to get openings going and a witness. I don't know how long it'll take for us to get a jury picked in this case. But, yeah, I will keep this --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Are we going 'til five?

THE COURT: We'll go to five. And if we don't have a jury

1	П	picked bu	t we're close, I'll probably keep everybody here a little bit to try
2		to get the	jury done. I mean if we get to 4:30, you know, probably won't
3		make you	do anything today.
4			MR. MARTINEZ: Okay.
5			MS. MERCER: Okay.
6			THE COURT: Even if we you know, if you want to talk
7		among yo	ourselves in terms of tomorrow.
8			THE CLERK: I have an 18-page Indictment to read.
9			THE COURT: You have an 18 page so that's 15 minutes of
10		reading ti	me just right there.
11			MR. MARTINEZ: And Ms. Mercer has about 740 witnesses to
12		read off,	potential witnesses.
13			THE COURT: All right.
14			MR. YAMPOLSKY: And that's her pare down list.
15			THE COURT: Okay. All right.
16			MR. MARTINEZ: Are you okay with us asking panel
17		questions	? Or do you want it just individual questions?
18			THE COURT: I'll let you have a chance to ask group
19		questions	
20			MR. MARTINEZ: Okay.
21			THE COURT: or individual questions; whatever you do. I
22		will you	know if it's repetitive with any question I ask, or anybody I
23		will shut y	you down.
24			MR. MARTINEZ: Okay.
25			THE COURT: We aren't going to ask the same question

six different ways. And I don't --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: You don't think they'll answer us differently than you?

THE COURT: Sometimes they might but most of the time, no. I mean, I'll let you have a little leeway. But, you know, we're not going to spend a lot of time on repeat questions. I can't think -- any of you have any questions, Mr. Yampolsky? Mr. Margolis?

MR. MARGOLIS: I don't think so, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The State?

THE CLERK: The circles.

THE COURT: Oh, that's right. See all those metal circles over here?

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Uh-huh.

MS. MERCER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Pretend that on this side of the metal circles is an imaginary line?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

MR. MARGOLIS: Okay.

THE COURT: You aren't to go across that imaginary line to the jury.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I see.

THE COURT: And I will definitely tell you to move back if you step over, over that line; that should be it. All right, anything else before we get started?

MS. MERCER: No, Your Honor.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: No.

THE COURT: All right. Let Bruce know that we can bring them in.

[In the presence of the prospective jurors]

THE MARSHAL: All rise, the jury is entering.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect the presence of the attorneys for both sides; the presence of the defendant. Does the parties stipulate to the presence of the voir dire panel?

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, very good. All right. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's good to see everybody here today. I want to thank you for coming down here and meeting your responsibilities as citizens here at Southern Nevada to be considered for jury service. I really do appreciate it.

My name is Eric Johnson. I'm the District Court Judge for Department 20 here in the Eighth Judicial District Court. Some people sometimes will ask me if Department 20 represents any particular geographic area like an assembly seat represents a certain area, or a state senate seat represents a certain area and it doesn't, it's just is an organizational term.

We have 32 general jurisdiction judges here in the Eighth Judicial District Court which essentially covers all of Clark County. And so to organize things, we assign each judge a department

number, and so I've been assigned Department No. 22 [sic]. People at times will ask me, what is a general jurisdictional judge? And quite simply, a general jurisdictional judge is a judge that handles criminal and civil jury trials, and that's why you're all down here today to be considered for possible participation in what is a criminal jury trial.

I want to thank you all for being here. I want to make sure you understand I'm not under any delusion that the vast majority of you are thrilled about being here. I do appreciate, as all the courts and judges appreciate, that this is an infringement on your time; that you all have jobs, or school, or family, or a variety of other different events and obligations that this impacts upon, so I do appreciate it.

I'm not under any delusion that when you got the summons in the mail that you danced around the house with your happy dance going, I finally got my jury summons, so I really do appreciate it. But in coming down here I want you also to appreciate what you're doing here, and the reason why we're asking you to come down here, and to be considered is because what you're doing here is very, very important.

The jury system is an essential, crucial element to our justice system. And people will ask me at times, why is that so; why do we have juries; why do we have jury trials; what's the big thing about juries. And I like to say that, the reason juries are so important is because you, as a jury, give our community confidence in the decisions that come out of this court.

Well what do I mean? Well if you think about it, what is a jury? And a jury is essentially a group of individuals taken from all

segments of Southern Nevada; all economic aspects of Southern Nevada; all different types of backgrounds out of Southern Nevada; you're selected totally at random from every area, and every economic and social stratum in the community to come down here and be considered for jury service, and you were selected totally at random.

We have a computer system here that selects and sends out the summonses, and it's got composed of 1.6 million names. So you all were pulled from 1.6 million names, it's sort of like you won the lottery but there's just not really a cash prize at the end of it. But we bring you down here and during the course of today, we go through a process to determine a final group of people to sit on a jury who we believe can listen to the witnesses that testify here under oath; look at the exhibits that were introduced into evidence.

And then, at the end, go back as a group of people and deliberate; talk among yourselves regarding the witnesses you heard; the evidence that you saw that was admitted, and then discuss and decide ultimately whether or not, in a criminal case, someone is guilty or not guilty of the charges beyond a reasonable doubt. Or in a civil case, to determine whether or not someone has been harmed and deserves damages by a preponderance of the evidence so you do that. And that's the thing you're the ones who do that, the citizens out of the community with no real interest or background in the case; no real knowledge about the case; who listen to just the evidence that's appropriate for you to hear and go back as a group and decide that, you're the ones to do that.

And it's because it's used, the citizens out of the community who make that decision, you give our community confidence in the decisions that come out of this court. I don't decide whether or not someone is guilty or not guilty of a crime, or deserves some sort of compensation. The governor doesn't get to do that; the county commission doesn't do that; the city council doesn't do that. There's no special panel of judges that does it, it's you, the citizen of the community that makes that decision. And because of that, you do give the community here confidence in the decisions that come out of this court.

I'm sure though, you know, you're all saying this is not a perfect system, and I'm not going to suggest it isn't. It's a system made up by humans and we're not a perfect law. But I will suggest that over the course of history, there has not been a better system that has been developed to have citizens out of the community look at the facts of the case and make a decision as to whether — how the justice system should treat someone, and this has been considered an essential right that we all have for hundred of years.

And I want to emphasize that, this is a right that all of you have and that your friends, close friends, and family member have. And if ever you, close family member, or friend get involved in the justice system, it's a right that you can rely on to have your case be handled by a jury.

And the original -- one of the first written constitutions, the Magna Carta, formed hundred of years ago in England and secured the right to jury trial; is one of the rights in that document. The U.S.

Constitution, when it was created in the 1780s, included the right to jury trial in the Bill of Rights. In the Nevada Constitution, when it was being created in the 1760s — or the 1860s, included the right to jury trials; a right in the Nevada Constitution.

So this has been a right that has been thought to be important to all of us and our participation in the justice system for hundreds of years. And it's also a right that has been fought for, and defended for significant period of time. And I want to emphasize that point that we've had, over the course of our history, millions of individuals serve in our armed forces.

Right now, we have approximately 1.3 million people serving in active duty status in our military, and about 800,000 in reserved status. And at any one time, we have around 200,000 people serving overseas. And I'd like to emphasize that point because these men and women in meeting their responsibilities; serving in our military and defending our rights, including our right to a jury trial, they give up a lot of things in the course of doing that, and meeting that obligation.

They're not always able to come home for a child birth, or to come home for a Christmas, or a Passover; to be there for a child's first date; first dance; first ballgame; see the homerun that's hit, or the basketball school that scored. They're not available, or able to do that because they're meeting their responsibilities to the military and to all of us in this country.

And I emphasize that point because there's going to come a time today during the course of the jury selection process when I

ask you, if there's anything about the schedule that we have in this case that's going to place a burden on you if you were to serve in this jury trial, and before you throw your hand up and you're like, I've got school; I've got work; I've got, you know, the family; or this/that; or other event, I want you to think about the millions of people who served; hundreds of thousands of people who have died or been injured in course of battles to defend our rights, and those who are serving here today who have given up a lot. And this is your opportunity as citizens of this community to provide a very real and important service to the community.

The last thing I want to say is, if you are selected as a juror, I think you will find it to be a very meaningful and important experience in your lives. Prior to coming onto the bench, I was a prosecutor with the United States Department of Justice over on the federal side with their organized crime and racketeering program.

And during the course of my time doing those kinds of cases, over 32 something years, I dealt with a lot of juries and trials that lasted several months to some that lasted just a couple days. And after every one of those trials, I would try to get a hold of some of the jurors to ask them about the experience and whether -- you know, what I could have done better, or how we could've better presented the case, or what they felt about how we handled the evidence to try to improve and make it a learning experience for me and my colleagues.

And I would always ask jurors, you know, how did you find the experience? And I'll tell you during the 32 years that I was actively litigating these cases, I didn't speak to anyone who didn't tell me

that they didn't find it to be a very important meaningful and worthwhile experience. In coming onto the bench about four years ago, I've done numerous criminal and civil jury trials.

And after each one of those trials, I tried to get one of those jurors to go back to the jury deliberation room so I can personally thank them for their service. And also to -- as a learning experience, to see if there's anyway we can improve as a court system in terms of the jury selection process and how we have the cases presented here at trial. And I always ask the jurors, you know, how did you find the experience? And I haven't spoken to anyone, in the four years that I've been doing this, who hasn't told that they didn't find it to be a very important meaningful experience that gave them a real sense of the significance of the jury in our justice system.

I've had some jurors come up to me at the end and say, I was so angry with you; I was so angry; I was so upset; I thought I've given you a good enough reason to get me off the jury; you didn't let me off, and I was really upset; but, you know, I'm glad you didn't let me off; I'm glad I served; I'm glad I had the opportunity; it was something that I think was important, and I was glad to be able to serve.

So I do think if you are selected to serve on the jury, you will find it to be a very important and meaningful experience. As I said, my name is Eric Johnson. I want to introduce some other people that you'll become familiar with during the course of this process.

Seated next to me is our Courtroom Clerk Linda. She really is the brains of the operations here. She keeps track of everything that's done here

in the courtroom. She keeps track of all the witnesses. She keeps track of all the exhibits. And most importantly, she's done this a lot of years herself, and she makes sure I don't screw up. And so she plays a really critical role here and will be here throughout the trial.

And next to her is Angie, she's our Court Recorder, and that's exactly what she does. She records everything that is said here in the courtroom. If you look around, you'll see these little black things with red lights on them, those are microphones. They're recording everything I'm saying right now, and they'll record everything that you all say during the course of the jury selection process, and what the witnesses say during the course of the trial.

It's very important that we get a record of what's said here in the courtroom. And in doing that, it's very important that we always identify who is speaking at any time, and that we don't speak over each other. So at times I may interrupt you or Angie may interrupt you and say, just for the record, that's Juror No. 6 or Juror John Doe or Jane Doe that's speaking. And there will be times where I might interrupt you or Angie might interrupt you and say, don't speak over each other.

When we do that, we're not trying to be rude in any way. It's just that it's very important that we get a clear record, and it's hard to do that if we don't get a name down who's talking or people speaking over each other. Don't feel bad if you get cautioned on speaking over each other that happens absolutely all the time. I'm guilty of that just as much as anybody, it's a common thing. Because what's

going to happen here today is I'll start asking you a question, or one of the attorneys will start asking you a question and you'll anticipate what my question is before I'm done, so you'll start to answer. And in reverse, I'll hear your answer and anticipate what you're going to say and start asking the next question, so it happens all the time. But we try to minimize that, and so we may at times ask you not to speak over each other.

The next one I want to introduce is our marshal,

Marshal Schvaneveldt; you've all met him, he's the one who brought you
up here. He's responsible for courtroom security when we're in session.
He's also the one who's responsible for dealing with all of you here
today. And if you're selected to serve on the jury, he's the one who's
going to be responsible for working with you.

If anything comes up during the course of the process today or during the trial; if you're selected as a juror; which you got a question or a concern about, anything other than the facts of this case, bring it to the marshal's attention and he'll bring it to my attention and we'll -- if necessary, I'll bring it to the attorneys' attention. So if you need to know where to park; you need to know where our vendor machine is -- you know -- or if you see something that bothers you in some way; or hear something that bothers you in some way, contact the marshal and he'll pass it on.

During the course of these proceedings, generally my staff and the attorneys will not talk to you. We'll, probably, won't even say, hi, to you if we should happen to run into you in an elevator or pass

you in the hallway. And it's not that we're trying to be anti-social in any way, but we want to make sure that you are not presented with any comments, or any information, or anything that would possibly be something you shouldn't be presented with in regards to your potential deliberations.

And so to do that we generally, as a rule, provide that the attorneys and my staff generally won't talk to you during the course of the proceedings. But if something comes up and you need to talk to somebody, talk to the marshal. Again, about anything other than the facts of this case, do not mention or talk about the facts of this case in any way.

At different times my Law Clerk Skyler, she's a recent graduate from the Boyd School of Law here at the University of Las Vegas -- University of Nevada of Las Vegas, and also recent member of the Nevada Bar. She may be in at different times. Skyler helps me with legal research and different issues that come up in the case, and so she may come in.

Danielle, my extern from UNLV School of Law may come in at different times. And then Kelly, my Judicial Assistant, may come in at different times as things might happen. So those are people you might see during the course of the trial, so that concludes pretty much of our introductions.

Now, I have a couple of orders that I want to make, and I'm going to emphasize these are orders. I'm ordering all of you not to do a couple of things. And hopefully after we get done with this process,

you'll understand why I'm making orders. But I'm also going to be asking you not to do the things that I'm going to be prohibiting here.

And the first thing I'm going to order you to not do is to not use social media in any way to refer to this case, or to discuss this case. Don't go on Facebook, or WhatsApp or your texting things, or Instagram, or Snapchat, or whatever else may be out there, and talk about this case and your potential involvement in any way. And hopefully you can appreciate why I'm ordering you not to do that. And I emphasize, I'm just saying about this case.

You know, you're free to go on Facebook and talk about the brackets for the NCAA tournament, and who you think is going to be an upset. And you're free to talk about your family or whatever, but do not talk about this case. And the reason -- and I'm asking you not to do that beyond ordering you because the reason for this is if you go on the Internet or social media, Facebook and --you know, during one of the breaks you take a selfie of yourself standing in front of the Regional Justice Center and post that and say, hey, I'm being considered for a trial in a criminal case, people can comment on that. And some of the comments may be of the nature that you shouldn't be exposed to, and so to avoid that, we just don't want you to go on social media and talk about the case in any way.

The other thing I'm going to order you and I emphasize, order you not to do, is to go on the Internet; your smartphones; your computers and do any sort of investigation or research about this case; any information you hear about this case; any word that comes up

during the course of the proceedings that you may not understand; do any research about me or any of the parties.

Again, I'm focusing on this case. If you need to go on the Internet for any other purpose, that's fine. But don't go on it to do any sort of investigation or research, and I'm asking you all not to do that too. Beyond ordering you, I'm asking you. And hopefully, again, it's obvious the reason why I'm asking you that.

If you were to go on the Internet and look up anything in regard to the parties or, you know, Google Maps to look at an area that's referred to, you'll be obtaining information that the other jurors wouldn't have. And you might be obtaining information that's inappropriate under the rules of evidence for you to have.

And so if you do that and your back in the jury room with information you shouldn't have or/and other jurors don't have, it makes the proceedings unfair to both sides during the course of the trial. So to avoid that, just don't go on the Internet and do any sort of research or investigation. The job of the attorneys in this case; they're job is to make sure you have the information you need when you go back to the deliberation room so let them do their job.

If you are selected as a juror in this case, you will be given the opportunity after our witness testifies to ask that witness written questions, so you will have a chance to ask some questions during the course of the trial, but don't go out and do any sort of investigation or research on your own.

All right, at this point in time, I'm going to do a roll call of

the group of 24 over here; make sure that everybody is sitting in the right seat, and that we have everybody we're supposed to have. During the course of the selection process today, I'm going to be referring to you either by your name or by your seat number.

And the way the seat numbering works is the back row, we have seats one through 10; the middle row, the second row down from the back, we have seats number 11 through 20, and then sitting in front of the wood bar there, we have seats number 21 through 24. And in Seat No. 1 is over to my left; to your right, and Seat No. 10 is over to my right and your left. And same thing for the second row, Seat No. 11 is to my left and to your right. And then Seat No. 20 is to my right; to your left. And then 21 through 24 same pattern, 21 over to my left; to your right. And 24 over to my right which is your left, so that's the way I'll be referring to you all today and will be identifying you for the purposes of the record.

In that regard, sitting in Seat No. 1 -- and now when I go through this, I need to get some acknowledgment that you're there. And as I said, we're recording all of this. And rather than pass a microphone down at this point in time, I need you to say something loud enough that those red/black light mics on the bench there will pick you up. So give me a here, or a yes, or present or whatever you feel like; make it loud and clear.

So sitting in Seat No. 1 should be Ms. Britton?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 106: Here.

THE COURT: Okay. And Seat No. 2 should be Mr. Bond?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 107: Here.
2	THE COURT: And Seat No. 3 should be Ms. Glassman?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: Here.
4	THE COURT: Thank you. Seat No. 4 should be Ms. Garcia
5	Rosales?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Here.
7	THE COURT: Seat No. 5 should be Ms. Arias?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 112: Here.
9	THE COURT: Seat No. 6 should be Mr. Thistle?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 114: Here.
11	THE COURT: Seat No. 7 should be Ms. Yager?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Here.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Seat No. 8 should be Ms.
14	Staudenmaier?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 117: Here.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Seat No. 9 should be Mr. Nettles?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Here.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Seat No. 10 should be Ms. Waters?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Here.
20	THE COURT: Okay, we're going to come back over here to
21	Seat No. 11, and that should be Ms. Scholl?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: Here.
23	THE COURT: Okay. And then Seat No. 12 should be Mr.
24	Kokoczka?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Kokoczka.

1	THE COURT: How bad did I butcher that?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Real bad.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and give me, how do you
4	pronounce it?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Ko-kocz-ka.
6	THE COURT: Ko-kocz-ka. All right, Seat No. 13 should be
7	Ms. Alcomindras? That's not
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: It's Alcomindras.
9	THE COURT: Alcomindras?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: Yeah.
11	THE COURT: All right, Seat No. 14 should be Ms. Santana?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Seat No. 15 should be Ms. Finnegan?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 126: Here.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Seat No. 16 should be Mr. Roland?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: Here.
17	THE COURT: Seat No. 17 should be Ms. Bohn?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 128: Here.
19	THE COURT: Seat No. 18 should be Mr. Kelly?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: Here.
21	THE COURT: Seat No. 19 should be Ms. Wetenkamp?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: Here.
23	THE COURT: All right. And Seat No. 20 should be Ms.
24	Brewster?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 132: Yes

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay, coming down to the third row, No. 21 should be Mr. Chang?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: Here.

THE COURT: No. 22 should be Mr. Purdy?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 135: Here.

THE COURT: No. 23 should be Mr. Elton?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 138: Ms. Elton.

THE COURT: Ms. -- oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Elton, I apologize.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 138: Yes.

THE COURT: I was on a run there with Misters, I apologize.

THE COURT: And then No. 24 should be Ms. Young?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 139. Here.

THE COURT: Okay, everybody is where they're supposed to be. All right, at this point in time I'm going to ask everybody to rise if you're able to, and that includes all of you out in the gallery and be sworn in to answer questions.

[Prospective jury sworn in by Clerk]

THE CLERK: Please be seated.

THE COURT: All right. Now as I mentioned before, this is -- I don't know if I mentioned before, but this is going to be a criminal trial, and that's what you're being considered for is a criminal trial. At this point in time, I'm going to ask the attorneys representing the State of Nevada to introduce themselves, and to give you a very, very, very short summary of the charges in this case, and then read off a list of witnesses.

Now, I want to emphasize that when they read off the list of witnesses, they're reading off anyone and everyone who they feel possibly, for whatever reason, could testify in this case. The list can get extraordinary long, and I don't want everyone to become panicky in terms of the number of witnesses they hear mentioned. It's usually very, very much fewer than what's listed out by the course of the State's so don't worry about it in that regard.

I've talked with the parties and we anticipate this case may run a little bit into next week. I think we can get it done by Monday or Tuesday next week. There is a light at the end of the tunnel so don't let the list of witnesses scare you in any way, but I do need you to listen to that list of witnesses. And if you think you know somebody, file that away in the back of your head because at some point very soon, I will ask you if you think you know any of the witnesses in this case. And at that point in time, you can raise your hand and say, I think I might know Witness Jane Doe. And we'll figure out at that point whether or not you know the Jane Doe that's being called into testify.

We all like to think we are unique, and each of us is unique as an individual but our names aren't that unique. And so there's a lot -- you know, Eric Johnson while I like the name; I lived with it now for a lot of years. I'm not under any delusion that there aren't a lot of other Eric Johnsons that are out there; same thing with any of these witnesses names.

So if you think you know somebody who -- an Eric Johnson or John Doe that gets mentioned, file that away, and then we'll

figure out a little later if the John Doe or Eric Johnson's being called to testify is the one that you know. All right, I'll ask the State to introduce themselves, give a short summary, and a list of witnesses.

MS. MERCER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, may I stand at the podium?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. MERCER: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. My name is Elizabeth Mercer and my co-counsel is Samuel Martinez. We're the Chief Deputy District Attorneys assigned to prosecute this case. This case involves a series of eight different robberies that occurred between May 21st of 2018 and June 7th of 2018 at the following locations: on May 21st the Roberto's Taco Shop located at 3400 South Hualapai Way was robbed; on May 26th of 2018, the Panda Express located at 1263 Silverado Ranch was robbed; on May 27th of 2018, the Duncan Donuts at 409 East Silverado Ranch was robbed; on May 31st the Roberto's Taco Shop at 2230 Horizon Ridge was robbed; also on May 31st of 2018, the Roberto's Taco Shop at 10430 Bermuda was robbed; on June 1st of 2018, the Khoury's Mediterranean grille located at 9340 West Sahara was robbed; on June 2nd the Albertson's located at 5975 West Tropicana Avenue was robbed, and on June 7th the Albertson's located at 2550 South Fort Apache was robbed.

