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GROVER, BRADLEY - LVMPD P\#4934 (or designee): CRIME SCENE ANALYST: Expert in the identification, documentation, collection and preservation of evidence and is expected to testify as an expert to the identification, documentation, collection and preservation of the evidence in this case.

MCNICKLE, DR, ALLISON - UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER: Will testify as a medical expert and to her observations, treatment, diagnosis and prognosis of the injuries sustained by the victim(s) in this case.

MORRISON, MAELEEN - LVMPD \#16191 (or designee): CRIME SCENE ANAILYST: Expert in the identification, documentation, collection and preservation of evidence and is expected to testify as an expert to the identification, documentation, collection and preservation of the evidence in this case.

RUBINO, ALLISON - LVMMP P\#14784 (or designee): Expert in the field of DNA extractions, comparisons, analysis, and the identification of bodily fluids and is expected to testify thereto.

STRUMILLO, JENNIFER - LVMPD \#16067 (or designce): CRIME SCENE ANALYST: Expert in the identification, documentation, collection and preservation of evidence and is expected to testify as an expert to the identification, documentation, collection and preservation of the evidence in this case.

WRIGHT, AMANDA - LVMPD P\#9974 (or designee): FIREARMS/TOOLMARKS EXAMINER with the Las Vcgas Metropolitan Police Department. He is an expert and is expected to testify thereto, including, but not limited to, the forensic science underlying firearms, ballistics, and toolmark comparison, analysis, interpretation, and methodology, microscopic comparison tools, technology, and findings, National Integrated Ballistic Information Network ("NIBIN") entry, analysis, interpretation, and results, firearms identification, operation, trigger pull, failure, capacity, and capability, ammunition, composition, trajectory, stippling and gunshot residue, cartridge composition, ejection pattern analysis (cartridge cases), distance determination, suppressors/silencers (commercial and
homemade) examination, serial number restoration, and firearms modification or homemade firearms examination).

The substance of each expert witness' testimony and copy of all reports made by or at the direction of the expert witness has been provided in discovery.

A copy of each expert witness' curriculum vitae, if available, is attached hereto.
'These witnesses are in addition to those witnesses endorsed on the Information or Indictment and any other witness for which a separate Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses has been filed.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#001565

## BY /s/ NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO <br> NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO <br> Chief Deputy District Attorncy <br> Nevada Bar \#011930

## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC MAIL

I hereby certify that service of the foregoing, was made this 5 th day of February, 2020, by Elcetronic Mail to:

PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE
E-mail Address: pdclerk@ClarkCountyNV.gov
/s/C. Bush
Secretary for the District Attorney's Office

0042
DARIN F. IMLAY, PUBLIC DEFENDER
NEVADA BAR NO. 5674
ROBSON M. MAUSER, DEPUTY PUBLIC DEFENDER
NEVADA BAR NO. 13692
PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE
309 South Third Street, Suite 226
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
Telephone: (702) 455-4685
Facsimile: (702) 455-5112
Robson.Hauser@clarkcountynv.gov
Attorneys for Defendant



## MOTION TO WITHDRAW DUE TO CONFLICT

COMES NOW, the Defendant, TED MICHAEL DONKO, by and through ROBSON M. HAUSER, Deputy Public Defender and respectfully moves this Honorable Court to allow the Public Defender to withdraw and to appoint independent counsel due to a conflict of interest.

This Motion is made and based upon all the papers and pleadings on file herein, the attached Declaration of Counsel, and oral argument at the time set for hearing this Motion.

DATED this Fth day of February, 2020.

By: /s/Robsoin M. Hawser<br>ROBSON M. HAUSER, \#13692<br>Deputy Public Defender

## DECLARATION

ROBSON M. HAUSER, makes the following declaration:

1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada; I am the Deputy Public Defender assigned to represent the Defendant in the instant matter, and the Defendant has represented the following facts and circumstances of this case.
2. That Mary Skelton, ID \#1509.461, is a witness noticed by the State in this case.
3. That Ms. Skelton has been previously represented by the Clark County Public Defender's Office in numerous cases, including C-16-318860-1, C-11-273013-1, and 10C266148-1.
4. That effective representation of the Defendant in the instant matter would necessarily prejudice the interests of any persons mentioned in this declaration.
5. Therefore, Defendant asks this Court to allow the Clark County Public Defender's Office to withdraw in this case due to conflict of interest and to appoint independent counsel to represent the Defendant.
6. The Defendant has been notified of the presentation of this motion.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. (NRS 53.045)
EXECUTED on this 5th day of February, 2020.