As a result of the robbery allegations, he's charged with 22 counts of robbery with use of a deadly weapon; one count of attempt robbery with use of a deadly weapon; eight counts of burglary while in possession of a firearm; five counts of conspiracy to commit robbery,

and six counts of assault with use of a deadly weapon.

There are also allegations that on or about May 24th of 2018, he stole a blue 2-door coupe Infiniti that belonged to Raymond [sic] Rutshaw from the apartment complex located in the vicinity of Blue Diamond and Cimarron Road, and that he used that vehicle in subsequent robberies. As a result of that conduct, he's charged with one count of grand larceny auto as well as one count of possession of a stolen vehicle.

Then on June 8th of 2018 when he was taken into custody at a Green Valley Grocery located at the intersection of Blue Diamond and Valley View, several detectives attempted to apprehend him and take him into custody. He resisted their commands; pulled a firearm on them and attempted to run one of them over. As a result of that, he's charged with one count of resisting a police officer with a firearm, and three counts of assault on a protective person with use of a deadly weapon.

As the Judge indicated, I'm going to read off a long list of names. We do not intend to call every single person I name, but if you could please listen closely: Pedro Marino; Juan Salazar; Rebel Rodriguez; Andorio Rodriguez; Dillon Walsh-Murray; Officer Keith Sonetti, a patrol officer with Metro; Mark Tolentino, another patrol officer with Metro; Matthew Carter, another patrol officer with Metro; Chanel Vargas Berbe, another patrol officer with Metro; Elias Cardenas, a robbery detective with Metro; Glezzelle Tapay, who's a crime scene analyst with Metro; Heather Gouldthorpe, who is a latent fingerprint

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

records for Life Storage by the name of Jennifer Ann [phonetic]; Charles

Yannis, a Henderson -- I'm sorry, a Metro Police Officer Louise Renhard; a crime scene analyst with Metro Joy Shlasinger; Christine Montisano; Christopher Mireles; Don Guiliano; Patrol Officer T. Defauw with Metro; Patrol Officer Michael Boyd with Metro; robbery Detective Eric Honea with Metro; robbery Detective Theodore Snodgrass with Metro; Crime Scene Analyst Jennifer Strumillo with Metro; Jennifer Hughes; Keymari Paxton; Martin Mercado; Jessica Krimm; Russell Anders, a patrol officer with Metro; Crime Scene Analyst -- or retired Crime Scene Analyst by the name of Randall McPhail with Metro; Denise Pratt; Guy Fransen; David Canvanugh; Enrique, and his last name is spelled H-U-A-P-A-Y-A; Adrian Thompson, a patrol officer with Metro; Garrett Wilson, a patrol officer with Metro; Robert Rafferty with Metro; Amanda Wright, a crime scene analyst with Metro; a DNA analyst with Metro by the name of Craig King; Detective Blake Penny; Detective Sean McNulty; retired Detective Joseph Emery with Metro; a K-9 Officer by the name of Nicklaus Bauchman with Metro, and Detective Richard Hart, he goes by Tony; he's also with Metro; you will also hear from a patrol officer by the name of Paylovic with Metro; a John Beckerly, another detective with Metro; Zachary Ivins, another detective with Metro; Michael O'halloran, another detective with Metro; Ernie Morgan, a K-9 Officer with Metro; Sabrina Steinmetz, a crime scene analyst with Metro; Stephanie Fletcher, a crime scene analyst with Metro; Ebony Stephens, a crime scene analyst with Metro; Stephanie Thi, T-H-I, a crime scene analyst with Metro; Jennifer -- oh, I'm sorry, I already said that name; Christie Thomas, a crime scene analyst with Metro; Tabatha Paine, a crime

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Marc Colon, another detective with Metro; Scott Mendoza, another detective with Metro; Kenton Buford, another detective with Metro; Joseph Patton another detective with Metro; Marvin Cotton; Tamika Hope; Odin Garcia; Kathy Geil, a firearms examiner with Metro, and Heather Gouldthorpe another latent fingerprint with Metro; as well as Derek Jappe, detective with Metro; C. Pastuna with Metro; Samuel Smith with Metro; Joe Lepore with Metro; M. Campbell with Metro; I. Williams with Metro; Prunchak P-R-U-N-C-H-A-K, first initial E with Metro; Detective Jason Nelson with Metro; Raven Rutshaw; James Downing, a custodian of records with T-Mobile; a custodian of records of AT&T, and potentially a co-conspirator Deann Page. Thank you, Your Honor.

scene analyst with Metro; Trever Alsup, another detective with Metro;

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. We're going to pause just one second, we're having a little feedback problem. My recorder wants to just do a test.

All right, ladies and gentleman, at this point in time we're going to start asking you some questions.

[Clerk and Court confer]

THE COURT: Oh, that's right. I screwed up, I apologize.

That's why we have Linda here, and she caught that. I stopped things to do a test, and I need to go back to where we go. I'd ask the Defense to introduce themselves and the defendant.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Good morning, my name is Mace Yampolsky, I'm a lawyer. I represent Shane Kittredge; this is Jason

Margolis, he's another lawyer who works with me, and this is Kaitlyn Stella, who's a paralegal in my office.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Are there anyone you want to add to the list of witnesses?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Theresa Musgay [phonetic] also works with as does Marina Alvarez.

THE COURT: Okay, very good. Thank you very much, Mr. Yampolsky. All right, now we'll get started in terms of asking you some questions. In this process I'm going to be focusing on the group over here of 24 people in Seats 1 through 24. But it's very important for all of you out in the gallery to listen to all of the questions. And if you would answer any of them, to remember — put that in the back of your head and remember that.

The reason is that, as we go through the 24 over here, inevitably someone is going to be excused for some reason or another as we go through the process. When someone is excused over here, we'll have one of you out in the gallery come and take their place. At that point in time when you sit down, I'm going to ask you if you heard the questions that I asked earlier today. And if you say, yes; I heard the questions you asked earlier today, I'll ask if you would have answered any of them. And if you wouldn't have, just say, no; I wouldn't have answered any of the questions. Or if you say, yes, I would have, I'll ask you to tell me which questions you would've answered and what your answer would've been, and you can go through and tell me the questions you would've answered and what your answer is.

.

Now if I ask you, did you have an opportunity to hear all the questions I earlier asked today and you say, no, well then I have to go back and ask you all the questions that I asked earlier today. And everybody is going to stare at you real mean like because that's going to really slow things down, and everybody wants to try to move this process along as quickly as possible.

So it's very important that all of you out there listen to all the questions, and if you would answer any of them to file that in the back of your brain and be prepared to tell us that. It's very important you all listen to the questions and you not make any assumption that for whatever reason you're not going to be called up to sit in one of the chairs over here. I'll tell you right now, I've done a number of jury trials since coming onto the bench and even before that it's not uncommon that we go through almost everybody in the gallery during the course of selecting a jury so it is important for all of you to listen to the questions.

Now, the thing I want to emphasize in terms of these questions, there's no right answer; there's no wrong answer. All we want is just an honest answer; be honest, and don't hold anything back. If you don't understand a question that I ask, just say I don't understand the question; raise your hand, and I'll try to rephrase it. If you don't hear a question, again, raise your hand; say, I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question, I'll make sure that it is repeated.

If at any time you don't feel comfortable giving an answer out here in front of everybody, tell me that you would like to do a sidebar. And what we'll do is have you come up and come around here

13°

to the back behind where I'm sitting, and the attorneys will be there; it will be recorded. But we'll let you answer back there rather that in front of everybody, if that makes it easier for you to answer the question. I don't encourage you to do a lot of sidebars because that takes up more time. But if it is necessary for us to get an honest answer from you, don't hesitate to ask for a sidebar to give an answer to one of the questions.

Now, as I said, all we're looking for is honest answers. And I've had people who been sitting where you are that expressed some concern; that they hesitate to give an answer because they're concerned it may show some prejudice or bias on their part, and that doesn't mean anything. We all have prejudices or biases. Sometimes we have unconscious prejudices and biases and we may not be aware of, and that doesn't mean you can't be a good juror if you have a prejudice or bias in some way.

Like I said, we all have some sort of prejudice or bias. But what we generally have found is if we recognize what those prejudices or biases are that we have and we take steps to consider them; think about them, we usually can put those biases or prejudices aside and be fair and that's what we're going to try to find out from all of you in that regard.

So don't feel bad if you have an answer which may suggest you have some prejudice or bias. Again, everybody has some prejudice or bias. We'll work from there and see if that's something that you recognize and you can put aside and feel that you can be fair to

10.

both sides in this case. So again, what we're looking for is a honest answer to the questions.

Now, the first question -- as I said, I'll be focusing on the 24 over here. But this first question, actually, is for everybody here in the courtroom. And so those of you out in the gallery, I need you to answer it too. The first question is language. Is there anyone having trouble understanding me concerning what I'm saying either because English is not your first language, or because you have a hearing problem?

Is there anyone who's having trouble hearing what I'm saying or understanding what I'm saying? I'm focusing first -- keep your hand up. I'm focusing first on the 24 over here; let the record reflect no hands. And then we have one juror -- or two jurors in the back, if you could hand the mic to one of them and let me get their badge number.

THE MARSHAL: Badge No. 264, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, what?

THE MARSHAL: Two, sixty-four.

THE COURT: Okay, that's Ms. Rosales. Ma'am, what's your problem either understanding what I'm saying? Can you hear me? Or is English not your first language.

MS. HERNANDEZ: She doesn't speak English.

THE COURT: She doesn't speak any --

THE MARSHAL: She doesn't speak any English.

THE COURT: All right.

THE RECORDER: Who's speaking for the record?

1	THE MARSHAL: That's her daughter-in-law, just so you
2	know.
3	THE COURT: Okay. What's your name for the record?
4	MS. HERNANDEZ: Tomasa Hernandez.
5	THE RECORDER: I'm sorry, she needs to speak into the mic.
6	MS. HERNANDEZ: Tomasa Hernandez.
7	THE COURT: All right.
8	THE RECORDER: Can you spell that please.
9	MS. HERNANDEZ: T-O-M-A-S-A, Hernandez,
10	H-E-R-N-A-N-D-E-Z.
11	THE COURT: Thank you very much. And then I saw another
12	hand, I thought.
13	THE MARSHAL: It's Badge No. 251, Judge.
14	THE COURT: And that's Ms. Nguyen. What's your concern,
15	Ms. Nguyen?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 251: I'm not speaking very well.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Do you understand really anything that
18	I'm saying?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 251: Some understand, but not
20	the whole thing.
21	THE COURT: All right, what is your native language?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 251: Vietnamese.
23	THE COURT: Okay. All right. But how much do you think
24	you're understanding what I'm saying? A little bit? Or a lot?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 251: I think about 10 or 20

percent.

right, anybody else who I missed? All right, let the record reflect no other hands. All right, the next set of questions is for the group of 24 over here. First of all, is there any one of you who is not a United States Citizen? Okay, let the record reflect no hands. Is there any one of you who has been convicted of a felony? Okay, let the record reflect no hands. Is there any one of you with a prejudice or bias for or against any individuals relating to age, gender, religion, ethnic origin, or sexual orientation? All right, let the record reflect no hands.

Now, we've had the defendant introduce -- Shane Kittredge introduced by his new attorneys. Is there anyone who thinks that they know the defendant in any way? Either know him, heard of him, have any association, or any sort of knowledge from whatever source about the defendant in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: May I ask a question, what is his last name again?

THE COURT: Kittredge, K-I-T-T-R-E-D-G-E.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: He just looks familiar to me.

THE COURT: Okay, that's -- hand the mic down if you would, Ms. Britton to No. 11, Ms. Scholl. For the record, Ms. Scholl is the one who asked of his last name and said he looked familiar. Do you have any senses to why he looks familiar to you, Ms. Scholl?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: I do not. I don't know if it's

from prior work. I lived here for 30 years but he just seems familiar to me.

THE COURT: All right, you have no idea why or -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: No idea, no.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything with your familiarity with him that's negative in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything in terms of your concern about prior familiarity with him that you feel would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: No.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you very much. Anybody else that thinks they have any knowledge, or information, or association with the defendant? Let's go down to No. 6, Mr. Thistle.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 114: Yeah. I remember reading about these robberies in the newspaper as they were occurring.

THE COURT: All right. I don't want you to say anything further at this point. But at a break, we'll probably ask you to come up to a sidebar, okay?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 114: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you for raising that with us, Mr. Thistle. All right, anybody else? Let the record reflect no other hands. Now both Defense Attorneys, Mr. Yampolsky and Mr. Margolis, have introduced themselves. Is there any one of you who thinks that you know them, have any information about them, familiarity with them, or

anything about them from any source? All right, let the record reflect no hands.

The District Attorneys, here, have introduced themselves. Is there anyone who thinks they know either one of the District Attorneys here; either know them, heard of them, have any information about them in any way from any source? All right, let the record reflect no hands.

Let me ask now a broader question, is there anyone who knows anyone who works at the Clark County District Attorney's Office either as an attorney, or as staff member in some way at the Clark County District Attorney's Office? Okay, we got a few hands on that. I usually like to go in order. If we can hand -- Ms. Britton, if you can hand that all the way down to No. 10, Ms. Waters.

And, Ms. Waters, who do you know at the Clark County District Attorney's Office?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Yolanda Givens [phonetic].

THE COURT: Okay. And how do you know her?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: We are church members together. We sing in the choir together.

THE COURT: Okay, how long you guys been doing that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Oh, god, her kids are
24/25, so way before that.

THE COURT: Oh, okay, so quite a while.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I mean, is that where you essentially

associate with her?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Yolanda, yeah, in church or -- well, of course, we have baby showers and weddings and that kind of thing.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. But you don't have a real social relationship with her beyond church? Do you guys go out together? Or go to dinner? Or have each other to your houses?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: No, we don't do that but we're close.

THE COURT: Okay, obviously. Okay, that's good. Do you know what she does at the District Attorney's Office?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: She's an attorney.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Is there anything about your relationship with her and her work that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: No.

THE COURT: All right. Do you feel you'll be able to follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence admitted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much, Ms. Waters. All right, I saw another hand. Is there anyone in the back row? All right.

The second row? Anyone think they know somebody in the District Attorney's Office? I thought I saw a hand.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: You did, but I misread you.

She doesn't work for the District Attorney's Office.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: I misunderstood you as well.

THE COURT: Okay. Well let's make a -- I'm sorry, we're going to have to make a record who just said that; that was -- the first person speaking was Ms. Wetenkamp, and the second person was 18, Mr. Kelly. All right. Well let me just -- if you can hand the mic down to Mr. Kelly, No. 18. I'm sorry, who did you think I was -- who did you --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: I thought you were saying any attorney that works for the court or anything.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask if you know somebody in the law a little bit later. All right. And then, Ms. Wetenkamp, No. 19, what did you think? I was just asking generally about attorneys?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to ask generally about attorneys here in a few minutes so just keep that in mind. Anybody else I missed who thought they might know someone with the Clark County District Attorney's Office either an attorney or staff? All right, let the record reflect no other hands.

Now, the Clark County District Attorney's Office has participated in a reality-type television program called, Sin City Justice, on the investigation discovery channel. Has anyone ever watched the program? Okay, we have one hand. Let's go down to No. 12, Mr. Kokoczka.

1		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I guess i nave seen it.
2		THE COURT: Okay, about how long ago was that?
3		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I have I have no idea,
4	maybe a	year.
5		THE COURT: Did you watch one or a lot of them?
6		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: When I'm bored, I put it
7	on.	
8		THE COURT: Okay.
9		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Not many.
10	·	THE COURT: Alrighty, I don't know I don't know whoever
11	appeared	on that program. Do you recognize either one of our attorneys
12	on that p	rogram?
13		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: No, I don't.
14		THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that program;
15	you're wa	atching it that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this
16	case?	
17		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I don't think so.
18		THE COURT: All right. Do you feel you would be able to
19	follow my	instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions
20	to the evi	dence admitted?
21		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I should.
22		THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you very much.
23	Anybody	else seen the program? All right, let the record reflect no other
24	hands. A	All right. Now, this case was investigated by was it Metro with
25	the whole	e investigation? Or the other law enforcement agencies

റ	
_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

MS. MERCER: Henderson as well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let me ask, is there anyone who thinks that they know someone who works for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police or the Henderson Police Department either as a police officer or as a staff member? All right, we got a few hands here. Let's go -- actually, if we could go back to the top row, and we'll hand off to No. 3, Ms. Glassman.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: I know a police officer here in --

THE RECORDER: Oh, I'm sorry, I don't think the mic is on.

THE MARSHAL: You can't grab it on the bottom, you'll turn it off. Now it's on.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: I know a police officer very well so --

THE COURT: All right, with law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: Henderson Police

Department.

THE COURT: And who's that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: Rick Turkhouse [phonetic].

THE COURT: And is he a police officer you said?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: Yes, he is.

THE COURT: Okay. And how long have you known him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: Ten plus years.

THE COURT: Okay. Generally, how do you know him?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: He's one of my agents.
2	I'm a corporate real estate broker, and he's also a licensee.
3	THE COURT: Okay. And so do you have a working
4	relationship, or a social relationship, or both?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: Both.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about his work with
7	the Henderson Police Department and your association with him that
8	would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: I don't believe so.
10	THE COURT: All right. Do you feel you would be able to
11	follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions
12	to the evidence submitted?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. I know there
15	was some other who else in the back row? Let's focus on the back
16	row. Let's go down now to No. 9, Mr. Nettles.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: I know a Scott Nickles
18	[phonetic] with Metro.
19	THE COURT: And how do you know him?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: He's a father-in-law of
21	friend's kid.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a close relationship?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Not at all.
24	THE COURT: All right. How long have you known him?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Probably about five or six

1	years.	
2		THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask anything about your
3	relations	ship with him and his work that would affect your ability to be a
4	fair juror	in this case?
5		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Not at all.
6		THE COURT: Would you be able to follow my instructions
7	and fairl	y and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence
8	submitte	ed?
9		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Yes.
10		THE COURT: Okay, thank you. And I think, Ms. Waters,
11	didn't yo	u have your hand up?
12		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Yes.
13		THE COURT: Okay, who do you know?
14		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: I know Maurice Collins, he
15	is a Met	ro police officer.
16		THE COURT: All right, and how do you know him?
17		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: I know him because his
18	mother i	s the godmother of my daughter.
19		THE COURT: Okay.
20		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: And he's been at my
21	house s	everal times, I know him real well.
22		THE COURT: Okay, about how long would that be?
23		PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: That would be 42 years.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, so that's a pretty good

that's how old he is.

24

25

1	relationship. Let me ask though, is there anything about his work and
2	your relationship with him that would affect your ability to be a fair juror
3	in this case?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: No.
5	THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: I have one more.
7	THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: My daughter Anicka
9	Cannon [phonetic].
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: She works for Metro;
12	she's a list.
13	THE COURT: Okay, how long has she been doing that?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: I want to say three or four
15	years, three to four years.
16	THE COURT: Okay. What kind of things does she do?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Fingerprinting; that, I just
18	know because she talks about that a lot. She deals with the public
19	you know, with guys who come in for work cards; people who come in
20	for that; that kind of thing; people that have to
21	THE COURT: Okay, anything about her work and your
22	relationship with her that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this
23	case?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: I guess not. I don't know.
25	THE COURT: Well I'm asking you. I mean, is there anything

about her work and your relationship with her that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: I don't think so.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you feel you would be able to follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence submitted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Yeah, I probably -- I mean, I could do that. It's just I know so much, yeah. I'm just --

THE COURT: And I appreciate you probably had chatted some with your daughter --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- and maybe some with Mr. --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Maurice, uh-huh.

THE COURT: -- Mr. Collins?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Mr. Collins, uh-huh.

THE COURT: But whatever they're talking about is totally different from this case, do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Right. Yes.

THE COURT: We're going to have witnesses come in here under oath and testify, and we'll have exhibits introduced. What I need to know from you is do you feel you can put aside your conversations with your daughter --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Oh, yeah.

THE COURT: -- and Mr. Collins and focus on the evidence in this case?

 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you very much. Anybody else in the back row that I missed? All right, in the middle row? I know there were some hands. Let's go -- if we could, let's go down first to No. 14, Ms. Santana. Who do you know, Ms. Santana?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: Ty Toller [phonetic]. I believe he's Metro, and he's a customer at my shop.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Is that the extent of your relation is that of a business customer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: Yes. I'm friends with his wife, but we're not socially. I mean they come into my shop and we talk.

THE COURT: Okay. What is your shop generally?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: Well I have a pet boutique in grooming.

THE COURT: Okay, that's pretty important. Trust me, we got two English Springer Spaniels, so that's an important thing. Let me ask you, is there anything about your relationship with them and their work that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: I don't think so.

THE COURT: All right. Do you feel you would be able to follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence submitted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. And then let's go down -- Mr. Kelly, No. 18.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: One of my employee's
2	husband works for the Metro Police Department. I don't know his first
.3	name, I just met him once; his last name is Lowry [phonetic].
4	THE COURT: Okay. Anything I take it since you don't
5	know his first name, you don't have much of a social relationship?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: No, I just wanted to say it.
7	THE COURT: No, and I'm glad you did. Anything about your
8	relationship with him that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this
9	case?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: No.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Can you hand that now to No. 19, Ms.
12	Wetenkamp.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: Heather and Dave
14	Gouldthorpe, and Heather was on the witness list.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: Next door neighbors
17	previously.
18	THE COURT: All right, previously. They're not currently your
19	neighbors?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: No.
21	THE COURT: How long have they not been your neighbor?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: Three or four years.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Were you close to them before
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: When they lived there, we
25	went back and forth. But since they moved, we don't see them as often.

THE COURT: Okay. When you say, "they lived there you; went back and forth", what do you mean?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: They would have parties and they would invite us, or they would stop by when they were walking their little girl and chat with us, or come over and borrow something and vice versa.

THE COURT: Okay, anything about your relationship with them and their work and your past relationship with them as neighbors that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: No.

THE COURT: All right. Do you feel you would be able to follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence submitted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Anyone else in the second row? Oh, I'm sorry, I missed No. 11, Ms. Scholl. Will you hand that all the way back down to her?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: Officer Fulton. However, he is my nephew's father. I have no relationship with him at all, but I did want you to know.

THE COURT: What law enforcement agency is he with? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: I believe he's Metro.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, anything about that relationship at all that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: No, not at all.

THE COURT: As I've asked other jurors, do you feel you would be able to follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence submitted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Anyone else I missed in the second row? Anyone down in the third row here? Okay, let's hand the mic down to No. 24, Ms. Young. Go ahead, Ms. Young.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 139: I know two officers in Metro.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 139: Bradley Nameth [phonetic] and Jordan Traverse [phonetic].

THE COURT: All right. How do you know each one of them?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 139: Brad used to live with us before he was -- when he was a kid.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 139: And I know him and his wife and his children, but we're not very close. And then Jordan Traverse, I've known -- I'm best friends with his wife and I've known them for about 20 years.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let me ask, is there anything about your relationship to them and their work that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 139: No.

THE COURT: All right, do you feel you would be able to

follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence submitted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 139: I believe so.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Anybody I missed? All right, let the record reflect no other hands. All right, we already had one person identify that they knew Heather Gouldthorpe, one of the witnesses that was listed out. Let me ask at this point, is there anyone of you who think you may know anyone on the witness list that was read off by the District Attorney's Office?

Okay, let's hand the mic over to No. 18, Mr. Kelly.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: Victor Delgado. I'm not sure if it's Delgado-Garcia. But one of my employees at my previous employer, her husband -- his name is Victor Delgado, so I'm not sure if it's Garcia or hyphenated.

THE COURT: So the -- I can't remember now, the Delgado that you know is Delgado hyphen Garcia?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: No, it's just Victor Delgado.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And this is one of your current employees?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: No, my former.

THE COURT: About how long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: About two half years, but I worked with her for five years. So I never met him, but I know her. I just wanted to --

~	ince that:		
3.	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: I know he's a custodian,		
4	but I don't know where. But that name is very distinctive, Victor		
5	Delgado.		
6	THE COURT: Okay. Does that help at all in terms of whether		
7	it's the one		
8	MS. MERCER: Court's indulgence, Your Honor.		
9	THE COURT: Sure. Did he say where was what kind?		
10	Did he ever indicate where he worked as a custodian?		
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: No, just a custodian.		
12	THE COURT: Okay.		
13	MS. MERCER: Your Honor, the witness's name is Victor		
14	Delgadillo-Garcia.		
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: Oh, okay, okay.		
16	THE COURT: Okay. Let me just ask anything about let's		
17	assume for just a moment that, it is the husband of your prior employee,		
18	anything about that that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this		
19	case?		
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: No, no, no.		
21	THE COURT: Okay. All right, I don't think that based on what		
22	we've got, he probably is that person. But if not, I don't think it is going		
23	to impact upon him in any way. All right, thank you very much, Mr. Kelly		
24	Anybody else I missed? All right, let the record reflect		
25	no other hands. Does anyone believe they know anything about the		

THE COURT: Did she ever indicate what he did or anything

facts of this particular case either through personal knowledge, conversation with people, the news media or social media? And, Mr. Thistle, I noted you so you don't have to say anything more. Let me ask that about anyone else here?

All right, let's pass the mic to No. 12, Mr. Kokoczka.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I do recall reading about it

in the newspaper.

THE COURT: Okay, let me not ask you to go any further with that. And then like I said with Mr. Thistle, we may have you come up to a sidebar a little bit later. But thank you for bringing that up, anybody else? Okay, let's hand the mic up to No. 9, Mr. Nettles.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: It just sounds familiar from reading the RJ a year ago, probably.

THE COURT: You don't have any specific recollection of it? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: No.

THE COURT: All right. But it just sounds familiar to something you read?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Yeah. If I'm in town, I read the RJ so --

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Again, we may ask you to come up to the sidebar, so I won't ask you to say anything else at this point in time, okay?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Okay.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Anybody else? All right, let the record reflect no other hands. All right, let me talk a little bit of the

schedule in this case. My hope is that we can get this case done by next Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday. I am quite sure, talking with the attorneys, that it shouldn't take us past next week. So we'll be going this week and possibly through next week, although we're going to make effort to get it done as quickly as possible.

In terms of scheduling, we'll be starting Mondays about 8:30 or nine o'clock in the morning. We'll go all day until around five o'clock with a break somewhere in there for lunch. On Tuesdays and Thursdays, we'll be starting at around 12:30 to 1:30, and going to five o'clock; have a couple breaks in there. We start a little bit later on Tuesdays and Thursdays; that day is the day that I have my criminal calendar.

Besides this case, I have several hundred other cases that I'm responsible to keep moving forward, and so I'll have anywhere from 25 to 50 matters on my calendars on each of those mornings. We'll get started a little bit later on Tuesdays and Thursdays. On Wednesdays, if I have my civil calendar, that can either run long or it can be short. Generally, though, we'll get started sometime around nine or 10 o'clock in the mornings on Wednesday. We'll go the entire day until five o'clock, of course, with a break for lunch. Fridays, we'll generally get started around, again, 8:30 or nine and go until five o'clock with a break for lunch.

As I said this week, we won't -- I didn't say this but this week we won't have any trial on Thursday. There will not be a trial on Thursday. So we'll just be meeting today, tomorrow, Tuesday,

Wednesday, and then Friday, and then we'll be meeting all next week.

And like I said, I'm pretty sure we'll be getting things done by the end of
next week as we get through the case.

As I do appreciate all trials are inconvenient, this trial could go on for a couple of weeks which isn't the longest trial you could be considered for. You're fortunate in a sense that this is not a construction defect case, where you can spend nine months considering potential flaws in stucco, or six months considering whether or not Las Vegas is too hard on yellow brass fixtures. Those are actual cases that had been tried in this court. And you don't need to be worrying about that, this will be no more than a two-week case.

But all trials, I do appreciate are inconvenient and I understand that but what you're doing here is very, very important. But I do want to know if there is any scheduling issue that you feel would create a hardship for you with the schedule that we just gone through. So let me ask, is there anybody who feels that there is a scheduling issue that they would not be able to resolve if they were to remain on the jury?

Okay, let's start with the back row first, we'll go to No. 3, Ms. Glassman. Okay, go ahead, Ms. Glassman.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: I just wanted to make sure it was on. The biggest thing for me is I have 175 agents, and I'm the only broker at the company. So it's a very long time obligation for me to be away from the office and not answering my calls for my agents in the middle of certain things and transactions; going into month end and so

on and so forth. So if it was a day or two, it wouldn't really be that big of a problem but this type of time commitment is very, very hard.

THE COURT: Okay. Well I mean not when we're not in session like tomorrow morning, or Thursday morning, or perhaps a little bit of time on Wednesday, you certainly could work as long as you were back here in that time.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: Yeah.

THE COURT: Would those time periods alleviate your concerns in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: It would help, but it's still going to be a real, real stretch. If I had somebody else to fill in for me or I have a small company, it wouldn't be so bad.

THE COURT: What do you do when you have a vacation or anything?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: I take my work with me, literally.

THE COURT: Okay. What do you mean you take it with you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: I have to operate from a computer. I mean, I still have to answer the phones.

THE COURT: All right. All right, thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 108: You're welcome.

THE COURT: Now, who else in the back row? All right, let's go down to -- I did see your hand, Mr. Thistle, go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 114: If it runs into next week, it will disrupt my classes at UNLV.

1	THE COURT: What classes? Are you a teacher?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 114: Yes, I'm a professor at
3	UNLV.
4	THE COURT: Okay. And what do you teach?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 114: I teach finance.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 114: I teach introductory
8	finance for it's required for all business majors. And I teach an MBA
9	Finance class, it's required for all MBA students.
10	THE COURT: And what days are you scheduled to do that?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 114: Monday/Wednesday.
12	THE COURT: What time?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 114: The undergraduate class
14	is 11:30 to one; the MBA classes 5:30 to 6:45.
15	THE COURT: Okay, thank you very much.
16	THE COURT: And then
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Hi.
18	THE COURT: Okay, let's go to No. 7, Ms. Yager [phonetic].
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: I have 9-year-old twins
20	and I pick them up from school. I don't know anything about aftercare
21	after five o'clock.
22	THE COURT: Okay. If we make sure that you got how far
23	away are you from the school?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Henderson International.
25	THE COURT: Okay.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: It's the other side.
2	THE COURT: That's called Sandy Ridge or something
3	like
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: That's right, very good.
5	THE COURT: All right, that's probably about 45 minutes?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Yeah.
7	THE COURT: All right. I can tell — if we got you out of here
8	by then, do you feel you would be able to pick them up?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: I don't know anything
10	about aftercare. I pick them up between 3:15 and 3:30, so I would have
11	to explore that.
12	THE COURT: All right, we'll have a break here. Could I ask
13	you to call –
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Sure.
15	THE COURT: after one of the breaks and see how late
16	their aftercare
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Sure.
18	THE COURT: could potentially go?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Sure.
20	THE COURT: And we'll see but I appreciate you raising
21	that.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Okay.
23	THE COURT: And I think next to you had their hand up.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 117: Hi, there.
25	THE COURT: Ves Ms Staudenmaier do ahead

	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
	7		
	8		
	9		
1	0	•	
1	1		
1	2		
1	3		
1	4		
1	5		
1	6		
1	7		
1	8		
1	9		
2	0		
2	1		1
2	2		
2	3		
	4		

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 117: Next Friday I have a plane ticket leaving Friday morning at 8:30 a.m.

THE COURT: Okay. And business or personal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 117: Personal, it's my

daughter's Mom's Weekend at her sorority in Reno.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, her what?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 117: In Reno at her sorority.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 117: But I have a plane ticket --

THE COURT: No, all right --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 117: If we're done by then, it will be okay as long as we're done before Friday.

THE COURT: All right, so next Friday?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 117: Next Friday.

THE COURT: All right, thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 117: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anybody else in the back row? Let's go right next door to Mr. Nettles, No. 9.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: I have a planned stay vacation to visit my daughter and grandkids in Idaho. I'm flying out Wednesday morning until Friday of next week; if we're done Tuesday, no problem.

THE COURT: All right. Is that anything that you could put off at all?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Well I would have to

cancel everything, and they would have to rearrange their schedule.

And knowing their grandma and grandpa are coming in and it's their -and they have this next week off is their break in Idaho.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. And let's go one more, Ms. Waters.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: The first thing is -- and I heard everything you said. My granddaughter's here for spring break. She is usually with me. She leaves next Saturday. The second thing -- oh, no, that's not until the following week. Okay, so I'm okay there. That's not until the following week, I'm okay.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: I just would like to say, too, though that my husband had a triple heart bypass.

THE COURT: I'm sorry.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: And even like today, he wasn't really feeling well but I left to come, and that happened the last day of November.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: And he is coming along, but I just would like to mention that.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. No, I appreciated that. Thank you. Anybody else in the back row I missed? All right. Who in the next row? All right, let's go down and start with No. 12, Mr. Kokoczka.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I have a 100-mile commute one way. And my household only has one vehicle, and it is

	÷	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	_	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
1 1 1 1 1 1 2	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	·	
.'	_	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	Q	
. '	IJ	
2	0:	
2	1:1	
2	2	
2	23	
2	4	
2	25	

being used by my housemate to -- several times a week to drive to St. George, Utah.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not sure but if I can arrange for accommodations down here so you didn't have to drive up and back every day, would that work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: It's going to be tough, Your Honor, because of sometimes -- this morning, I was even stuck in a little traffic coming here, and I do have to get up probably about 4:30.

THE COURT: Well, no, that's what I'm saying -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- if we can arrange accommodations, room accommodations, here would that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I really wouldn't want that.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Where do you live right now?

St. George?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Mesquite.

THE COURT: Oh, Mesquite.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right. Okay, and what was the issue with your car?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: We only have one car in the household.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you. All right, let's go to the next one. All right, we'll go down to No. 14, Ms. Santana.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: So I -- as I mentioned, I

1	have a small business in Boulder City, and I'm a sole proprietor. I have
2	two groomers that depend on me to be there. I run the shop in the
3	bottom. I check-in dogs and check them out. So I do have a friend that
4	helps me here and there. I know she can help me tomorrow, but
5	Wednesday she has oral surgery. And next Monday, I have a
6	colonoscopy that's been scheduled for a long time.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: So that would interfere
9	THE COURT: So you got colonoscopy next Monday?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: The 25 th , yes.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: And I just got a reminder
13	to pick up my prep and all that fun stuff.
14	THE COURT: All right. Lucky you.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: No, I'm not looking forward
16	to it.
17	THE COURT: No, I wouldn't be worried about you if you
18	were. All right, anything else?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: No.
20	THE COURT: All right, thank you. Who else? Who's next?
21	Let's go down couple to No. 16, Mr. Roland.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: Yeah, mine is just work
23	and taking my daughters to school.
24	THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: Because I work graveyard

12 to 8. And then when I get off, I got to take them straight to school and I have to pick them up because their mom works day shift.

THE COURT: All right, when do you pick them up?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: Three o'clock.

THE COURT: How old are your kids?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: Eleven and eight.

THE COURT: Is there any after-school care that they could participate in?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: Not my middle school. My little daughter, she goes to dance like right after I pick her up. Her dance practice is at five to seven. And my 8-year-old, she doesn't do any after-school programs.

THE COURT: Is there anyone who could sort of watch them for this week and next week?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: It will all be if their mother can leave work early, that's what it really depend on. Like today, she was able to leave early while I came here.

THE COURT: Okay. If she can, is there any friends that she have that she can call up when things are difficult?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: Not really.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you very much. Who's next? Is there anyone else in the second row? All right, let's go all the way down to No. 20, Ms. Brewster. Go ahead, Ms. Brewster.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 132: Yes, I have chronic back pain, and I have pain management once a month which is the 26th of this

month. And I have problems sleeping at night, so it's really hard for me to get up early in the mornings. And some mornings, I can't get up at all and I'm on, you know, some pretty heavy medication.

THE COURT: Okay, what kind of medication are you on?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 132: Norco; Cyclobenzaprine;

Meloxicam.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, does it help at all to stand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 132: Sometimes, because I have back problems and knee problems because I've had shots. And I have like a tumor and a cyst on the tumor in my knee cap. And I've had bad back problems since the day before 9/11 happened.

THE COURT: All right. But standing doesn't help you any? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 132: Not really.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 132: Standing and walking is my major problem.

THE COURT: All right. All right, thank you very much.

Anyone in the fourth row? All right, let's hand the mic down to No. 21,

Mr. Chang. Go ahead, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: As far as my business, I have patients scheduled throughout the week, and I would have to cancel all the appointments.

THE COURT: And what's -- I'm sorry, your business?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: Optometrist. At this point,
I wouldn't be able to find any fill-in doctors. But more importantly, I have

several children patients who are undergoing therapy right now, which I should -- requires me to see them weekly. And the other fill-ins I would be able to -- even if I were able to find -- they're not certified to be able to do that treatment.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that something that couldn't be put off a couple weeks?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: No, because they had already started, and so there's a certain timeframe they need to be -- excuse me, seen during.

THE COURT: And there's no one you can get to handle those therapy sessions for the next couple of weeks?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: No, because they're not certified to do it.

THE COURT: Okay, anyone else in the fourth row?

THE CLERK: Third row.

THE COURT: Or third row? I'm Sorry. All right, let the -- anyone I missed? All right, let the record reflect no other hands. All right, let me move on to some additional questions. Let me ask, is there anyone over here that was really thrilled and happy to receive the summons in the mail for jury service? Every now and then I get somebody who is really thrilled and happy. I'm not going to get anybody today, obviously, at this point in time. All right, we'll let the record reflect no hands.

Now let me ask, is there anyone -- and if you already mentioned scheduling issue; which is the root of this issue, you don't

need to mention that again. But is there anyone who was really upset that you got the summons? And if you were upset again because of scheduling issues you've already mentioned, you don't need to explain them again.

But let me ask, is there anyone who was really upset that you got the summons for jury duty? Okay, let the record reflect no hands. Let me ask, is there anyone of you or close family or friend, who had been engaged in some way in the practice of law either as an attorney or paralegal or staff? Either you or close family member or close friend.

Okay, I remember Mr. Kelly and Ms. Wetenkamp, but let's go in order. Who in the back row? Okay, let's move to No. 7, Ms. Yager. Go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Hi, there. Father maritime; brother attorney works with a magistrate in federal court in New Orleans.

THE COURT: All right, so your brother works for a magistrate in New Orleans Federal Court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Yeah. Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And your father was a maritime attorney?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Maritime, yes.

THE COURT: I'm assuming he wasn't here locally.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: No, in New Orleans also.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: With bar exam questions

1	and graded them.
2	THE COURT: So neither one was in criminal law?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: No.
4	THE COURT: Okay.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Sorry.
6	THE COURT: That's fine, just asking. Anything about your
7	relationship to them and their legal
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Oh, I have others.
9	THE COURT: Oh, okay, I'm sorry. Go ahead, I apologize.
10	Go ahead.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Stepdaughter, general
12	counsel U.C. Irvine, and then I have two close friends who are local. I
13	think one is criminal called, Galbroy Christian Galbroy.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: And they were close
16	personal friends.
17	THE COURT: Okay. All right, anything about those your
18	relationship with them and their work that would affect your ability to be
19	a fair juror in this case?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: No.
21	THE COURT: All right, thank you very much.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 116: Okay.
23	THE COURT: Anyone else?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 112: I did not raise my hand,
25	sorry.

1	THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. We'll go down to No. 5, Ms.
2	Arias.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 112: So just two individuals tha
4	are both criminal defense attorneys here, Cristina Hinds and Craig
5	Mueller.
6	THE COURT: Okay. How do you know them?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 112: I went to high school with
8	Cristina. I've known her for 30 years.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 112: And Craig is her husband.
11	THE COURT: Okay, anything about your relationship with
12	them and their work that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this
13	case?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 112: Not at all.
15	THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you very much.
16	Anybody in the back row I missed? All right, let's go down to No. 10,
17	Ms. Waters.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: My husband was a law
19	enforcement officer with gaming.
20	THE COURT: Okay.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: He's retired now.
22	THE COURT: All right, so not an attorney though?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: No.
24	THE COURT: Okay. And just while I got you here
25	because that will be the next question, how long did he work for

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: About 17 years.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything about your relationship and his work, law enforcement in gaming that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: No.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Anyone else I missed in the back row? Oh, don't worry, I'm moving to the next row here in a second. All right, no other hands. Let's move to the second row, Seats 11 through 20, and I saw Mr. -- No. 12, Mr. Kokoczka's hand come up.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I had a cousin -- I have a cousin that's a corporate attorney in Jackson, Michigan.

THE COURT: Okay. And anything about your relationship with him and his work that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Not that I know of.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you. Anyone else in the second row? Okay, let's go down to No. 18, Mr. Kelly.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: I know Angela Cook [phonetic], she's a friend and we volunteered together. She is an attorney for children here in Nevada.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, anything about your relationship with her that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 129: No. Your Honor.

	١	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	

THE COURT: Okay. All right, and anyone else you know? All right, let's move one over to No. 19, Ms. Wetenkamp.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: My niece Jamie Doctor, I don't know what kind of law she's into, and Crystal Herrera who now works for the Clark County School District as an attorney.

THE COURT: Okay, anything about your relationship with them that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else I missed in the second row? All right, anyone in the third row? Okay, let's hand the mic down to No. 21, Mr. Chang.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: I know a James Kwon, an attorney in town. He's just a friend.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: Just a friend.

THE COURT: All right, socialize any?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: Yep.

THE COURT: What kind of work does he do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: I think he's employed as a business attorney.

THE COURT: Okay, anything about your relationship with him and his work that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 133: No.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Anyone else I missed?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: So any attorneys in town?

THE COURT: If you or someone close to you, or close family member or close friend --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Not an acquaintance?

THE COURT: -- engaged in the practice of law.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: Not just your basic acquaintance to --

THE COURT: Yeah, someone close to you, close family member, or close friend. All right, and just for the record, that was Mr. Nettles who was speaking. All right, no one who fits that bill?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 118: No, sir.

THE COURT: No, sir. Okay, good deal, thank you. Okay, let me ask -- and if you already identified somebody when I asked about Metro or Henderson Police Department, you don't need to talk about them again. Let me ask, is there anyone of you either you or a close family member or close friend been engaged in law enforcement work or security work? Again, if you've already mentioned someone, you don't need to mention them again.

But let me ask, is there any one of you or close family member or close friend who had been engaged in law enforcement work or security work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: I have a question.

THE COURT: Okay, let's hand the mic up to No. 10, Ms.