\%/Robson M. Hauser

ROBSON M. HAUSER

## NOTICE OF MOTION

TO: CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, Attorney for Plaintiff: YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the foregoing MOTION TO WITHDRAW DUE TO CONFLICT will be heard on 7th day of February, 2020, at 8:30 a.m., District Court, Department X.

DATED this 5th day of February, 2020.
DARIN F. IMLAY
CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

By: /s/Robson M. Hauser
ROBSON M. HAUSER, \#13692
Deputy Public Defender

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that service of the above and forgoing MOTION was served to the Deputy District Attorney in open court on this __7th_d day of February, 2020.

> By: __/s/Robson M Hauser -PD

An employee of the
Clark County Public Defender's Office

AIN
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#001565
NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#011930
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212
(702) 671-2500

Attorney for Plaintiff
DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff,
-vs-
TED MICHAEL DONKO, \#2668752

Defendant.

## CASE NO: C-19-345584-1

DEPT NO: XXV

## AMENDED

INFORMATION

STATE OF NEVADA COUNTY OF CLARK ${ }^{\text {ss. }}$

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, District Attorney within and for the County of Clark, State of Nevada, in the name and by the authority of the State of Nevada, informs the Court:

That TED MICHAEL DONKO, the Defendants) above named, having committed the crimes of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Category B Felony - NRS 200.481 - NOC 50226); ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.330, 193.165 - NOC 50031); ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.471 - NOC 50201) and DISCHARGING FIREARM AT OR INTO OCCUPIED STRUCTURE, VEHICLE, AIRCRAFT, OR WATERCRAFT (Category B Felony - NRS 202.285 - NOC 51442);, on or about the 1st //
day of October, 2019, within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada,

## COUNT 1 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use force or violence upon the person of another, to wit: JONATHAN SANCHEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said JONATHAN SANCHEZ, resulting in substantial bodily harm to JONATHAN SANCHEZ.

## COUNT 2 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use force or violence upon the person of another, to wit: FERNANDO ESPINOZA, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said FERNANDO ESPINOZA, resulting in substantial bodily harm to FERNANDO ESPINOZA.

## COUNT 3 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought attempt to kill JONATHAN SANCHEZ, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said JONATHAN SANCHEZ.

## COUNT 4 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought attempt to kill FERNANDO ESPINOZA, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said FERNANDO ESPINOZA.

## COUNT 5 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought attempt to kill DEANDRE WOODS, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at the said DEANDRE WOODS.

## COUNT 6 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON

did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: DEANDRE WOODS, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by pointing and/or shooting said firearm at the said DEANDRE WOODS.

## COUNT 7 - DISCHARGING FIREARM AT OR INTO OCCUPIED STRUCTURE, VEHICLE, AIRCRAFT, OR WATERCRAFT

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, maliciously, and feloniously discharge a firearm at or into a structure, said structure, not having been abandoned, located at 56 Linn Lane, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#001565

## BY

NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar \#011930
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## DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
STATE OF NEVADA

## JURY LIST

1. PATRICIA HILDRETH
2. ANTONIO MENA-LUVERA
3. DAISY ARIAS
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5. TIMOTHY USHER
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7. YANDIA AROCHA RODRIGUEZ
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CASE NO. C345584-1
TED MICHAEL DONKO
DEPT. NO. VI
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## ALTERNATES

Secret from above
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STEVEN B. WOLFSON
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#001565
NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#011930
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212
(702) 671-2500
Attorney for Plaintiff

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


CASE NO: C-19-345584-1
DEPT NO: XXV

SECOND AMENDED

INFORMATION

## STATE OF NEVADA COUNTY OF CLARK $\{$ ss.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, District Attorney within and for the County of Clark, State of Nevada, in the name and by the authority of the State of Nevada, informs the Court:

That TED MICHAEL DONKO, the Defendants) above named, having committed the crimes of OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON (Category B Felony - NRS 202.360 - NOC 51460), on or about the 1st day of October, 2019, within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously own, or have in his possession and/or under his custody or control, a firearm, to wit: an unknown 40 caliber semi-automatic firearm, the Defendant being a convicted felon, having in 2014, been convicted of Attempt Burglary, in Case No. C298636 and/or having in 2012, been convicted of Attempt Grand Larceny, in Case No.