Waters.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Just a question. I'm a

1	retired settlement officer with IRS, and I was a revenue officer. I don't		
2	know if guys consider that enforcement work or not, so that's my		
3	question.		
4	THE COURT: Okay. No, and I appreciate you bringing that		
5	up.		
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Okay.		
7	THE COURT: If I remember correctly, revenue officers didn't		
8	have arrest authority, is that correct?		
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Right.		
10	THE COURT: Yeah.		
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Right. We worked with a		
12	lot of the attorneys in there. But so I just wanted to		
13	THE COURT: Is that here in Las Vegas?		
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Yeah.		
15	THE COURT: All right.		
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: I retired.		
17	THE COURT: How long did you do that?		
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: Thirty-one years.		
19	THE COURT: Okay. And anything about that work that would		
20	affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?		
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 119: No.		
22	THE COURT: Okay. All right, very good. All right, so let's go		
23	back again either you or close family member or close friend has been		
24	involved in law enforcement work or security work? Let's focus on the		
25	back row first. Anyone? I don't see any hands. All right, the second		

row? And let's go down, first, to No. 12, Mr. Kokoczka.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I had a close cousin that was a deputy sheriff.

THE COURT: Where?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: In Jackson, Michigan -- or Jackson County, I should say.

THE COURT: All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: And we were real close, and we spoke a lot about what he did.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, anything about your relationship to him and his work that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: That, I couldn't tell you.

THE COURT: Well, I mean --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I mean, I don't know which way -- you know, we talked about law enforcement quite a bit too, so --

THE COURT: Whatever he told you, you would agree, is totally separate and apart from anything that's going to be involved in this case? There's not going to be any facts from anything he talked about there that's going to be an issue.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Well it can't be, that was at least over 10 years ago.

THE COURT: Yeah, so --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: So nothing with that, but maybe something connecting to it; I don't know because he did a lot of

work so --

1

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: All right. Well do you think you would be able to focus on the witnesses who testify here and the exhibits here, and go back into the jury room and be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Maybe. I can't tell you because, you know, we spoke a lot over 20 years --

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: -- that he was deputy so --

THE COURT: All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I'm just being honest.

THE COURT: No, I appreciate that. That's what I want, thank you. All right, anyone else in the second row? Let's go down -- oh, did No. 11, Ms. Scholl, did you have your hand up?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: I did.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I apologize, I didn't see it. Go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: So my husband did some security work in the past. He worked with; for Mr. White with the wrestling and a couple of other companies, armed guard. However, he no longer does that.

THE COURT: Okay. About how long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: Well he kind of worked on and off for a couple of different companies. I'd say probably the last time he worked was at least a year and a half ago or two.

THE COURT: All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: However, he will go if they

25

1

4

5

7

8

3

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

call him.

THE COURT: All right, fair enough. Anything about his work and your relation with him that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you feel you would be able to follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence admitted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 121: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. And who else in the second row? Let's go down to No. 14, Ms. Santana.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: I worked for a security and a customer service company 10 years ago in San Diego, Elite.

THE COURT: Okay. And what did you do for them?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: We worked big venues, stadiums, baseball parks, and major league baseball parks. And we just did crowd control and alcohol control, and just make sure people were

safe. But I did not carry a firearm or anything, I just -- if we had any incidents, we'd radio in to get a police officer.

THE COURT: Okay, okay, good. Did you like doing that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: It was fun.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you get into a lot of good games?

THE COURT: Yeah, there you go.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: I did.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: San Diego was nice.

THE COURT: All right, anything about that work and your experience with that company that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: No. I saw a lot of things, but some were not pleasant but we were more concerned about the safety of our surrounding.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, again, obviously whatever happened in San Diego or whatever was different than what --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: Yeah.

THE COURT: Do you feel you would be able to focus on the witnesses who testify here and the exhibits here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 124: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, who's next? We'll go down to No. 16, Mr. Roland.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: That's my current job. I'm a security supervisor at the Stratosphere Hotel.

THE COURT: All right. How long have you been doing that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: Three years.

THE COURT: And did you do any security work before you started there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: Just in houses.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, and how many people are you supervising?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: On a shift -- on our shift on graveyard, it's like two supervisors; one manager; officers on the floor,

20

21

22

23 24

25

so anywhere from like 10 to 15.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, anything about your work and that you do at the Stratosphere that would affect your ability to be a fair iuror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 127: No.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. And who's next? Go down to No. 19, Ms. Wetenkamp.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: My son was vice president of Global Security for Diamond Resorts for nine years, and just switched to a new security position with a different company, that I don't remember the name of, in August.

THE COURT: Okay, anything about his work that would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 131: No.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you very much. Anyone else in the second row? All right, what about in the third row? Okay, let's hand the mic down to No. 22, Mr. Purdy.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 135: My oldest brother is retired LAPD detective, and my nephew is a current Colorado PD detective.

THE COURT: All right. Are you close to either one of those?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 135: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right, socialize much?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 135: Yep.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you, anything about their work and your relation to them that would affect your ability to be a fair

juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 135: No.

THE COURT: Do you feel you would be able to follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence admitted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 135: I do.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you. Anyone else I missed? All right. Let's do one more question; then we'll break for lunch. Now, as has been explained, this case involves charges of conspiracy to commit robbery, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, attempt robbery with use of a deadly weapon, burglary while in possession of a firearm, assault with a deadly weapon, grand larceny auto, possession of stolen vehicle, assault on a protective person with a deadly weapon, and resisting a public officer with use of a firearm.

Is there anything -- does anyone feel that there's a possibility that you cannot be fair or keep an open mind as to whether the State has met its burden of proof of proving the charges beyond a reasonable trial until the end of the trial because of the nature of the charges in this case?

So essentially I'm asking, because of the nature of the charges in this case, is there anyone who doesn't feel they could keep an open mind as to whether the State has met its burden of proof until the end of the trial because of the nature of the charges in this case?

Okay, let's hand the mic down to No. 20, Ms. Brewster.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 132: Okay, for one thing, I'm

2

saved and I'm a praying woman. And I don't believe in any violence whatsoever. I just --I don't see a reason for nobody to try to destroy somebody with a vehicle, or anything else.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 132: I don't like it. I'm just going to tell the truth. I know everybody's thinking it but I'm saying it, I don't like it.

THE COURT: Let me stop you and we can maybe talk with you a little bit more during the break. Is that okay, Ms. Brewster?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 132: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Anybody else? All right, let's go down to No. 12, Mr. Kokoczka.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: I do have one concern with myself. Several years back in the Mesquite area -- I'm sure everybody knows of the Bundy situation, and I was real close friends with the family. And the way they were treated, it was --

THE COURT: Okay, let me stop you right there.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Okay.

THE COURT: And you've highlighted the issue.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Okay.

THE COURT: Do you feel that would impact some way in your ability to be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 122: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, again, we may want to talk to you a little bit more at a sidebar. But thank you for bringing that up, sir.

1	Anybody else that I missed here? All right, let's go one over to No. 13,
2	Ms. Alcomindras.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: Alcomindras, close.
4	THE COURT: I was close.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: Yeah.
6	THE COURT: Give me some credit, I was close. Yes,
7	ma'am.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: I was robbed while
9	working at a fast food before.
10	THE COURT: Okay. About how long ago was that?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: It was like 10 years ago.
12	THE COURT: All right. And you said, what kind what
13	restaurant?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: It was a Pizza Hut on MLK
15	and Alexander.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Do you know if anyone was ever
17	apprehended from that robbery?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: Yeah. I actually went to
19	court here in this building for it.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And were you satisfied or dissatisfied
21	with law enforcement's response?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: Satisfied.
23	THE COURT: All right. Now let me ask you, anything about
24	that experience you think would affect your ability to be a fair juror in this
25	case?

A.A. 159

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: I don't think so.

THE COURT: All right. Do you feel you would be able to follow my instructions and fairly and unbiasedly apply those instructions to the evidence admitted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 123: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Anybody else? Because of the nature of the charges here, feel they would not be fair and keep an open mind until the end of the case to determine whether the State has met its burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt? All right, let the record reflect no other hands.

This is probably a good -- I know there's some people that need a bathroom break; this is also probably a good time to take a lunch break. I'm going to ask -- it's just a little bit past 12:20. I'm going to ask everybody to try to get back here by 1:20. Get out in the hall -- try to get here by 1:15, so we can get started again at 1:20.

I know that's not giving you a lot of time. But here's the long and short of it, we cannot get started again until all of you; you over here in this box, and you out there in the gallery get back. So if anyone of you decides this is the time to see what the Fremont Street Experience is like and ride the zip line that takes more than an hour, we're all going to be waiting to hear about your experience when you get back.

And the long and short of it is, I will try my best to get through the jury selection process today. If we don't get through it, then we're going to have to have everybody come back tomorrow. So I want

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to try to keep things moving as quickly as possible so that we can have you all out of here if possible, or minimize the inconvenience as possible.

While you're out there, do not talk to each other about this case or about anyone who has anything to do with it; do not let anyone -- do not talk with each other; do not talk with anyone else about the case or about anyone that has anything to do with it; do not let anyone come up to you and talk to you about the case or about anyone that has anything to do with it. If someone should try to talk to you about the case, please report it to me immediately by contacting the Marshal; do not listen to any radio or television reports about the case or anyone who has anything to do with it; do not undertake any sort of investigation or research, visit the scene of any events mentioned during the course of the trial. This would include use of social media to any way discuss the case or the use of the internet or other reference materials to do any sort of investigation or research. And do not begin to form or express any opinion connected with this case until you either been selected as a juror, had a chance to be seated and listen to the evidence, and you go back to the jury room to deliberate. So with that, have a great lunch and we'll see you back here at 1:15.

THE MARSHAL: All rise, jury's exiting.

[Outside the presence of the prospective jurors]

THE COURT: Okay, let's start out first with the two jurors that were sitting in the back, who have really, I think, pretty clearly --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: They can't understand. I mean, I'll

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

24

25

MR. MARTINEZ: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let's deal with -- why don't we deal with any cause objections at this point in time, and then we'll deal with the scheduling issues. Let me ask the State, is there anybody at this point in time that they wish to move for cause?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah, the only --

THE COURT: Well, wait, I'm asking the State.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Oh, sorry.

THE COURT: I'll be right -- I'm not going to forget you.

MR. MARTINEZ: I didn't have any for cause, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now I'll turn to --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Go ahead.

MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, I just feel like the young lady that was robbed at the Pizza Hut. I admire her aplomb in saying that she feels she's able to be fair and not hold any residual resentment or bias from that, but I just have a hard time believing it. I feel like, on some level, the evidence in this case will raise that memory and it might make it difficult to be fair. I can appreciate that she said she can be, but I feel like the nature of that experience and some of the evidence in this case they're too close, it's too close.

THE COURT: All right. State's position?

MR. MARTINEZ: That's why we got peremptory challenges. I don't think it's an appropriate basis for challenge for cause just because she's been a victim of a robbery before. She said she could be fair.

THE COURT: I mean, I'll -- at this point in time, I'm going to

deny it. I'm not going to preclude you from raising it again in the future. And you're obviously can ask for some stuff if you want to during your individual voir dire, but she did indicate that it was 10 years ago. I mean I'd be — yeah, if this was like last year, I'd be much more concern about it. But this was 10 years ago; she said she could be fair. So at this point in time, I'm not going to remove her from cause. But I'm not precluding you from raising that again, and you have a chance to chat with her.

Anybody else, at this point, from the Defense?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's talk about scheduling issues, No. 3, Ms. Glassman. She is the only broker for 175 agents.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I'm sorry --

MR. MARTINEZ: I don't feel bad for her at all.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I don't feel bad either. There's telephones --

THE COURT: Okay. I don't feel bad for her either, let's just leave it at that. I'm not inclined to let her go. I'm taking the State is concurring with me?

MR. MARTINEZ: I agree.

THE COURT: And Defense concurs with me?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes, we concur with you.

THE COURT: All right, we're not going to let Ms.

Glassman go at this point. All right. Mr. Thistle, he's got class a couple days next week. I'll be frank, I'm not inclined to let him go at this point in time. I mean, he's a teacher. I mean, I had my teachers say, oh, I can't

22

23

24

25

do it and make me take make-up classes at ridiculously inconvenient time. So he can make them do classes at ridiculously inconvenient times but, I mean, that's my take.

State's position?

MR. MARTINEZ: We'll submit it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Submit it.

THE COURT: Okay, I'm not going to let Mr. Thistle go. Ms. Yager, actually, she was going to check in terms of after-school care. At one time I thought Henderson -- well, I mean, I was never associated with Henderson International. But usually they had child care until at least five or six o'clock and she was going to call, so I'm not inclined to let her go right now.

But let me ask the State's position?

MR. MARTINEZ: We'll submit.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: We'll submit it too.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Margolis, you look like you're about to say something.

MR. MARGOLIS: Just Clark County schools has Safekey and Teen Scene. They have those programs.

THE COURT: Yeah, but she's in private school.

MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, so I can't speak to that.

THE COURT: I'm guessing that they probably have something.

MR. MARGOLIS: I'd be surprised if they do.

1

TH	IE COURT:	All right, but	we won't l	et Ms. Yage	er go a	at this
point. And th	nen Ms. Stau	ıdenmaier, s	he has airl	ine tickets n	ext F	riday
morning.						

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I don't think that's going to be a problem.

I can't imagine -- the only way -- and I still can't imagine -- I would assume that we're going to finish by next Wednesday; even if we finish on Thursday, I don't know how long the jury will be deliberating.

THE COURT: All right. Well that's why we have alternates.

MS. MERCER: Yeah.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah.

THE COURT: I'm not going to let her off at this point.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, I don't think it's necessary.

THE COURT: All right. Well what did Mr. Nettles have next week? Oh, he's got vacation scheduled Wednesday through Friday.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: It's getting close.

MR. MARTINEZ: Yeah.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah, I'd say, I would not have a problem excusing him, if the State's okay with it?

MR. MARTINEZ: I don't have a problem with it either.

THE COURT: Let me think about Mr. Nettles at this point. But both sides are saying that they're okay if I excuse him?

MR. MARTINEZ: That's correct.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right.

MR. MARGOLIS: The grandkids are on Spring Break next week. He made a pretty good case, he backed it all up.

THE COURT: You got to be old and heartless like me; wait until I have grandkids. All right, then -- did Ms. Waters have anything? No, she didn't.

THE CLERK: No.

THE COURT: All right.

THE CLERK: Yeah, she did. No, she -- her granddaughter is here.

THE COURT: Yeah. But then she said that wasn't a problem, it was going to be the next week after that.

THE CLERK: Right.

THE COURT: So she was good. All right, what about Mr. Kokoczka, who I assure you if I don't excuse him this time, he'll come up with even a better reason why he should be excused.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes. I'm sorry, I had my phone and I lost it. And I don't know how to shut it up, but I'll figure it out.

THE COURT: That's okay. I'm inclined to let Mr. Kokoczka go. What's the State's position?

MS. MERCER: We agree.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes. Because you're right, he would've come up with something else.

THE COURT: He's going to come up with --

MR. MARGOLIS: I just, kind of, want to hear what it is. I mean, that's my position. I'm being honest, but I understand everyone else's.

THE COURT: No. He's saying here that the Bundy's -- and

1	we're going to near abo
2	Kokoczka. Ms. Santar
3	sound like she's the gr
4	MR. YAMPO
5	MS. MERCE
6	THE COURT
7	the deal. It sounds like
8	there to keep an eye o
9	MR. YAMPO
0	THE COURT
1	MR. YAMPO
2	MR. MARTIN
3	MR. YAMPO
4	THE COURT
5	scheduled for anytime
6	MR. YAMPO
7	excusing her.
8	THE COURT
9	MR. MARTII
20	doing, to get off the jur
21	MR. YAMPO
22	THE COURT
23	Santana?
24.	MR. YAMPO

out -- I don't know. All right, we'll excuse Mr. na, small business; the grooming shop, it doesn't oomer.

DLSKY: No.

R: Yeah.

Γ: She sounds like she's the business end of e the shop will go on, it's just whether or not she's n.

DLSKY: Yeah, I'll submit it.

T: Now, she has a colonoscopy. Now that --

DLSKY: Yeah.

NEZ: Yeah, that's a viable --

DLSKY: Yeah, that's --

Γ: And that's why she probably won't get it soon.

DLSKY: Right. And I don't have any problem

T: All right. What's the State's position?

NEZ: It's not like it's a fun thing, she's going to be y duty.

DLSKY: Right.

T: So everybody is good getting rid of Ms.

DLSKY: Yeah.

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes.

1

2

MR. YAMPOLSKY: That root canal, jury duty, that's right up there.

THE COURT: All right. Let's see Mr. Roland, he works from eight to -- from 12 to eight; he takes the kids to school; picks them up at three; one goes to dance; the other one -- I don't know what of anything she does. What's your thoughts of Mr. Roland?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I'll submit it.

MR. MARTINEZ: Is he going to be awake? I mean he works from 12 to eight.

THE COURT: Well I mean that's a concern.

MR MARTINEZ: Yeah.

THE COURT: But let me ask you all what you all think?

MR. MARTINEZ: We'll submit it, Your Honor.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I don't know what to do.

MS. STELLA: Let me fix it.

THE COURT: You know how to silence it, right?

MS. STELLA: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Give it to the --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: The kids.

THE COURT: Give it to the kid? I mean, not that I want to -- that she's a kid, but give it to the young person that understands how this all works.

MR. MARTINEZ: I know how to silence a phone for the record as well.

THE COURT: I do, too, for the record.

:

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I did until I got this phone.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, what was our thoughts? I'm sorry, what was our thoughts on Mr. Roland?

MR. MARTINEZ: I think he was going to check if their mother would be able to leave work early.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MARTINEZ: So I'll submit it to Your Honor's discretion.

THE COURT: What's your position Mr. Yampolsky or Mr.

Margolis as to Mr. Roland?

MR. MARGOLIS: I think he should be allowed to go.

THE COURT: I just always -- I mean because it's work-related -- let me think about Mr. Roland for right now, along with Mr. Nettles. All right. And then the next one we got is Ms. Brewster. Anybody have an issue with Ms. Brewster, who seems like she isn't in a lot of pain right now. But let me ask the State's position?

MR. MARTINEZ: Submit it, Your Honor.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: We'll submit it.

THE COURT: All right. Let me for the record, I mean, my sense of Ms. Brewster is she is utilizing narcotics to control her pain. I was hopeful she was going to say that she can stand and that would relieve it. And we can obviously make her come in; make steps to have her be in a position where she can stand and relieve it, but she indicated that standing and anything didn't help with it. So, I mean, we're going to have someone who would have serious pain issues, plus she's sleepy. But my biggest concern is, I did get a sense that she is utilizing narcotics

1

to control the pain so I will excuse Ms. Brewster, No. 20.

Mr. Chang, he's the optometrist. He obviously figured out that I didn't have a lot of sympathy for his schedule generally, so he brought up that he has children in special therapy that no one else is accredited in doing. What's the State's thoughts as to him?

MR. MARTINEZ: We'll submit it to Your Honor's discretion.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I'll submit it.

MR. MARTINEZ: I find that hard to believe, but we'll submit it.

MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, I think --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah, we find it hard to believe too.

MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, I found others' narratives more compelling.

THE COURT: All right, I won't let Mr. Chang go right now.

Let's see Mr. Nettles -- all right, he had the vacation Wednesday through

Friday with the grandkids that I'm supposed to have sympathy for.

Everybody was going to let Mr. Nettles go, is that --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, I'll let Mr. Nettles go.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: It wasn't so hard.

THE COURT: Yeah. Mr. Roland, I'm going to leave Mr. Roland on right now, and let's see if he -- what he finds out about the kids. I mean, I was surprised he didn't raise the issue of sleep.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: He seemed pretty alert.

MR. MARGOLIS: And he seemed really with it --

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. YAMPOLSKY: He seemed really with it, absolutely.

MR. MARGOLIS: -- compared to others up there.

THE COURT: So, I mean, I'm going to leave him on for now. But, you know, when you get down to doing peremptories; if he's still there and rather than just throw that one out as a waiver, you might have some sympathy in Mr. Roland's -- all right, so at this point in time, I'm showing that I'm going to excuse No. 9, Mr. Nettles; No. 12, Mr. Kokoczka; No. 14, Ms. Santana, and No. 20, Ms. Brewster.

Is that – does the State concur with that?

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Defense concur with that?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I asked, I show that we're going to let go at this point: No. 9, Mr. Nettles; No. 12, Mr. Kokoczka; No. 14, Ms. Santana, and No. 20, Ms. Brewster.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.

THE COURT: Anybody else I missed? Or anything else at this point in time.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to emphasize, again, I asked about cause. I'll ask you several more times about cause; you can reassert someone for cause at any time. I'll let you know when the point of no return is at, so I know you moved as to somebody, No. 13, I think; you're not precluded from raising --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Ms. Alcomindras.

1				
1	THE COURT: Yeah, you're not precluded from bringing it up			
2	later. I want to make sure just because I ruled now doesn't mean that			
3	you I'll ask you to all right, anything else before we break for lunch?			
4	MS. MERCER: I'm sorry, Your Honor.			
5	THE COURT: Anything else? Am I talking to myself?			
6	MR. YAMPOLSKY: What?			
7	MS. MERCER: Mr. Yampolsky's very distracting.			
8	THE COURT: All right, anything else?			
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I've heard that before.			
10	THE COURT: Anything else before we break for lunch,			
11	State?			
12	MS. MERCER: Your Honor, I think we're plausibly close to a			
13	negotiation.			
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: We may have this resolved.			
15	THE COURT: That's fine. If you do, bring a plea agreement			
16	when you come back at 1:15.			
17	MS. MERCER: Okay.			
18	THE COURT: All right.			
19	MS. MERCER: Thank you, Your Honor.			
20	THE COURT: Anything else from the State?			
21	MR. MARTINEZ: No, Your Honor.			
22	THE COURT: Anything else from Defense?			
23	MR. MARGOLIS: Nothing.			
24	MR. MARGOLIS: No, Your Honor.			
25	THE COURT: Okay, we'll see you in a few.			

MS. MERCER: Thank you.

[Proceeding resumed at 2:03 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the prospective jurors]

THE COURT: All right. Okay, Mr. Kittredge, I want you to listen carefully because in a second, I'm going to ask one of your attorneys to state the substance; by that, I mean the primary or most important terms of your plea negotiation with the state. I want you to listen carefully because when he's done, I'm going to ask you if you heard what he said and if you agree that he accurately stated the substance of your negotiation with the State. Will you do that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Counsel, whoever wants to do it.

MR. MARGOLIS: Sure. Mr. Kittredge is going to plead guilty pursuant to the guilty plea agreement you have before Your Honor. He's going to plead guilty to conspiracy to commit robbery, B felony; robbery with use of a deadly weapon as evidence by Counts 2 through 4; as well as resisting a public officer with use of a firearm, which is also a category C felony; which is Count 5 of the amended superseding indictment.

In return, the parties have agreed to stipulate to a sentence of 18 to 45 years in the Nevada Department of Corrections.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Kittredge, did you just hear Mr. Margolis go through the substance of your negotiations with the State?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And did he accurately state the substance; that

22

23

24

25

is the primary and most important terms of your negotiation with the State?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he did.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, do you read, write and understand the English language?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you received a copy of the amended superseding indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: I have.

THE COURT: Okay. And this is -- just to make sure we're on the same page, this is the indictment charging you with Count 1, conspiracy to commit robbery, a category B felony, in violation of Nevada Revised Statutes 200.380 and 199.480, and in Counts 2, 3 and 4 with robbery with use of a deadly weapon, a category B felony, in violation of Nevada Revised Statutes 200.380 and 193.165, and in Count 5, with resisting a public officer with use of a firearm, a category C felony in violation of Nevada Revised Statute 199.280.

Did you receive a copy of that indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And did you read it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And did you discuss with your attorneys the charges in the amended superseding indictment to which you intend to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

24

25

THE COURT: Do you waive me reading out loud, here, in court today the amended superseding indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, before accepting your guilty plea, there are a number of questions I'm going to have to ask you to ensure myself that you're entering a valid plea. If you do not understand any of the questions, would you please let me know so I can rephrase the question?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. If at any time you wish to take a break in the proceedings so you can discuss matters in private with your attorney, will you let me know that so I can give you the opportunity and chance to do so?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. How old are you?

THE DEFENDANT: Thirty-eight.

THE COURT: And where were you born?

THE DEFENDANT: Albuquerque, New Mexico.

THE COURT: How far did you go in school?

THE DEFENDANT: Graduated; some college.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you taken any drugs, medicine, pills of any kind, or drunk any alcoholic beverages in the past 24 hours?

THE DEFENDANT: No. sir.

THE COURT: Are you on any medication at the jail?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Have you ever been treated for any
2	mental illness or addiction to narcotic drugs of any kind?
3	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Okay, what have you been treated for?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Schizophrenic manic, bipolar, anxiety,
6	depression, and PTSD.
7	THE COURT: And you're not on any medications for those
8	right now?
9	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Do you feel those are relatively well
11	controlled without any medication?
12	THE DEFENDANT: After committing these offenses, I'm
13	trying to stay off drugs, even mental drugs, you know.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	THE DEFENDANT: So I'm maintaining.
16	THE COURT: All right, you've mentioned some serious
17	mental health issues. Do you feel that any of those issues is impacting
18	on your ability to understand what's going on here today?
19	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. No, sir.
20	THE COURT: Do you feel they are impacting on your ability
21	at all to understand what you are charged with and the nature of those
22	charges?
23	THE DEFENDANT: No, not at all.
24	THE COURT: All right. Do you feel they impact upon your
25	ability at all to understand the plea agreement you're entering into with

23

24

25

the State?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: And they don't affect your ability to read and understand, for instance: the amended superseding indictment or the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: No, not in any way.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you feel you understand what's happening here today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Tell me in your own words what's happening here today?

THE DEFENDANT: We resolved a plea and went over my plea agreement; you're just making sure that I understand.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, does either Counsel have any -- does any Counsel from either side have any doubts as to the defendant's competence to plead at this time?

MS. MERCER: No, Your Honor.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Based on Counsel's representations, the Court's own observations of the defendant, I find the defendant is competent to plead in this matter. Now, have you had ample opportunities to discuss your case with your attorneys?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you discussed with them any possible defenses, defense strategies, and circumstances which might be in your

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied to have them as your attorneys and the advice they have given you?

THE DEFENDANT: Of course, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you understand that under the constitution and laws of the United States and the state of Nevada, you're entitled to a trial by jury on the charges contained in the amended superseding indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in order to convict you, all the jurors would have to agree you are guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that, at trial, while you'd be -- let me try again. Do you understand that, at trial, you would presume to be innocent and the State would have to overcome that presumption and prove you guilty beyond a reasonable doubt by competent evidence and you would not have to prove you were innocent?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that, in the course of the trial, witnesses for the State would have to come to court and testify in your presence and your attorney could cross examine those witnesses and could object to evidence offered by the State?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that, at trial, your attorney would have the right to call witnesses and present evidence on your behalf?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that, at trial, while you would have a right to testify if you chose to do so, you would also have the right not to testify, and if you decided not to testify at your trial, the State would not be able to use the fact you didn't testify against you in any way to prove the State's case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If I accept your guilty plea, do you understand that you'll be waiving, that is giving up your right to a jury trial and all of the other rights I've just discussed?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: In pleading guilty, do you understand that you'll also have to waive your right not to testify against yourself because you'll have to admit you committed the crimes charged in the amended superseding indictment and I am going to have to ask you questions about what you did to satisfy myself that you are guilty as charged?

THE DEFENDANT: Made some mistakes I committed -- I committed --

THE COURT: No, no, right now, do you understand that I'm going to be asking you -- you're going to -- you have a right not to testify against yourself, do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct, correct.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in making this plea you're going to be waiving that right and admitting that you committed the crimes charged here? So you're going to be essentially admitting you committed the crimes and that's incriminating yourself, do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And I'm going to have to ask you -- you're also have to waive your right to not incriminate yourself because I'm going to have to ask you some questions about what you did and you're going to have to answer those questions, and that would be incriminating yourself, do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, you've been charged in the amended superseding indictment in Count 1, with conspiracy to commit robbery. Do you understand that for you to be guilty of this crime, the State would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that on and between May 21, 2018 and June 7, 2018, and that during that time and in Clark County, you did conspire, that is reach an agreement with Deanna Page to commit a number of robberies? Do you understand the State would have to prove all those facts beyond a reasonable doubt for you to be found guilty of conspiracy to commit robbery?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You've been charged in Counts 2, 3 and 4 with robbery with use of a deadly weapon. Do you understand that for you to be guilty -- found guilty of robbery with use of a deadly weapon in those

counts, you would have to -- the State would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that you were in Clark County, Nevada in -- between May 21 and May 26 of 2018; May 27 and May 31 of 2018, and June 1 and June 7 of 2018 in Clark County? Do you understand the State would have to prove that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And on each of those occasions, the State would also need to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that you did willfully and unlawfully take personal property, that being U.S. Currency from either the person or in the presence of different individuals charged in Counts 2, 3 and 4 of the superseding indictment, by means of force or violence or fear of injury to them without their consent and against their will? Do you understand the State would have to prove those facts beyond a reasonable doubt for you to be guilty of the robbery aspect of robbery with use of a deadly weapon?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you understand that in additionally the State would also have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that in taking that property by means of force or violence or fear of injury to those individuals, that you utilized a deadly weapon, that being a firearm? Do you understand the State would have to prove that beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, are you aware that as to Count 1, conspiracy to commit robbery, that the penalty for this count is a

minimum sentence of one year to a maximum sentence of six years in the Nevada Department of Corrections?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in addition to or separate from any sentence of imprisonment, you can be fined up to \$5,000 for conspiracy to commit robbery?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: As to Counts 2, 3 and 4, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, do you understand that the penalty for these counts as to the robbery aspect is a minimum sentence of two years to a maximum sentence of 15 years in the Nevada Department of Corrections?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you aware that as to the use of a deadly weapon aspect of robbery with use of a deadly weapon that, the Court is required to sentence you to a consecutive term of one to 15 years in the Nevada Department of Corrections for the use of a deadly weapon as to each one of those counts?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: As to Count 5, resisting public officer with use of a firearm, are you aware that the penalty for this crime is a minimum sentence of one year to a maximum sentence of six years in the Nevada Department of Corrections?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you aware that in addition to or separate from any sentence of imprisonment for resisting a public officer with use

of a firearm, you can be fined up to \$10,000?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now as to each one of these counts, Counts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, do you understand that the Court could sentence you consecutive terms for each one of these counts?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, do you also understand that an assessment fee of \$25, a DNA assessment fee of \$3, and if you're not already been tested, a DNA testing fee of \$150 will be imposed at the time of sentencing?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if you've not previously been tested for DNA, you'll be ordered to be tested for DNA at the time of sentencing?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Pursuant to the statute to which you're pleading guilty, you are eligible for probation for the crime of conspiracy to commit robbery charged in Count 1, and resisting a public officer with use of a firearm in Count 5. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, do you understand that the -- do you understand that the decision whether to grant you probation on either one of the counts is my decision as the sentencing judge, regardless of any recommendation by your attorney or any recommendation by the prosecutor; if I decline or decide not to sentence you to probation on

those counts and you're not happy with my sentence, do you understand that you cannot withdraw your plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now as to Counts 2, 3 and 4 which charge you with robbery with use of a deadly weapon, do you understand that you're not eligible for probation on any of those counts?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, do you understand if I was to sentence you to probation on either Count 1 or Count 5, you would be required to abide by conditions specified by the court and that probation could be revoked if you've violated any of those conditions?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if probation was revoked for any reason, you could be imprisoned for the full term of any suspended sentence I might give in this matter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that the court may order you to make restitution to any victim of the offenses to which you're pleading guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the offenses to which you are pleading guilty are felony offenses?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If your plea is accepted, you'll be adjudged guilty of a felony and that may deprive of you of a valuable civil right,

2	any kind of firearm, the ability to apply to a foreign government for a
3	Visa, or the ability to travel freely and internationally. Do you understand
4	that?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Now, has anyone threatened you or forced you
7	to plead guilty?
8	THE DEFENDANT: No.
9	THE COURT: Has anyone told you that if you do not plead
10	guilty some other adverse action will be taken against you?
11	THE DEFENDANT: No.
12	THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty because of any
13	coercion from, or fear from any co-defendant?
14	THE DEFENDANT: No.
15	THE COURT: Now, have you through your attorneys entered
16	into a plea agreement with the State?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
18	THE COURT: I'm holding in my hand a document titled,
19	Guilty Plea Agreement which at page 6 shows a signature for you, did
20	you sign this?
21	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
22	THE COURT: Did you read it before you signed it?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorneys before
25	you signed it?

such as the right to vote, the right to serve on a jury, the right to possess

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Did they answer all your questions?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you feel you understand the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You understand that your attorney, at the start of this proceeding, went through the substance or the primary terms of your plea agreement with the State but this written plea agreement contains in writing everything you and the State are agreeing to, do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that even if your attorney did not mention a term or understanding with the State orally at the beginning of the proceedings; if it's in your plea agreement and in writing, you're also agreeing with these terms?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, has anyone made any promise to you other than those set forth in the plea agreement to induce you or cause you to plead guilty here today?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand that any recommendation or stipulation of sentence agreed to by your attorney and the attorneys for the State is not binding on the court and that you might on the basis of your guilty plea receive a more severe sentence than that requested

or recommended?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if that were to happen, you would not have the right to withdraw your guilty plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now other than what's set forth in your plea agreement, has anyone made any prediction or promise to you as to what your sentence will be?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand that under your agreement with the State, if you failed to interview with the Department of Parole and Probation, failed to appear at any subsequent hearings in this case, or an independent magistrate by affidavit review confirms probable cause you have committed new criminal charges, including reckless driving or DUI but excluding minor traffic violations, the State will have the right to argue for any legal sentence in term of confinement allowable for the crimes to which you're pleading guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions about what you have alleged to have done in the second amended -- let's try that again, in the amended superseding indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. How then do you plead to the charge in Count 1 of the amended superseding indictment, conspiracy to commit robbery, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: How do you plead to the charge in Count 2 of the amended superseding indictment, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: How do you plead to the charge in Count 3, robbery with use of a deadly weapon in the second -- in the amended superseding indictment, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: Let me just go back to Count 2 and make sure that you understand; have a clear record as to what that count involved. How do you plead to the charge in Count 2, robbery with use of a deadly weapon in the amended superseding indictment, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: Okay. Going to Count 4, robbery with use of a deadly weapon in the amended superseding indictment, how do you plead, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: And as to Count 5, resisting a public officer with use of a firearm in the amended superseding indictment, how do you plead, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Your Honor, maybe -- did you miss three or did I mishear it?

THE COURT: No.

MS. MERCER: No, he did three. He just went back to do --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Oh, you went back, okay.

THE COURT: Yeah, I didn't -- when I asked him how he pled to Count 2, I don't think I referenced the crime.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Oh, okay. All right.

THE COURT: I just wanted to make sure he understood when I referenced Count 2 –

MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right.

THE COURT: -- that I was referencing --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

THE COURT: -- a robbery with use of a deadly weapon.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

THE COURT: But we'll just double check, it never hurts to be sure, Mr. Yampolsky.

How do you plead to Count 3, robbery with use of a deadly weapon in the amended superseding indictment, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, let me ask you as to Count 2, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, were you in Clark County, Nevada between May 21, 2018 and May 26, 2018?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And during that period of time and in Clark
County, did you willfully and unlawfully take personal property, that
being U.S. Currency from either the person or in the presence of Juan
Diaz-Salazar or Andorio Rodriguez and/or Robert Rodriguez and/or

Abigail Salazar and/or Anthony Rodriguez and/or Elibrada Guiao and/or Trixie Arcinas and/or Diego Mora-Gomez?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: And did you do this by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And did you do this without their -- did you take this personal property without their consent and against their will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And in the course of doing this, did you use a deadly weapon, that being a firearm?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. As to Count 3, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, were you in Clark County, Nevada between May 27, 2018 and May 31, 2018?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And during that period of time and in Clark County, did you willfully and unlawfully take personal property, that being U.S. Currency, from the person or in the presence of Jennifer Strode and/or Azaley Gomez and/or Anette Menzi and/or Madison Serwicki and/or Jorge Hernandez-Garcia and/or Sandra Amador-Hernandez and/or Maria Solis and/or Victor Delgadillo-Garcia?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And did you do this with means of force or violence, or fear of injury to them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And did you take this personal property without their consent and against their will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And in doing this, did you utilize a deadly weapon, that being a firearm?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. As to Count 4, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, were you in Clark County, Nevada between June 1, 2018 and June 7, 2018?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And during that period of time and in Clark County, did you willfully and unlawfully take personal property, that being U.S. Currency from either the person or in the presence of Don Giuliano and/or Joy Shlasinger and/or Jennifer Hughes and/or Keymari Paxton and/or Denise Pratt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And did you do this by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And in taking this personal property, did you do it without their consent and against their will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And in taking the personal property, did you use a deadly weapon, that being a firearm?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. As to Count 1, conspiracy to commit robbery, were you in Clark County, Nevada between May 21, 2018 and June 7, 2018?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And during that period of time and in Clark County, did you willfully and unlawfully conspire, that is reach an agreement with Deanna Page to commit the robberies as set forth in Counts 2, 3 and 4 of the amended superseding indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And then as to Count 5, resisting public officer with use of a firearm, were you in Clark County, Nevada June 8, 2018?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And on that date and in Clark County, did you willfully and unlawfully resist, delay, or obstruct Law Enforcement Officers J. Emery and/or S. McNulty and/or R. Hart all of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you agree that they are public officers who were discharging or attempting to discharge their legal duty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And did you obstruct, resist, delay, and obstruct them by pointing a firearm at those officers in an effort to flee from the officers?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And did you do this by using a firearm or removing, taking, or attempting to take or remove a firearm from the person of, or the immediate presence of, the public officer in the course of such resistance, obstruction or delay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Does the State require anything further in terms of canvass?

MR. MARTINEZ: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Since you acknowledged that you are in fact guilty as charged in Counts 1 through 5; since you know your right to trial; what the maximum possible punishment is, and since you're voluntarily pleading guilty, I will conditionally accept your guilty plea. It's the finding of the Court, the defendant is fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea, and that his plea of guilty is knowing and voluntary supported by an independent basis and fact containing the essential elements of the offenses charged. Again, his plea is therefore conditionally accepted.

Let's go ahead and set a sentencing date.

THE CLERK: May 7th at 8:30.

MS. MERCER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We'll need to bring in the jury. Do any of the parties want to remain in here when I bring in the juries?

MS. MERCER: If it's easier for you, we can stay here until

your done, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's up to you. Do you want to have the defendant removed?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Whatever the Court's pleasure.

THE COURT: Why don't we go ahead and take the defendant out, and we'll bring in the jury in.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

MS. MERCER: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Mace.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Take care.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Jason.

MR. MARGOLIS: Of course.

[In the presence of the prospective jurors]

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, I want to apologize for the delay. I know -- my marshal indicated that essentially you all got back by 1:15 which is really critical for us to keep things moving along. So I want you to know I really appreciate it, it's very hard to do that with a group this large. So I really do appreciate you taking your time getting done through the lunch.

I'm apologizing for the delay. On the other hand, I think, since nobody over here indicated that they were really thrilled to get the summons in the mail, I think in the end you'll be happy to hear that, during the course of your lunch and the time of this last hour, what we refer to as a plea agreement was reached between the defendant and the representatives of the State.

And the defendant just completed a plea; taking a guilty plea in the case so that concludes the case in purposes of determining the issue of guilty or not guilty of the defendant. And we no longer need your services, you all are going to be excused at this point in time; you're free to talk about this on social media if you want; you're free to go on the Internet and look anything up in regard to it that you want.

I know you may be sitting here; walking out here going, gee, this was a royal waste of my time. And I'm sorry if you do feel that way; I'm sorry that you do feel that, you really shouldn't feel that way. The fact that you were here today ready to be considered for jury service was what prompted this case to be resolved. So you did serve a very important role in seeing that this case was resolved, and you shouldn't feel that you wasted your time in any way.

The good news; the further good news I can offer you is that, you shouldn't receive another summons in the mail for 18 months. I cannot guarantee that with the Federal District Court here. You can be summoned by the Federal District Court tomorrow, and you'll have to deal with them on your own. When you leave, make sure that you give the marshal your badge and so that he's got that.

Again, I want to thank you. What you did here today resolved the case. And if we had to go to trial; what you would've done as a jury would've been critical to the success of our justice system and ensuring, again, public confidence in the decisions that come out of this system. So I want to thank you for your time, and I wish you all the best.

I guess Spring starts this week so have a wonderful Spring, and we'll see you all later. [Hearing concluded at 2:36 p.m.] I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability. ngie Caliello Court Recorder/Transcriber

Electronically Filed 11/25/2020 3:40 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RSPN** STEVEN B. WOLFSON 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 JONATHAN E. VANBOSKERCK 3 Chief Deputy District Attorney 4 Nevada Bar #006528 200 Lewis Avenue 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 6 Attorney for Plaintiff

> DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

-VS-

SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE,

#1779637

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Defendant.

CASE NO: A-20-815382-W

C-18-333335-2

DEPT NO: XX

STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST-CONVICTION) AND MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

DATE OF HEARING: DECEMBER 22, 2020 TIME OF HEARING: 12:00 PM

COMES NOW, the State of Nevada, by STEVEN B. WOLFSON, Clark County District Attorney, through JONATHAN E. VANBOSKERCK, Chief Deputy District Attorney, and hereby submits the attached Points and Authorities in Response to Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction) and Motion for Appointment of Counsel.

This response is made and based upon all the papers and pleadings on file herein, the attached points and authorities in support hereof, and oral argument at the time of hearing, if deemed necessary by this Honorable Court.

26 //

27 //

28 /

\\CLARKCOUNTYDA.NET\CRMCASE2\2018\380\59\201838059C-RSPN-(SHAN JOHNATHON KITTREDGE)-001.DOCX

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On August 1, 2018, the State filed a Superseding Indictment charging Shan Jonathon Kittridge (hereinafter "Petitioner") with the following: Counts 1-5, 8-10, 12-16, 20-21, 27-28, 33-34, 36-37, 40 — Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon; Counts 7, 19, 26, 35, 39 — Conspiracy to Commit Robbery; Count 17 — Attempt Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon; Counts 6, 11, 18, 25, 31-32, 38, 42 — Burglary while in Possession of a Firearm; Counts 22-24, 29-30, 41, — Assault with a Deadly Weapon; Count 43 — Grand Larceny Auto; Count 44 — Possession of Stolen Vehicle; Counts 45-47 — Assault on Protected Person With Use of a Deadly Weapon; and Count 48 — Resisting Public Officer With Use of a Firearm. Petitioner's co-defendant was also charged as to Counts 7-11, 19-31, and 35-42. On August 21, 2018, Petitioner pled not guilty and waived his right to a speedy trial.

On December 19, 2018, Petitioner filed a Motion for Medical Treatment. On January 8, 2019, statements were made by defense counsel that Petitioner had sent several kites but has been unable to receive medical attention. A two (2) week continuance was requested for Mr. Frank Toddre, from the Attorney General's Office, to speak with medical personnel. On January 23, 2019, Mr. Toddre filed a Status Report regarding Petitioner's treatment. A Declaration from the Director or Nursing Bob Faulkner was attached. On January 24, 2019, this Court noted that Petitioner was being treated and defense counsel concurred. Defense counsel did note that Petitioner was waiting for an MRI and x-rays. Accordingly, the Court then denied the motion.