C274598, in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, felonies under the laws of the State of Nevada.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#001565

BY


Names of witnesses known to the District Attorney's Office at the time of filing this Information are as follows:

NAME<br>CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS<br>CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS<br>CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS<br>ESPINOZA, FERNANDO<br>MARIN, J.<br>RAFALOVICH, MARCO or Designee<br>RAMOS-GRAJEDA, GENARO<br>SANCHEZ-LOZA, JONATHAN<br>STAFFOD, E.<br>WOODS, DEANDRE<br>\section*{ADDRESS}<br>CCDC<br>LVMPD COMMUNICATIONS<br>LVMPD RECORDS<br>C/O DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE<br>LVMPD P\#15026<br>CCDA INVESTIGATOR<br>C/O DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE<br>C/O DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE<br>LVMPD P\#13642<br>C/O DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
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DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, -vs-

TED MICHAEL DONKO, Defendant.

CASE NO: C-19-345584-1
DEPT NO: 6

## VERDICT

We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant TED DONKO, as follows:
COUNT 1 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN
SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Jonathan Sanchez)
(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)
Guilty of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm

- Guilty of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon
- Guilty of Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm
- Guilty of Battery
$\square \quad$ Not Guilty


COUNT 2 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Fernando Espinoza)
(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)
Guilty of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm
$\square \quad$ Guilty of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon
$\square \quad$ Guilty of Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm

- Guilty of Battery
- Not Guilty

COUNT 3 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Jonathan Sanchez)
(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)
$\sqrt{ }$ Guilty of Attempt Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon
Guilty of Attempt Murder
Not Guilty
COUNT 4 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Fernando Espinoza)
(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)
Guilty of Attempt Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon

- Guilty of Attempt Murder
- Not Guilty

COUNT 5-ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Deandre Woods)
(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)
Guilty of Attempt Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon
Guilty of Attempt Murder
Not Guilty

## COUNT 6 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Deandre Woods)

(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)
Guilty of Assault with a Deadly Weapon
Guilty of Assault
$\square \quad$ Not Guilty

## COUNT 7 - DISCHARGING FIREARM AT OR INTO OCCUPIED STRUCTURE,

 VEHICLE, AIRCRAFT, OR WATERCRAFT(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)

- Guilty of Discharging Firearm At or Into Occupied Structure, Vehicle,

Aircraft, or Watercraft
$\square \quad$ Not Guilty
DATED this 13 day of February, 2020


FOREPERSON CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff,

CASE NO: C-19-345584-1
DEPT NO: VI
TED MICHAEL DONKO,
Defendant.
-vs-

## VERDICT

We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant as follows:
COUNT 1 - OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON
(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)


Guilty of Ownership or Possession of Firearm by Prohibited Person
Not Guilty

DATED this 13 day of February, 2020


1. SHELLEY BUSH
2. TAMARA JACQUEZ
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DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, -vs-

TED MICHAEL DONKO, Defendant.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY (INSTRUCTION NO. I) MEMBERS OF THE JURY:

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

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


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

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

A Second Amended Information is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of his/her guilt.

In this case, it is charged in an that TED MICHAEL DONKO, the Defendant above named, having committed the crimes of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Category B Felony RS 200.481 - NOC 50226); ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.330, 193.165 - NOC 50031); ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.471- NOC 50201); and DISCHARGING FIREARM AT OR INTO OCCUPIED STRUCTURE, VEHICLE, AIRCRAFT, OR WATERCRAFT (Category B Felony - NRS 202.285NOC 51442) on or about the 1st day of October, 2019, within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada,

## COUNT 1 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use force or violence upon the person of another, to wit: JONATHAN SANCHEZ, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said JONATHAN SANCHEZ, resulting in substantial bodily harm to JONATHAN SANCHEZ.