On March 11, 2019, the State filed a Notice of Intent to Seek Punishment as a Habitual Criminal.

On March 18, 2019, jury trial began, but Petitioner ultimately decided to plead guilty pursuant to a Guilty Plea Agreement ("GPA"). According to the GPA, "both parties stipulate to a total term of imprisonment of eighteen (18) to forty-five (45) years in the Nevada Department of Corrections." The Amended Superseding Indictment was also filed, and charged Petitioner with: Count 1- Conspiracy to Commit Robbery; Counts 2-4 – Robbery with

26

27

28

Use of a Deadly Weapon; and Count 5 – Resisting Public Officer With Use of a Firearm. On May 8, 2019, defense counsel filed a Sentencing Memorandum.

On May 14, 2019, the District Court sentenced Petitioner to the Nevada Department of Corrections as follows: Count 1 - a minimum of twenty-eight (28) months with a maximum of seventy-two (72) months; Count 2 – a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months, plus a consecutive term of a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months for Use of a Deadly Weapon, concurrent with Count 1; Count 3 – a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months, plus a consecutive term of a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months for Use of a Deadly Weapon, consecutive to Count 2; Count 4 – a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months, plus a consecutive term of a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months for Use of a Deadly Weapon, concurrent with Count 3; and Count 5 - a minimum of twenty-four (24) months and a maximum of sixty (60) months, consecutive to Count 3, with one hundred fifty-six (156) days credit for time served. Petitioner was further ordered to pay \$4,153.37 in Restitution, with \$2,802 to be paid jointly and severally with the co-defendant. Restitution was ordered in the following amounts: \$400 to Panda Express, \$300 to Duncan Donuts; \$331 to Roberto's Taco Shop; \$100 to Khoury's Mediterranean Restaurant and \$3,022.37 to Albertson's. The aggregate total sentence was eighteen (18) years to forty-five (45) years. The Judgment of Conviction was filed on May 16, 2019.

On April 5, 2019, Petitioner filed another Motion for Medical Treatment. According to Petitioner, he had an infection from lesions, and said infection was left untreated with no refills for antibiotics. On April 16, 2019, counsel for the Clark County Detention Center ("CCDC") advised that Petitioner was seen by a doctor, just not as quickly as he would have liked, and Mr. Margolis, on behalf of Mr. Yampolsky advised that Petitioner was now taking antibiotics. Additionally, Petitioner had a follow-up appointment for the bullet in his head. The Court then denied the Motion as Moot.

//

On May 14, 2019, defense counsel field a Notice of Withdrawal of Attorney.

On May 22, 2020, Petitioner filed the instant post-conviction Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Motion for Appointment of Counsel. The State responds herein.

ARGUMENT¹

I. PETITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE HE IS ENTITLED TO HABEAS RELIEF

Petitioner claims his counsel was ineffective and that his guilty plea was unknowingly and unintelligently signed. Petition at 7. The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that, "[i]n all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right...to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense." The United States Supreme Court has long recognized that "the right to counsel is the right to the effective assistance of counsel." Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 686, 104 S. Ct. 2052, 2063 (1984); see also State v. Love, 109 Nev. 1136, 1138, 865 P.2d 322, 323 (1993).

To prevail on a claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel, a defendant must prove he was denied "reasonably effective assistance" of counsel by satisfying the two-prong test of Strickland, 466 U.S. at 686-87, 104 S. Ct. at 2063-64. See also Love, 109 Nev. at 1138, 865 P.2d at 323. Under Strickland, a defendant must show first that his counsel's representation fell below an objective standard of reasonableness, and second, that but for counsel's errors, there is a reasonable probability that the result of the proceedings would have been different. 466 U.S. at 687-88, 694, 104 S. Ct. at 2065, 2068; Warden, Nevada State Prison v. Lyons, 100 Nev. 430, 432, 683 P.2d 504, 505 (1984) (adopting the Strickland two-part test). "[T]here is no reason for a court deciding an ineffective assistance claim to approach the inquiry in the same order or even to address both components of the inquiry if the defendant makes an insufficient showing on one." Strickland, 466 U.S. at 697, 104 S. Ct. at 2069.

¹ Although this Petition appears to be time-barred, since it was filed on May 22, 2020, and the Judgment of Conviction was filed on May 16, 2019, it is not because the Clerk's Office received it on April 19, 2020.

The Court begins with the presumption of effectiveness and then must determine whether the defendant has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that counsel was ineffective. Means v. State, 120 Nev. 1001, 1011, 103 P.3d 25, 32 (2004). "Effective counsel does not mean errorless counsel, but rather counsel whose assistance is '[w]ithin the range of competence demanded of attorneys in criminal cases." Jackson v. Warden, 91 Nev. 430, 432, 537 P.2d 473, 474 (1975).

Counsel cannot be ineffective for failing to make futile objections or arguments. <u>See Ennis v. State</u>, 122 Nev. 694, 706, 137 P.3d 1095, 1103 (2006). Trial counsel has the "immediate and ultimate responsibility of deciding if and when to object, which witnesses, if any, to call, and what defenses to develop." <u>Rhyne v. State</u>, 118 Nev. 1, 8, 38 P.3d 163, 167 (2002). Further, a defendant who contends his attorney was ineffective because he did not adequately investigate must show how a better investigation would have rendered a more favorable outcome probable. <u>Molina v. State</u>, 120 Nev. 185, 192, 87 P.3d 533, 538 (2004). A defendant is not entitled to a particular "relationship" with his attorney. <u>Morris v. Slappy</u>, 461 U.S. 1, 14, 103 S.Ct. 1610, 1617 (1983).

Based on the above law, the role of a court in considering allegations of ineffective assistance of counsel is "not to pass upon the merits of the action not taken but to determine whether, under the particular facts and circumstances of the case, trial counsel failed to render reasonably effective assistance." Donovan v. State, 94 Nev. 671, 675, 584 P.2d 708, 711 (1978). This analysis does not mean that the court should "second guess reasoned choices between trial tactics nor does it mean that defense counsel, to protect himself against allegations of inadequacy, must make every conceivable motion no matter how remote the possibilities are of success." Id. To be effective, the constitution "does not require that counsel do what is impossible or unethical. If there is no bona fide defense to the charge, counsel cannot create one and may disserve the interests of his client by attempting a useless charade." United States v. Cronic, 466 U.S. 648, 657 n.19, 104 S. Ct. 2039, 2046 n.19 (1984).

"There are countless ways to provide effective assistance in any given case. Even the best criminal defense attorneys would not defend a particular client in the same way."

Strickland, 466 U.S. at 689, 104 S. Ct. at 689. "Strategic choices made by counsel after thoroughly investigating the plausible options are almost unchallengeable." Dawson v. State, 108 Nev. 112, 117, 825 P.2d 593, 596 (1992); see also Ford v. State, 105 Nev. 850, 853, 784 P.2d 951, 953 (1989). In essence, the court must "judge the reasonableness of counsel's challenged conduct on the facts of the particular case, viewed as of the time of counsel's conduct." Strickland, 466 U.S. at 690, 104 S. Ct. at 2066.

Claims for relief devoid of specific factual allegations are "bare" and "naked," and are insufficient to warrant relief, as are those claims belied and repelled by the record. <u>Hargrove v. State</u>, 100 Nev. 498, 502, 686 P.2d 222, 225 (1984). "[Petitioner] *must* allege specific facts supporting the claims in the petition[.]...Failure to allege specific facts rather than just conclusions may cause [the] petition to be dismissed." NRS 34.735(6) (emphasis added).

When a conviction is the result of a guilty plea, a defendant must show that there is a "reasonable probability that, but for counsel's errors, he would not have pleaded guilty and would have *insisted on going to trial*." Hill v. Lockhart, 474 U.S. 52, 59, 106 S.Ct. 366, 370 (1985) (emphasis added); see also Kirksey v. State, 112 Nev. 980, 988, 923 P.2d 1102, 1107 (1996); Molina v. State, 120 Nev. 185, 190-91, 87 P.3d 533, 537 (2004).

When considering ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claims where the Petitioner pleaded guilty, the Nevada Supreme Court has held that:

A defendant who pleads guilty upon the advice of counsel may attack the validity of the guilty plea by showing that he received ineffective assistance of counsel under the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution. However, guilty pleas are presumptively valid, especially when entered on advice of counsel, and a defendant has a heavy burden to show the district court that he did not enter his plea knowingly, intelligently, or voluntarily. To establish prejudice in the context of a challenge to a guilty plea based upon an assertion of ineffective assistance of counsel, a defendant must demonstrate a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's errors, he would not have pleaded guilty and would have insisted on going to trial.

(emphasis added). Molina, 120 Nev. 185, 190-91, 87 P.3d 533, 537(internal quotations and citations omitted). "A reasonable probability is a probability sufficient to undermine

confidence in the outcome." <u>Strickland</u>, 466 U.S. at 694, 104 S.Ct. at 2068. It is counsel's duty to candidly advise a Petitioner regarding whether or not they believe it would be beneficial for a Petitioner to accept a plea offer, but the ultimate decision of whether or not to accept a plea offer is the Petitioner's, as it was in this case. <u>Rhyne</u>, 118 Nev. at 8, 38 P.3d at 163.

Nevada precedent reflects "that where a guilty plea is not coerced and the defendant [is] competently represented by counsel at the time it [is] entered, the subsequent conviction is not open to collateral attack and any errors are superseded by the plea of guilty." Powell v. Sheriff, Clark County, 85 Nev. 684, 687, 462 P.2d 756, 758 (1969) (citing Hall v. Warden, 83 Nev. 446, 434 P.2d 425 (1967)). In Woods v. State, the Nevada Supreme Court determined that a defendant lacked standing to challenge the validity of a plea agreement because he had "voluntarily entered into the plea agreement and accepted its attendant benefits." 114 Nev. 468, 477, 958 P.2d 91, 96 (1998).

Furthermore, the Nevada Supreme Court has explained:

"[A] guilty plea represents a break in the chain of events which has preceded it in the criminal process. When a criminal defendant has solemnly admitted in open court that he is in fact guilty of the offense with which he is charged, he may not thereafter raise independent claims relating to the deprivation of constitutional rights that occurred prior to the entry of the guilty plea."

Webb v. State, 91 Nev. 469, 470, 538 P.2d 164, 165 (1975) (quoting Tollet v. Henderson, 411 U.S. 258, 267, 93 S.Ct. 1602, 1608 (1973)). Indeed, entry of a guilty plea "waive[s] all constitutional claims based on events occurring prior to the entry of the plea[], except those involving voluntariness of the plea[] [itself]." Lyons, 100 Nev. at 431, 683 P.2d 505; see also, Kirksey, 112 Nev. at 999, 923 P.2d at 1114 ("Where the defendant has pleaded guilty, the only claims that may be raised thereafter are those involving the voluntariness of the plea itself and the effectiveness of counsel.").

//

7 8

A. Petitioner's Claims that Counsel was Ineffective are Nothing More Than Bare and Naked Assertions.

According to Petitioner, he complained to his counsel that because of the injury to his head, he did not clearly or intelligently understand what counsel was explaining to him regarding the GPA. Petition at 7. Petitioner notes that he sent several kites regarding medical treatment and states that "someone who was shot not once, but twice in the head is under great strain mentally physically as well as spiritually." <u>Id.</u> Petitioner further claims that counsel was also ineffective because counsel failed to explain to the Court that he needed more time to understand the State's offer. Petitioner's claims are nothing more than bare and naked assertions that are belied by the record and suitable for summary denial pursuant to <u>Hargrove</u>, 100 Nev. at 502, 686 P.2d at 225.

First, by signing the GPA, Petitioner agreed that he understood the consequences of his plea and that counsel had explained said consequences to him. GPA pp. 2-4. Additionally, Petitioner acknowledged that his plea was entered into voluntarily and knowingly:

I have discussed the elements of all of the original charge(s) against me with my attorney and I understand the nature of the charge(s) against me.

I understand that the State would have to prove each element of the charge(s) against me at trial.

I have discussed with my attorney any possible defenses, defense strategies and circumstances which might be in my favor.

All of the foregoing elements, consequences, rights, and waiver of rights have been thoroughly explained to me by my attorney.

I believe that pleading guilty and accepting this plea bargain is in my best interest, and that a trial would be contrary to my best interest.

I am signing this agreement voluntarily, after consultation with my attorney, and I am not acting under duress or coercion or by virtue of any promises of leniency, except for those set forth in this agreement.

I am not now under the influence of any intoxicating liquor, a controlled substance or other drug which would in any manner impair my ability to

THE COURT: Do you feel they are impacting on your ability at all to understand what you are charged with and the nature of those charges?

THE DEFENDANT: No, not at all.

THE COURT: All right. Do you feel they impact upon your ability at all to understand the plea agreement you're entering into with the State?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: And they don't affect your ability to read and understand, for instance: the amended superseding indictment or the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: No, not in any way.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you feel you understand what's happening here today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Tell me in your own words what's happening here today?

THE DEFENDANT: We resolved a plea and went over my plea agreement; you're just making sure that I understand.

Recorder's Transcript: Jury Trial – Day 1, March 18, 2019 ("RT) pp. 98-99 (emphasis added). Based upon the record, Petitioner understood what was going on at, the time he entered his plea.

Additionally, the Court informed Petitioner that if at any time he needed to discuss something with counsel, in private, he would be given the opportunity:

THE COURT: Okay. Now, before accepting your guilty plea, there are a number of questions I'm going to have to ask you to ensure myself that you're entering a valid plea. If you do not understand any of the questions, would you please let me know so I can rephrase the question?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. If at any time you wish to take a break in the proceedings so you can discuss matters in private with your attorney, will you let me know that so I can give you the opportunity and chance to do so?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

RT p. 97. Moreover, Petitioner informed the Court that he was pleading guilty without any coercion, that he signed the GPA, and that he discussed the agreement with his attorney. RT p. 107. Petitioner also responded affirmatively that he felt as though he understood the plea agreement. RT p. 108. Further, Petitioner acknowledged that he understood the charges and relevant penalties. RT pp. 102-05.

Now, Petitioner's attachment of the Minutes from January 8, 2019, do not provide any support for his claim. On that day, statements were made that Petitioner had not received medical attention. However, on January 23, 2019, counsel from the Attorney General's Office filed a Status Report and Declaration after speaking with medical personnel. According to the Status Report, Petitioner was treated for his alleged wounds and follow-up tests, including x-rays, had been ordered. On January 24, 2019, this Court noted that Petitioner was being treated and defense counsel concurred. Petitioner did not enter into his guilty plea until March 18, 2019, approximately two (2) months after he was given treatment. Accordingly, Petitioner was given medical attention prior to entering his plea. Regardless, the plea canvass evidences that fact that his plea was entered into knowingly and voluntarily.

As to Petitioner's specific claims against counsel, by signing the GPA, counsel certified that he had fully explained everything to Petitioner prior to his entry of plea:

- I, the undersigned, as the attorney for the Defendant named herein and as an officer of the court hereby certify that:
- 1. I have fully explained to the Defendant the allegations contained in the charge(s) to which guilty pleas are being entered.
- 2. I have advised the Defendant of the penalties for each charge and the restitution that the Defendant may be ordered to pay.
- 3. I have inquired of Defendant facts concerning Defendant's immigration status and explained to Defendant that if Defendant is not a United States citizen any criminal conviction will most likely result in serious negative immigration consequences including but not limited to:
 - a. The removal from the United States through deportation;
 - b. An inability to reenter the United States;

- c. The inability to gain United States citizenship or legal residency;
- d. An inability to renew and/or retain any legal residency status; and/or
- e. An indeterminate term of confinement, by with United States Federal Government based on the conviction and immigration status.

Moreover, I have explained that regardless of what Defendant may have been told by any attorney, no one can promise Defendant that this conviction will not result in negative immigration consequences and/or impact Defendant's ability to become a United States citizen and/or legal resident.

- 4. All pleas of guilty offered by the Defendant pursuant to this agreement are consistent with the facts known to me and are made with my advice to the Defendant.
- 5. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the Defendant:
 - a. Is competent and understands the charges and the consequences of pleading guilty as provided in this agreement,
 - b. Executed this agreement and will enter all guilty pleas pursuant hereto voluntarily, and
 - c. Was not under the influence of intoxicating liquor, a controlled substance or other drug at the time I consulted with the Defendant as certified in paragraphs 1 and 2 above.
- GPA p. 7. For these reasons, Petitioner failed to show that counsel was ineffective.

B. Petitioner Failed to Establish Prejudice.

Here, Petitioner failed to show that there is a "reasonable probability that, but for counsel's errors, he would not have pleaded guilty and would have insisted on going to trial."

See Hill, 474 U.S. 52, 59, 106 S.Ct. 366, 370. Instead, Petitioner made another bare and naked assertion that he was prejudiced because had he been in the right state of mind, he would not have pled guilty and would have proceeded to trial. Petitioner initially faced forty-eight (48) charges, with significantly higher penalties. With the possibility of facing a lengthier sentence, Petitioner cannot now argue that but for the alleged error, he would have gone to trial. Moreover, the plea was entered into during the first day of trial, after voir dire had begun. At any point Petitioner could have told the Court he did not wish to proceed with the GPA and to continue with the trial. Instead, Petitioner was clear that he wanted to enter into this guilty

23

24

25

26

27

28

plea. For the reasons stated above, Petitioner's counsel was effective, and his claim should be denied.

PETITIONER IS NOT ENTITLED TO AN APPOINTMENT OF II. **COUNSEL**

Under the U.S. Constitution, the Sixth Amendment provides no right to counsel in postconviction proceedings. Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722, 752, 111 S. Ct. 2546, 2566 (1991). In McKague v. Warden, 112 Nev. 159, 163, 912 P.2d 255, 258 (1996), the Nevada Supreme Court similarly observed that "[t]he Nevada Constitution...does not guarantee a right to counsel in post-conviction proceedings, as we interpret the Nevada Constitution's right to counsel provision as being coextensive with the Sixth Amendment to the United States McKague specifically held that with the exception of NRS 34.820(1)(a) Constitution." (entitling appointed counsel when petitioner is under a sentence of death), one does not have "any constitutional or statutory right to counsel at all" in post-conviction proceedings. Id. at 164, 912 P.2d at 258.

However, the Nevada Legislature has given courts the discretion to appoint postconviction counsel so long as "the court is satisfied that the allegation of indigency is true and the petition is not dismissed summarily." NRS 34.750. NRS 34.750 reads:

> A petition may allege that the Defendant is unable to pay the costs of the proceedings or employ counsel. If the court is satisfied that the allegation of indigency is true and the petition is not dismissed summarily, the court may appoint counsel at the time the court orders the filing of an answer and a return. In making its determination, the court may consider whether:
>
> (a) The issues are difficult;

- (b) The Defendant is unable to comprehend the proceedings;
- (c) Counsel is necessary to proceed with discovery.

(emphasis added). Under NRS 34.750, it is clear that the court has discretion in determining whether to appoint counsel.

Here, the issues are not difficult as Petitioner's claims are belied by the record. Next, while Petitioner claims that he is unable to adequately present his claims without counsel, Petitioner failed to allege that he is unable to comprehend the proceedings. Finally, counsel is

1	not needed to proceed with discovery nor does Petitioner allege that counsel is needed for this
2	reason. Therefore, Petitioner is not entitled to an appointment of counsel.
3	<u>CONCLUSION</u>
4	For the foregoing reasons, Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-
5	Conviction) and Motion for Appointment of Counsel must be denied.
6	DATED this 25th day of November, 2020.
7	Respectfully submitted,
8 9	STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565
10	DN //JONIAMITAN E WANDOUKEDOK
11	BY /s/ JONATHAN E. VANBOSKERCK JONATHAN E. VANBOSKERCK
12	Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #006528
13	
14	
15	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
16	I hereby certify that service of the above and foregoing was made this 7th day of July,
17	2020, by depositing a copy in the U.S. Mail, postage pre-paid, addressed to:
18	SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE, BAC#1202642 SOUTHERN DESERT CORRECTIONAL CENTER
19	P.O. BOX 208 INDIAN SPRINGS, NEVADA 89070
20	INDIAN STRINGS, NE VIDIN 65070
21	BY /s/ L.M. Secretary for the District Attorney's Office
22	Secretary for the District Authority's Office
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	JEV/sw/lm/GCU
	A.A. 211

A-20-815382-W

DISTRICT COURT **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Writ of Habeas Corpus

COURT MINUTES

December 22, 2020

A-20-815382-W

Shan Kittredge, Plaintiff(s)

State of Nevada, Defendant(s)

December 22, 2020

12:00 PM

Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

HEARD BY:

Johnson, Eric

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 12A

COURT CLERK: Everett, Tia

RECORDER:

Calvillo, Angie

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

William J. Merback

Attorney for Defendant

JOURNAL ENTRIES

Court stated Defendant not present and in custody with the Nevada Department of Corrections.

Court noted having read Defendant's petition and State's Response; COURT ORDERED, Petition DENIED and stated findings. Defendant s Mother Sofie Kittredge present via blue. Mr. Kittredge advised counsel was to be appointed and that never happened and the habeas corpus was filed as the attorney never helped appeal. Court stated based on the sentence imposed; FURTHER ORDERED previous ruling VACATED and Request for Appointment of Counsel GRANTED. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, matter SET for Confirmation of Counsel.

NDC

1/21/2021 1:45 PM CONFIRMATION OF COUNSEL

Printed Date: 12/25/2020 Page 1 of 1 Minutes Date: December 22, 2020

Prepared by: Tia Everett

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Writ of Habeas Corpus

COURT MINUTES

January 21, 2021

A-20-815382-W

Shan Kittredge, Plaintiff(s)

VS.

State of Nevada, Defendant(s)

January 21, 2021

11:00 AM

All Pending Motions

HEARD BY: Craig, Christy

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 16D

COURT CLERK: Carolyn Jackson

RECORDER: Kaihla Berndt

REPORTER:

PARTIES

PRESENT:

Lichtenstein, Allen

Attorney

Thomas, Morgan B.A.

Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Upon inquiry of court if the office of conflict counsel appointed Mr. Lichtenstein to the case, Mr. Lichtenstein stated they had. COURT ORDERED, confirmation of counsel CONFIRMED.

Colloquy regarding setting of schedule for Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. COURT ORDERED, filing of writ due May 20, 2021, response by State due September 16, 2021, reply due by October 14, 2021, and matter CONTINUED for argument on October 21, 2021 at 11:00 a.m. Mr. Lichtenstein stated his client will need to be transported. Ms. Thomas stated she will make a note to prepare a trasport order. Court directed Mr. Lichenstein to advise State if his client does not want to be transported.

CONTINUED TO: 10/21/2021 11:00 AM

CLERK'S NOTE: Minute Order prepared by Nicole McDevitt via listening to JAVS recording. /nm 2/4/2021

PRINT DATE:

02/04/2021

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

January 21, 2021

Electronically Filed 5/19/2021 10:28 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

Allen Lichtenstein
NV Bar No. 3992
Allen Lichtenstein, Attorney At Law, LTD.
3315 Russell Road, No. 222
Las Vegas, NV 89120
Telephone (702) 433-2666
Facsimile (702) 433-9591
allaw@lvcoxmail.com
Attorney for Plaintiff Shan Kittredge

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

SHAN KITTREDGE,	Case No: A-20-815382-W
Plaintiff,	Dept No:. XXXII
v.	STIPULATION AND ORDER
STATE OF NEVADA,	
Defendant	
	nat Petitioner Kittredge's Supplemental Brief,
Dated this day of May 2021.	e on or before July 7, 2021.
Respectfully submitted by:	

1		/s/Allen Lichtenstein
2		NV Bar No. 3992 Allen Lichtenstein, Attorney At Law, LTD.
3		3315 Russell Road, No. 222
		Las Vegas, NV 89120
4		(702) 433-2666
5		allaw@lvcoxmail.com
6		Attorney for Shane Kittredge
7		
8		
		/s/Jonathan VanBoskerck
9		Deputy DA
10		Clark County District Attorney's Office
		200 Lewis Avenue
11		Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212
12		(702) 671-2500
12		jonathan.vanboskerck@clarkcountyda.com
13		
14		Attorney for the State of Nevada
1.		
15		
16		
17		ODDED
18		ORDER
10	It is hereby ordered that Petitione	r Kittredge's Supplemental Brief, currently du
19	it is hereby ordered that retitione	r Kittledge's Supplemental Brief, currently du
20	on May 20, 2021, shall now be due on or before	July 7, 2021.
21		
- 1		
22		
23		
		District Court Judge
24		
25		
26		
27		
21		
1		

Electronically Filed 5/19/2021 12:08 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

CNND

2

1

3 Shan Kittredge, Plaintiff(s)

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

DISTRICT COURT

CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT

hereby provided that the following electronically filed document does not conform to the

Pursuant to Rule 8(b)(2) of the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules, notice is

Plaintiff

The document filed to commence an action is not a complaint, petition,

match the cause of action identified in the document.

application, or other document that initiates a civil action. See Rule 3 of the

Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure. In accordance with Administrative Order 19-5,

the submitted document is stricken from the record, this case has been closed and

designated as filed in error, and any submitted filing fee has been returned to the

The document initiated a new civil action and the case type designation does not

The document initiated a new civil action and a cover sheet was not submitted as

The submitted document initiated a new civil action and was made up of multiple

The case caption and/or case number on the document does not match the case

 $\|_{vs.}$

A-20-815382-W Department 32

Stipulation and Order

05/19/21 at 10:28 AM

State of Nevada, Defendant(s)

applicable filing requirements:

Title of Nonconforming Document:

Party Submitting Document for Filing:

Date and Time Submitted for Electronic

Reason for Nonconformity Determination:

filing party.

required by NRS 3.275.

documents submitted together.

7

6

5

8

9

11

.

12 13

14

Filing:

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

1

A.A. 216

caption and/or case number of the case that it was filed into.

1	The document was not signed by the submitting party or counsel for said party.
2	☐ The document filed was a court order that did not contain the signature of a
3	judicial officer. In accordance with Administrative Order 19-5, the submitted
4	order has been furnished to the department to which this case is assigned.
5	☐ Motion does not have a hearing designation per Rule 2.20(b). Motions must
6	include designation "Hearing Requested" or "Hearing Not Requested" in the
7	caption of the first page directly below the Case and Department Number.
8	Pursuant to Rule 8(b)(2) of the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules, a
9	nonconforming document may be cured by submitting a conforming document. All documents
	submitted for this purpose must use filing code "Conforming Filing – CONFILE." Court filing
10	
11	fees will not be assessed for submitting the conforming document. Processing and convenience
12	fees may still apply.
13	
14	Dated this: 19th day of May, 2021
15	By:/s/ Marie Kramer
16	Deputy District Court Clerk
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 19, 2021, I concurrently filed and served a copy of the foregoing Clerk's Notice of Nonconforming Document, on the party that submitted the nonconforming document, via the Eighth Judicial District Court's Electronic Filing and Service System.

By: /s/ Marie Kramer
Deputy District Court Clerk

Electronically Filed 7/14/2021 11:56 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

Allen Lichtenstein Allen Lichtenstein, Attorney at Law, Ltd. Nevada Bar No. 3992 3315 Russell Road, No. 222 Las Vegas, Nevada 89120 (702) 433-2666 (phone) (702) 433-9591 (fax) allaw@lvcoxmail.com Attorney for Petitioner

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

26

27

28

IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK STATE OF NEVADA

SHAN JONATHAN KITTREDGE, CASE NO: A-20-815382-W Petitioner DEPT: THE STATE OF NEVADA,

> SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION FOR A Respondent WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

> > Date of Hearing:

C-18-33335-2

XX

Comes now, Petitioner, Shan Kittredge, by and through the undersigned counsel, and hereby files Supplemental Brief to the Petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus pursuant to NRS 34.280, as set forth in this Court's Minute Order.

This motion is made and supported by the attached Points and Authorities, and is further supported by all papers, pleadings and documents on file herein, and any future hearing. Dated this 14th day of July, 2021

21 22

Respectfully submitted by:

/s/Allen Lichtenstein Allen Lichtenstein Nevada Bar No.: 3992 Allen Lichtenstein, Attorney at Law, Ltd. 3315 Russell Road, No. 222 Las Vegas, NV 89120 (702) 433-2666 – phone (702) 433-9591 - fax

A.A. 219

allaw@lvcoxmail.com Attorney for Petitioner

7.

T.

INTRODUCTION

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

On May 22, 2020, Petitioner filed a pro se Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (**Exhibit A**). Petitioner in pertinent part asserts that his defense counsel, MaceYampolsky, Esq., was ineffective for not pursuing or challenging issues of mental impairment. On 6/8/2018, Petitioner sustained multiple gunshot wounds to the head upon arrest and thus leading to Petitioner's incapacity to make cogent judgments/decisions when offered the guilty plea agreement on 3/18/2019. This is in violation of his right to due process as guaranteed by the 5th, 6th, and 14th to The United States Constitution.

Said documentation evidencing degree of cognitive impairment has been strangely unexplored and sadly unavailable for examination at this point in order to definitively determine cause and deleterious effect of said gunshot wounds to Petitioner's head. Without court authorization, Petitioner cannot subpoena said necessary records. According to N.R.S. § 34.500(9), "Habeas Corpus relief is available where courts find that there has been a specific denial of Petitioner's Constitutional rights with respect to conviction or sentence in a criminal case." Moreover, N.R.S. § 31.27 makes provision for evidentiary hearings.

"The extraordinary remedy of habeas corpus is appropriate to test the legality of a conviction which is challenged on constitutional grounds." *Shum v. Fogliani*, 82 Nev. 156, 158, 413 P.2d 495, 496 (1966), *citing Dean v. Fogliani*, 81 Nev. 541, 407 P.2d 580 (1965) and *Garnick v. Miller*, 81 Nev. 372, 403 P.2d 850 (1965).

II. NATURE OF THE ILLEGAL DETENTION

A.A. 220

Petitioner is being held in violation of his constitutional rights based upon the following grounds:

1. Trial counsel was ineffective:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

A. For not pursuing mental impairment/incapacity issues due to possible traumatic brain injury after sustaining two (2) gunshot wounds to the head upon 6/8/2018 arrest.

III. FACTS IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLEMENT

The case as presented by Petitioner was established on the following version of events:

On August 1, 2018, the State filed a Superseding Indictment charging Shane Jonathon Kittridge (hereinafter "Petitioner") with the following: Counts 1-5, 8-10, 12-16, 20-21, 27-28, 33-34, 36-37, 40 – Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon; Counts 7, 19, 26, 35, 39 – Conspiracy to Commit Robbery; Count 17 – Attempt Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon; Counts 6, 11, 18, 25, 31-32, 38, 42 -Burglary while in Possession of a Firearm; Counts 22-24, 29-30, 41, -Assault with a Deadly Weapon; Count43 - Grand Larceny Auto; Count 44 - Possession of Stolen Vehicle; Counts 45-47 – Assault on Protected Person With Use of a Deadly Weapon; and Count 48 – Resisting Public Officer With Use of a Firearm. Petitioner's co-defendant was also charged as to Counts 7-11, 19-31, and 35-42. On August 21, 2018, Petitioner pled not guilty and waived his right to a speedy trial. On December 19, 2018, Petitioner filed a Motion for Medical Treatment. On January 8, 2019, statements were made by defense counsel that Petitioner had sent several kites but has been unable to receive medical attention. A two (2) week continuance was requested for Mr. Frank Toddre, from the Attorney General's Office, to speak with medical personnel. On January 23, 2019, Mr. Toddre filed a Status Report regarding Petitioner's treatment. (Exhibit B). A Declaration from the Director of Nursing Bob Faulkner was attached (Exhibit B). On January 24, 2019, this Court noted that Petitioner was being treated; and defense counsel concurred. Defense counsel did note that Petitioner was waiting for an MRI and x-rays (as of this writing,

28

Petitioner has not been able to secure copies of same). Accordingly, the Court then denied the motion. On March 11, 2019, the State filed a Notice of Intent to Seek Punishment as a Habitual Criminal. On March 18, 2019, jury trial began with the jury being selected and seated. After the lunch break, Petitioner decided to plead guilty pursuant to a Guilty Plea Agreement ("GPA"). According to the GPA, "both parties stipulate to a total term of imprisonment of eighteen (18) to forty-five (45) years in the Nevada Department of Corrections." The Amended Superseding Indictment was also filed and charged Petitioner with: Count 1-Conspiracy to Commit Robbery; Counts 2-4 – Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon; and Count 5 – Resisting Public Officer, With Use of a Firearm. On May 8, 2019, defense counsel filed a Sentencing Memorandum. On May 14, 2019, the District Court sentenced Petitioner to the Nevada Department of Corrections as follows: Count 1 –a minimum of twenty-eight (28) months with a maximum of seventy-two (72) months; Count 2 – a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months, plus a consecutive term of a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months for Use of a Deadly Weapon, concurrent with Count 1; Count 3 –a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months, plus a consecutive term of a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months for Use of a Deadly Weapon, consecutive to Count 2; Count 4 –a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months, plus a consecutive term of a minimum of forty-eight (48) months and a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months for Use of a Deadly Weapon, concurrent with Count 3; and Count 5 –a minimum of twenty-four (24) months and a maximum of sixty (60) months, consecutive to Count 3, with one hundred fifty-six (156) days credit for time served. Petitioner was further ordered to pay \$4,153.37 in Restitution, with \$2,802 to be paid jointly and severally with the co-defendant. Restitution was ordered in the following amounts: \$400 to Panda Express, \$300 to Duncan Donuts; \$331 to

5

Roberto's Taco Shop; \$100 to Khoury's Mediterranean Restaurant and \$3,022.37 to Albertson's. The aggregate total sentence was eighteen (18) years to forty-five (45) years. The Judgment of Conviction was filed on May 16, 2019.

On April 5, 2019, Petitioner filed another Motion for Medical Treatment. According to Petitioner, he had an infection from lesions, and said infection was left untreated with no refills for antibiotics. On April 16, 2019, counsel for the Clark County Detention Center ("CCDC") advised that Petitioner was seen by a doctor, just not as quickly as he would have liked and Mr. Margolis, on behalf of Mr. Yampolsky advised that Petitioner was now taking antibiotics. Additionally, Petitioner had a follow-up appointment for the bullet in his head (as of this writing, Petitioner has not been able to secure same records). The Court then denied the Motion as moot.

On May 14, 2019, defense counsel filed a Notice of Withdrawal of Attorney.

On May 22, 2020, Petitioner filed a pro se post-conviction Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus on the grounds of ineffective counsel claim.

IV. THE DEFICIENT PERFORMANCE OF DEFENSE COUNSEL WARRANTS THE GRANTING OF HABEAS CORPUS RELIEF.

To prevail in an ineffective counsel claim, the defendant must show that there is a reasonable probability that but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. A reasonable probability is a probability sufficient to undermine confidence in the outcome. *Strickland v. Washington*, 104 S. Ct. 2052, 2068, 466 U.S. 668, 694 (U.S.,1984). A reasonable probability is a probability sufficient to undermine confidence in the outcome, "but it does not require that a defendant demonstrate that he would have been acquitted." (emphasis added), State v. Rogers, 2001 MT 165, ¶ 14, 306 Mont. 130, ¶ 14, 32 P.3d 724, ¶ 14 (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S. at 694, 104 S. Ct. at 2068, 80 L.Ed.2d at 698). State v. Kougl, 323 Mont. 6, 13, 97 P.3d 1095, 1100 (Mont.,2004).

Ineffective assistance cases turn on their individual facts. *Langston v. Wyrick*, 698 F.2d 926, 931 (8th Cir.1982) *Sanders v. Trickey*, 875 F.2d 205, 209 (C.A.8 (Mo.), 1989).

1

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Turning on the facts as evidenced in Petitioner's 5/22/2020 Pro Se Petition, in relevant part, Petitioner's attorney, Mace Yampolsky, Esq., neglected to stress and or utilize a defense of a possibility that Petitioner suffered impaired judgment due to sustaining two (2) gunshot wounds to the head (nine (9) gunshot wounds in total) upon his arrest on June 8, 2018. Therefore, Petitioner should never have been advised to accept a guilty plea agreement, at that point, due to possible inability to make sound judgments and life decisions due to traumatic brain injury. According to the record referenced (supra at Pg. 4, L. 13-25) on 12/19/2018 Petitioner filed a Motion for Medical Treatment for the bullet wound on his neck that was oozing plasma and pus. There was only a mention of MRIs and x-rays but nothing beyond that. Another Motion for Medical Treatment was filed on or about 4/5/2019 (supra at Pg. 6, line 10-20). After aggressive inquiry of multiple possible sources, present counsel has not been able to secure any kind of significant medical records, i.e., diagnostics, such as the Glascow Coma Scale stats; psychometric assessments of cognitive impairment after traumatic brain injury from Petitioner's initial hospitalization upon arrest in June 2018 nor any subsequent brain related diagnostic tests/assessments. Said medical documents are essential to Petitioner's situation in order to have an understanding concerning mental capacity - the crux of his case. As necessary as these documents certainly are to establish the most basic requirements of Petitioner's defense, they were inexplicably not included in his original defense. Why were they so conspicuously and oddly absent? Even though these diagnostic tests are referenced on pages 4 and 6 (supra) and quoted from State's 11-20-2020 Reply Brief at Page 3, Lines 22-28, unfortunately, the medical aspect of Petitioner's case at trial stage seems to have been incomprehensibly ignored as though inconsequential and frivolous. Why was this not pursued until now? Additionally, there is no

1 e
2 h
3 r
4 C
5 a
6 K
7

evidence of any competency hearing. Moreover, if one compares "before" (prior to the 6/8/2018 head gunshot wounds; existing LVMPD file photo of Mr. Kittredge pg. 23 of 6/13/2018 police report) and "after" (after 6/8/2018 head gunshot wounds from online NDOC, Southern Desert Correctional Facility Inmate Photo) photographs of Petitioner (both attached as **Exhibit C**), it is apparent that the after prison photo shows a demonstrable difference and asymmetry to Mr. Kittredge's face – most compellingly suggestive of brain trauma as a result of the bullet wounds to his head.

For this phase of Petitioner's proceedings, any-and-all diagnostics, including MRIs, CAT scans, x-rays of his head/neck and medical assessments/physicians' impressions/reports to rule out or demonstrate neurological deficits are imperative to obtain and review.

Petitioner may have ill-advisedly and inadvertently signed a guilty plea agreement - for which he is serving up to a maximum 45-year sentence that he was not competent to fully comprehend. The conspicuously questionable legal stratagem that omitted essential evidence concerning competency at trial stage conflated with nomothetic indifference, justify redress and accountability of the judicial process through the instant Petition.

I. As to deficient performance:

In Summerlin v. Schiro, 427 F.3d 623 at 630 (9th Cir. 2005) (en banc): the Ninth Circuit stated that "[w]e have long recognized an attorney's duty to investigate and present mitigating evidence of mental impairment." See also, Riggins v. Nevada (90-8466), 504 U.S. 127 (1992): ("Nevada law prohibits the trial of incompetent persons."), Nev. Rev. Stat. § 178.400 (1989), and, Leavitt v. Arave, 646 F.3d 605, 620 (9th Cir. 2011) Reinhardt, J. dissenting.. ("That he conducted a thorough investigation relevant to one possible strategy does not make any more reasonable his failure to investigate a potentially much stronger case for

.0

Id.

mitigation. Parmenter simply neglected the one subject that he should have known mattered most.")(emphasis added).

Also pertinent to the instant appeal is *Dusky v. United States of America*, 362 U.S. 402, 80 S. Ct. 788, 4 L.Ed.2d 824 (1960), which states that "the record in this case does not sufficiently support the findings of competency to stand trial,' for to support those findings under 18 U.S.C. § 4244, 18 U.S.C.A. § 4244 the district judge 'would need more information than this record presents." The Dusky Court further notes:

...it is not enough for the district judge to find that 'the defendant (is) oriented to time and place and (has) some recollection of events,' but that the 'test must be whether he has sufficient present ability to consult with his lawyer with a reasonable degree of rational understanding—and whether he has a rational as well as factual understanding of the proceedings against him.'

Even though Petitioner responded with seeming clarity to each of Judge Johnson's

questions during the guilty plea agreement Q&A, it was not clear that he really had a reasonable degree of rational understanding of what he was agreeing to on March 18, 2019. Moreover, unlike the instant case, the defendant in *Dusky* had the benefit of psychiatric testimony as to competence. Still the U.S. Supreme Court saw fit to "reverse and remand the case to the District Court for a new hearing to ascertain petitioner's present competency to stand trial, and for a new trial if petitioner is found competent." *Id*.

Reviewing court transcript under date of 3/18/2019, Petitioner, Kittredge, did not have the benefit of psychiatric or medical analysis of any sort. After careful combing through court documents available through Odyssey and the records of trial attorney Mace Yampolsky's office, we were able to find references to the undisputed fact that Petitioner's sustained 6/8/2018 bullet head wounds, as well as evidence of prolonged illegal drug use. Defense attorney's 5/18/2019 Sentencing Memo mentions at Page 5, lines 7-10: "...it is a damn shame that it took having bullets

still lodged in his [Kittredge] face and being in critical condition for weeks..." "By virtue of many conversations, counsel has come to conclude that Shan just wasn't thinking at all [on 6/8/2018]."

He was basically in a heroin fueled haze and the synapses that ought to have been firing quite clearly weren't. It would be instructive perhaps to determine what if any effect Mr. Kittredge's long spanning drug abuse has had on his brain, but given the trauma he sustained due to multiple gunshot wounds to the head he suffered, counsel does not know that we will ever be able to know much for sure.

Id. at Pg. 8, lines 14-20.

Even though traumatic brain injury is referenced, there is no evidence of neurological deficit testing, medical reports, evaluations or the like presented in Petitioner's defense. This clearly falls below the level of competence set forth in *Strickland*. Based upon the foregoing, Petitioner files this Supplemental Brief for Petition of Habeas Corpus (post-conviction) relief claiming ineffective assistance of counsel.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays for the following:

- 1. That his Habeas Corpus proceeding go forward, and
- 2. That consistent with his 5th, 6th, and 14th Amendment rights that this Court re-open discovery and also order an evidentiary hearing in this matter,

Dated this 14th day of July, 2021 Respectfully submitted by:

/s/Allen Lichtenstein
Allen Lichtenstein
Nevada Bar No.: 3992
Allen Lichtenstein, Attorney at Law, Ltd.
3315 Russell Road, No. 222
Las Vegas, NV 89120
(702) 433-2666 – phone; (702) 433-9591 – fax
allaw@lvcoxmail.com
Attorney for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that on July 14, 2021, I served all parties through the Court's electronic filing and service system and also the email to the following: JONATHAN VANBOSKERCK Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #006528 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 Jonathan.Vanboskerck@clarkcountyda.com

A.A. 228

still lodged in his [Kittredge] face and being in critical condition for weeks..." "By virtue of many conversations, counsel has come to conclude that Shan just wasn't thinking at all [on 6/8/2018]."

He was basically in a heroin fueled haze and the synapses that ought to have been firing quite clearly weren't. It would be instructive perhaps to determine what if any effect Mr. Kittredge's long spanning drug abuse has had on his brain, but given the trauma he sustained due to multiple gunshot wounds to the head he suffered, counsel does not know that we will ever be able to know much for sure.

Id. at Pg. 8, lines 14-20.

Even though traumatic brain injury is referenced, there is no evidence of neurological deficit testing, medical reports, evaluations or the like presented in Petitioner's defense. This clearly falls below the level of competence set forth in *Strickland*. Based upon the foregoing, Petitioner files this Supplemental Brief for Petition of Habeas Corpus (post-conviction) relief claiming ineffective assistance of counsel.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays for the following:

- 1. That his Habeas Corpus proceeding go forward, and
- 2. That consistent with his 5th, 6th, and 14th Amendment rights that this Court re-open discovery and also order an evidentiary hearing in this matter,

/s/Allen Lichtenstein

Dated this 14th day of July, 2021 Respectfully submitted by:

> Allen Lichtenstein Nevada Bar No.: 3992 Allen Lichtenstein, Attorney at Law, Ltd. 3315 Russell Road, No. 222

Las Vegas, NV 89120 (702) 433-2666 – phone; (702) 433-9591 – fax

allaw@lvcoxmail.com Attorney for Petitioner

EXHIBIT A

Shan Janothon Kittedge Petitioner/In Propia Persona Post Office Box 208, SDCC Indian Springs, Nevada 89070 FILED
MAY 2 2 2020
CLERK OF GOURT

IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK

SHAN JONATHON KITTREDGE;	A-20-815382-w Dept. XX
Petitioner,	
VS.	Case No. C-18-333335.2
STATE OF NEVADA	Dept. No. XX
	Docket
Respondent(s).	

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST-CONVICTION)

INSTRUCTIONS:

- (1) This petition must be legibly handwritten or typewritten signed by the petitioner and verified.
- (2) Additional pages are not permitted except where noted or with respect to the facts which you rely upon to support your grounds for relief. No citation of authorities need be furnished. If briefs or arguments are submitted, they should be submitted in the form of a separate memorandum.
- (3) If you want an attorney appointed, you must complete the Affidavit in Support of Request to Proceed in Forma Pauperis. You must have an authorized officer at the prison complete the certificate as to the amount of money and securities on deposit to your credit in any account in the institution.
- (4) You must name as respondent the person by whom you are confined or restrained. If you are in a specific institution of the department of corrections, name the warden or head of the institution. If you are not in a specific institution of the department within its custody, name the director of the department of corrections.
- (5) You must include all grounds or claims for relief which you may have regarding your conviction and sentence.

ATR 19 2020

2

(6) You must allege specific facts supporting the claims in the petition you file seeking relief from any conviction or sentence. Failure to allege specific facts rather than just conclusions may cause your petition to be dismissed. If your petition contains a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, that claim will operate to waive the attorney-client privilege for the proceeding in which you claim your counsel was ineffective.

6

5

(7) If your petition challenges the validity of your conviction or sentence, the original and one copy must be filed with the clerk of the district court for the county in which the conviction occurred. Petitions raising any other claim must be filed with the clerk of the district court for the county in which you are incarcerated. One copy must be mailed to the respondent, one copy to the attorney general's office, and one copy to the district attorney of the county in which you were convicted or to the original prosecutor if you are challenging your original conviction or sentence. Copies must conform in all particulars to the original submitted for filing.

10

PETITION

1. Name of institution and county in which you are presently imprisoned or where and who you 11 are presently restrained of your liberty: SOUTHERN DESERT CORRECTIONAL CENTER. 12 2. Name the location of court which entered the judgment of conviction under attack: Eighth 13 Judicial District Court. Clark County, Nevada 14 3. Date of judgment of conviction: May 15th 2019 15 4. Case number: <u>C-18-333335-2</u> 16 5. (a) Length of sentence: Eighteen to Porty - Pive Years 17 (b) If sentence is death, state any date upon which execution is scheduled: N/A 18 6. Are you presently serving a sentence for a conviction other than the conviction under attack in 19 this motion: 20 Yes ____ No __ If "Yes", list crime, case number and sentence being served at this time: ____ 21 22 7. Nature of offense involved in conviction being challenged: Count 1 - Conspiracy To 23 Commit Robbery (Category B Felony) Counts 2.3. & 4 - Robbery With 24 use of a Deadly weapon Category B felony and Count 5- Resisting 25 Public Officer with use of A firearm (Category C Felony). 26 27 28

to another count of an indictment or information, or if a guilty plea was negotiated, give det 10 10 11 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 11 12 11 12 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 19 10 10 10 10 10 11 11 12 11 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 19 10 10 10 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 19 10 10 11 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 19 10 11 11 11 12 12 13 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	I	8. What was your plea? (Check one)
(c) Nolo contendere 9. If you entered a guilty plea to one count of an indictment or information, and a not guilto another count of an indictment or information, or if a guilty plea was negotiated, give det to another count of an indictment or information, or if a guilty plea was negotiated, give det 10. If you were found guilty after a plea of not guilty, was the finding made by: (check on (a) Jury (b) Judge without a jury 11. Did you testify at trial? Yes No 12. Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction? Yes No 13. If you did appeal, answer the following: (a) Name of court: (b) Case number or citation: (c) Result: (d) Date of appeal: (Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14. If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state of federal? Yes No	: 2	(a) Not guilty
9. If you entered a guilty plea to one count of an indictment or information, and a not guilty another count of an indictment or information, or if a guilty plea was negotiated, give det 10. If you were found guilty after a plea of not guilty, was the finding made by: (check on (a) Jury	3	(b) Guilty
to another count of an indictment or information, or if a guilty plea was negotiated, give det 10	4	(c) Nolo contendere
10. If you were found guilty after a plea of not guilty, was the finding made by: (check on (a) Jury	5	9. If you entered a guilty plea to one count of an indictment or information, and a not guilty ple
10. If you were found guilty after a plea of not guilty, was the finding made by: (check on (a) Jury (b) Judge without a jury 11. Did you testify at trial? Yes No 12. Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction? Yes No 13. If you did appeal, answer the following: (a) Name of court: (b) Case number or citation: (c) Result: (d) Date of appeal: (Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 21. 14.) If you did not appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you prescribed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state of federal? Yes No	6	to another count of an indictment or information, or if a guilty plea was negotiated, give details:
10. If you were found guilty after a plea of not guilty, was the finding made by: (check on (a) Jury	7	
(a) Jury	8	
(b) Judge without a jury	9	10. If you were found guilty after a plea of not guilty, was the finding made by: (check one)
12	10	(a) Jury
12. Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction? Yes No 13. If you did appeal, answer the following: (a) Name of court: (b) Case number or citation: (c) Result: (d) Date of appeal: (Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 22 23 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state of federal? Yes No	11	(b) Judge without a jury
Yes No 13. If you did appeal, answer the following: (a) Name of court: (b) Case number or citation: (c) Result: (d) Date of appeal: (Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 22 23 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or federal? Yes No	12	11. Did you testify at trial? Yes No
13. If you did appeal, answer the following: (a) Name of court: (b) Case number or citation: (c) Result: (d) Date of appeal: (Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 22 23 24 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or federal? YesNo	13	12. Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?
(a) Name of court: (b) Case number or citation: (c) Result: (d) Date of appeal: (Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or federal? Yes No	14	Yes No
(b) Case number or citation: (c) Result: (d) Date of appeal: (Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pred filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state of federal? Yes No	15	13. If you did appeal, answer the following:
(c) Result: (d) Date of appeal: (Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 22 23 24 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or federal? Yes No	16	(a) Name of court:
(d) Date of appeal: (Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you predid filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state of federal? Yes No	17	(b) Case number or citation:
(Attach copy of order or decision, if available). 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 22 23 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or federal? Yes No	18	(c) Result:
21 14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not: 22 23 24 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or federal? Yes No	19	(d) Date of appeal:
22	20	(Attach copy of order or decision, if available).
23 24 15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre- 25 filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or 26 federal? Yes No		14.) If you did not appeal, explain briefly why you did not:
15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you pre- filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state of federal? Yes No		
filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state of federal? YesNo_v	1	
26 federal? Yes No		15. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you previously
27	25	filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or
	26	federal? Yes No V
28	2.7	
ii .	28	

1	10. If your answer to 10 that Tes , give the following information.
2	(a) (1) Name of court:
3	(2) Nature of proceedings:
4	
5	(3) Grounds raised:
6	
7	
8	(4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion?
9	Yes No
10	(5) Result:
11	(6) Date of result:
12	(7) If known, citations of any written opinion or date of orders entered pursuant to each
13	result:
14	(b) As to any second petition, application or motion, give the same information:
15	(1) Name of Court:
16	(2) Nature of proceeding:
17	(3) Grounds raised:
18	(4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion?
19	Yes No
20	(5) Result:
21	(6) Date of result:
22	(7) If known, citations or any written opinion or date of orders entered pursuant to each
23	result:
24	(c) As to any third or subsequent additional application or motions, give the same
5	information as above, list them on a separate sheet and attach.
6	
7	
8	

ı	(d) Did you appeal to the nighest state of federal court having jurisdiction, the result of action
2	taken on any petition, application or motion?
3	(1) First petition, application or motion?
4	Yes No V
5	Citation or date of decision:
6	(2) Second petition, application or motion?
7	YesNo
8	Citation or date of decision:
9	(e) If you did not appeal from the adverse action on any petition, application or motion,
10	explain briefly why you did not. (You may relate specific facts in response to this question. Your
11	response may be included on paper which is 8 1/2 x 11 inches attached to the petition. Your respon
12	may not exceed five handwritten or typewritten pages in length).
13	
14	
15	17. Has any ground being raised in this petition been previously presented to this or any other
16	court by way of petition for habeas corpus, motion or application or any other post-conviction
17	proceeding? If so, identify:
18	(a) Which of the grounds is the same:
19	
20	(b) The proceedings in which these grounds were raised:
21	
22	(c) Briefly explain why you are again raising these grounds. (You must relate specific facts
23	in response to this question. Your response may be included on paper which is 8 ½ x 11 inches
24	attached to the petition. Your response may not exceed five handwritten or typewritten pages in
5	length).
6	
7	
8	jantan kanalan dari kacamatan dari kanalan dari bermatan dari bermatan dari bermatan dari bermatan dari bermat Bermatan dari bermatan dar

	18. If any of the grounds listed in Nos. 23(a), (b), (c), and (d), or listed on any additional pages
	you have attached, were not previously presented in any other court, state or federal, list briefly what
	grounds were not so presented, and give your reasons for not presenting them. (You must relate
	specific facts in response to this question. Your response may be included on paper which is 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ x
	It inches attached to the petition. Your response may not exceed five handwritten or typewritten
6	pages in length).
7	
8	19. Are you filing this petition more than one (1) year following the filing of the judgment of
9	conviction or the filing of a decision on direct appeal? If so, state briefly the reasons for the delay.
10	(You must relate specific facts in response to this question. Your response may be included on
11	paper which is 8 ½ x 11 inches attached to the petition. Your response may not exceed five
12	handwritten or typewritten pages in length).
13	1
14	I
15	20. Do you have any petition or appeal now pending in any court, either state or federal, as to the
16	judgment under attack?
17	Yes No
18	If "Yes", state what court and the case number:
19	1 - 1 V / / /
20	21. Give the name of each attorney who represented you in the proceeding resulting in your
21	conviction and on direct appeal: Mace Yampolsky, ESA
22	
23	
24	22. Do you have any future sentences to serve after you complete the sentence imposed by the
25	judgment under attack?
26	Yes No If "Yes", specify where and when it is to be served, if you know:
27	
28	6
11	

Summarize briefly the facts supporting each ground. If necessary, you may attach pages stating additional grounds and facts supporting same.

23. (a) GROUNDONE: <u>Defendant/Petitioner's Counselor was ineffective</u>

And his Guilty Plea was unknowingly and unintelligently signed

6 7

23

25

26

28

3.

4

5

23. (a) SUPPORTING FACTS (Tell your story briefly without citing cases or law): In June of 2018 petitioner was shot by (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police who was in alliance with Major Violators Unit) Nine times two of those shots were to the head. Petitioner Complained to his Attorney that because of the injury to his head he did not Clearly or intelligently understand what his Attorney Mr. Mace Yampolsky was trying to explain to him concerning a Guilty Plea the Assistant District Attorney was offening. Petitioner was confused and unable to think Clearly. Petitioner offers as evidence that he could not think Clearly and intelligently the Court Minutes dated January 8th 2019. In the above named document petitioner can be seen in in Courtroom 12A explaining that he has Sont several inmate Kites i.e. reduest seeking medical attention but was unable to get any medical attention. Someone being shot twice in the head is a miracle to be alive any layman or Professional Knows or Should Know that questioning someone who was shot not once, but twice in the head is under great strain mentally physically as well as spiritually. The injury to petitioner's head was extremely serious and the medication he received was not sufficient to overbear his will to resist the questioning, his injuries impaired his rational faculties. Crunsel was also ineffective because he failed to explain to the.

i	23. (b) GROUND TWO: Continued from page 7
2	Court that petitioner needed more time (because of his serious
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	Should not have been place under duress to make a serious dec-
1.1	isian after the trauma festitioner Suffered after being shot in the
12	head. This is Axiomatic, no argument can contravert what any
13	human Could or Should Know. That is that, any one getting shot
14	twice in the head Should never be signing not only a plea Agree-
15	ment but any Agreement for that matter.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
25	
27	
28	
	·

CERTFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAILING

	2 1, Shan Jonathan Kittnedge, hereby certify, pursuant to NRCP 5(b), that on this 1
	3 day of Apri , 2020, I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing, "Petition For Win
	4 Of Habeas Corpus
	by placing document in a sealed pre-postage paid envelope and deposited said envelope in the
	6 United State Mail addressed to the following:
	Steven D. Gnierson Clerk of The Court
. !	200 Lauris Ave. Las Vegas, NV. 39155-1160
10	
- ,11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	CC:FILE
18	April
19	DATED: this stay of 2020.
20	
21	1/1 the #120X41
22	Post Office Box 208, S.D.C.C. Indian Springs, Nevada 89018
24	IN FORMA PAUPERIS:
25	
26	
27	
28	
~"	
1	

AFFIRMATION Pursuant to NRS 2398.030

The undersigned de	oes hereby affirm that the preceding Petition Fo
Writ Of (Mite of Doc	
filed in District Court Case	number <u>C18 333335-2</u>
Does not contain th	e social security number of any person.
	-OR-
☐ Contains the social s	security number of a person as required by:
A. A specific	state or federal law, to wit:
(State specific	: law)
	- or -
B. For the add for a federal o	ministration of a public program or for an application r state grant.
Signature	4/1/20
Shan Jonathon Kittred Print Name	ge
Pro'se	

l	WHEREFORE, Shan J. Kittredge, prays that the court grant <u>Petitioner Kittredge</u>
2	relief to which he may be entitled in this proceeding.
3	EXECUTED at Southern Dessert Correctional Center
. 4	on the 1st day of April . 2020
5	
6	
7	Signature Cor Petitioner
8	VERIFICATION
9	Under penalty of perjury, pursuant to N.R.S. 208.165 et seq., the undersigned declares that he is
10	the Petitioner named in the foregoing petition and knows the contents thereof; that the pleading is
11	true and correct of his own personal knowledge, except as to those matters based on information and
12	belief, and to those matters, he believes them to be true.
13	
14	
15	Signature of Petitioner
16	
17	Atttorney for Petitioner
18	Attorney to Pentione.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
5	
6	
- I	
7	

EXHIBIT-A

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

January 08, 2019

C-18-333335-2

State of Nevada

VS

Shan Kittredge

January 08, 2019

8:30 AM

Motion

HEARD BY: Johnson, Eric

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 12A

COURT CLERK: Linda Skinner

RECORDER:

Angie Calvillo

REPORTER:

PARTIES

PRESENT:

Mercer, Elizabeth A.

Attorney Plaintiff

State of Nevada Toddre, Frank A, II

Attorney

Yampolsky, Mace J. Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

-Statements by Mr. Yampolsky including that Defendant has sent several kites, however, has been unable to get any medical attention. Upon Court's inquiry, Mr. Toddre advised he was just made aware of this issue and requested the matter be continued so that he can speak with the medical personnel. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED TWO (2) WEEKS.

CUSTODY (COC-NDC)

... CONTINUED 1/24/19 9:00 AM

PRINT DATE:

12/05/2019

Page 5 of 6

Minutes Date:

August 21, 2018

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

January 24, 2019

C-18-333335-2

State of Nevada

VS

Shan Kittredge

January 24, 2019

9:00 AM

Motion

HEARD BY: Johnson, Eric

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 12A

COURT CLERK: Linda Skinner

RECORDER:

Angie Calvillo

REPORTER:

PARTIES

PRESENT:

Merback, William J.

State of Nevada

Attorney Plaintiff

Yampolsky, Mace J.

Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Frank Toddre from the Nevada Department of Corrections also present. Court noted it appears Defendant is being treated. Mr. Yampolsky concurred but advised he is waiting for an MRI and Xrays. Following colloquy, COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED.

CUSTODY (COC-NDC)

PRINT DATE: 12/05/2019

Page 6 of 6

Minutes Date:

August 21, 2018

A.A. 244

1	CERTFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAILING		
2	I, Shan Kittnedge hereby certify, pursuant to NRCP 5(b), that on this 1		
3	day of April 2020, I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing, "MOTION		
4	FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL "		
5	by placing document in a sealed pre-postage paid envelope and deposited said envelope in the		
6	United State Mail addressed to the following:		
7			
8			
9	200 LEWIS AVE. 3rd floor LAS VEGAS. NV. 189155-1160		
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17	CC:FILE		
18			
19	DATED: this gray of 2020.		
20			
21	X #1202692		
23	/In Propria Personam Post Office Box 208,S.D.C.C. Indian Springs, Nevada 89018		
24	IN FORMA PAUPERIS:		
25			
26			
27			
28			

AFFIRMATION Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding MOTION FOR

APPOINTMENT OF C	`NUNSEI
(Title of Docume	
filed in District Court Case nur	mber
Does not contain the so	ocial security number of any person.
	-OR-
Contains the social secu	urity number of a person as required by:
A. A specific stat	te or federal law, to wit:
(State specific lav	w)
	-or-
B. For the adminifor a federal or st	distration of a public program or for an application ate grant.
Y Signaturye	2) <u>4/1/20</u> Date
Shan Kittned Print Name	lge_
Title	

Shan Kithredge#1202642 SDCC P.O.Box 208 Indian Springs N.V. 89070



To: Steven D. Grier son/ Clark of Court 200 Lewis Live. 3rd Floor Las Vegas N.V. 89155-1160

MACO COMMICTION

IIS IN THE STREET OF

A.A. 247

EXHIBIT B

	AARON D. FORD		
2	Nevada Attorney General		
3	FRANK A. TODDRE II (Bar No. 11474) Senior Deputy Attorney General		
0	Office of the Attorney General		
4	555 E. Washington Avenue, Ste. 3900		
	Las Vegas, NV 89101		
5	Telephone: (702) 486-3149		
6	Facsimile: (702) 486-3773 E-Mail: ftoddre@ag.nv.gov		
0	He-Man. Hoddre@ag.nv.gov		
7	Attorneys for Specially Appearing Party		
	Nevada Department of Corrections		
8			
9	DISTRICT	COURT	
10	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
		1, 1111 ¥ 111211	
11	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	Case No. C-18-333335-2	
12	Plaintiff,	Dept. No. XX	
12	Tianiun,		
13	V		
_	TOTAL DOE TIDOD DENIGION		
14	JOHN DOE HDSP DENTIST, et al.,		
15			
	Defendants.		
16			
17	STATUS REPORT		
18	The Specially Appearing Party, Nevada Department of Corrections, by and through		
19	counsel, Aaron D. Ford, Nevada Attorney General, and Frank A. Toddre II, Senior Deputy		
20			
20	Attorney General, hereby submit their Status Report in compliance with the Court's Order		
21	stemming from the January 8, 2019 Minute Order on Defendant Shan Kittredge's Motion		
22	for Medical Treatment.		
- 1			
23	Defendant Kittredge is currently housed at High Desert State Prison, in the lawfu		
24	custody of Nevada Department of Corrections ("NDOC"). The NDOC is not a party to this		
25	case. Kittredge filed a motion for medical treatment, or alternatively transport to ar		

1 || MISC

26

27

28

on January 8, 2019, but NDOC had not prepared an opposition. At the hearing, Counsel

Senior Deputy Attorney General Frank A. Toddre II appeared at the oral arguments

outside contractor doctor's office for treatment.

agreed to submit a request to High Desert State Prison medical for an update of Kittredge's medical file and if necessary, request immediate attention.

The NDOC submits the attached Declaration from Director of Nursing Bob Faulkner as Exhibit A. Pursuant to request of Counsel and the motion, Kittredge was treated for his alleged wounds and follow up tests, and x-rays have been ordered. The undersigned has advised Counsel Mace Yampolsky of the results of treatment. If necessary, the NDOC can make the medical records available to the Court for *in camera* review.

DATED: January 23, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

AARON D. FORD Nevada Attorney General

By: <u>/s/ Frank A. Toddre II</u>
Frank A. Toddre II (Bar No. 11474)
Senior Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of the State of Nevada, Office of the Attorney General, and that on January 23, 2019, I electronically filed the foregoing **STATUS REPORT**, via this Court's electronic filing system. Parties that are registered with this Court's electronic filing system will be served electronically as follows:

Mace Yampolsky, 625 South Sixth Street Las Vegas, NV 89101

Elizabeth Mercer Chief Deputy District Attorney Elizabeth.mercer@clarkcountyda.com

<u>/s/ Barbara Fell</u>

Barbara Fell, an employee of the Office of the Nevada Attorney General