## COUNT 2 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use force or violence upon the person of another, to wit: FERNANDO ESPINOZA, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said FERNANDO ESPINOZA, resulting in substantial bodily harm to FERNANDO ESPINOZA.

## COUNT 3 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought attempt to kill JONATHAN SANCHEZ, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said JONATHAN SANCHEZ.
COUNT 4 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON
did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought attempt to kill FERNANDO ESPINOZA, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said FERNANDO ESPINOZA.

## COUNT 5 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought attempt to kill DEANDRE WOODS, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at the said DEANDRE WOODS.

COUNT 6 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON
did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to wit: DEANDRE WOODS, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by pointing and/or shooting said firearm at the said DEANDRE WOODS.

COUNT 7 - DISCHARGING FIREARM AT OR INTO OCCUPIED STRUCTURE, VEHICLE, AIRCRAFT, OR WATERCRAFT
did then and there willfully, unlawfully, maliciously, and feloniously discharge a firearm at or into a structure, said structure, not having been abandoned, located at 56 Linn Lane, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada.

It is the duty of the jury to apply the rules of law contained in these instructions to the facts of the case and determine whether or not the Defendants are guilty of one or more of the offenses charged.

Each charge and the evidence pertaining to it should be considered separately. The fact that you may find a defendant guilty or not guilty as to one of the offenses charged should not control your verdict as to any other Defendant offense charged.

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

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

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

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

A defendant's state of mind does not require the presentation of direct evidence as it existed during the commission of a crime. The jury may infer the existence of a particular state of mind of a party from the circumstances disclosed by the evidence.
$\qquad$
The Defendant is presumed innocent until the contrary is proved. This presumption places upon the State the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crime charged and that the Defendant is the person who committed the offense.

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

If you have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the Defendant, he is entitled to a verdict of not guilty.
$\qquad$
You are here to determine the guilt or innocence of the Defendant from the evidence in the case. You are not called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt or innocence of any other person. So, if the evidence in the case convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the Defendant, you should so find, even though you may believe one or more persons are also guilty.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The elements of an attempt to commit a crime are:

1) the intent to commit the crime;
2) performance of some act towards its commission; and
3) failure to consummate its commission.

Attempt Murder is the performance of an act or acts which tend, but fail, to kill a human being, when such acts are done with express malice, namely, with the deliberate intention unlawfully to kill.

It is not necessary to prove the elements of premeditation and deliberation in order to prove Attempt Murder.

The intention to kill may be ascertained or deduced from the facts and circumstances of the killing, such as the use of a weapon calculated to produce death, the manner of its use, and the attendant circumstances characterizing the act.

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

You are instructed that if you find a defendant guilty of Attempt Murder, you must also determine whether or not a deadly weapon was used in the commission of this crime.

If a deadly weapon was used in the commotion of the crime, the person is guilty of Attempt Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon.

As used in these instructions, a "deadly weapon" means:
(1) Any instrument which, if used in the ordinary manner contemplated by it design and construction, will or is likely to cause substantial bodily harm or death, or
(2) Any weapon, device, instrument, material or substance which, under the circumstances in which it is used, attempted to be used or threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death.

The State is not required to have recovered the deadly weapon used in an alleged crime, or to produce the deadly weapon in court at trial, to establish that a deadly weapon was used in the commission of the crime.

In order to "use" a deadly weapon, there need not be conduct which actually produces harm but only conduct which produces a fear of harm or force by means or display of the deadly weapon in aiding the commission of the crime.

Battery means any willful and unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another.

The force used by the defendant need not be violent or severe, and need not cause bodily pain or bodily harm. Any slight touching by the defendant upon the person of another suffices, as long as the touching was intentional and unwanted.

If that force is accomplished with the use of a deadly weapon, the person is guilty of Battery with a Deadly Weapon.

If that force results in substantial bodily harm to the victim, the person is guilty of Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.

If that force is accomplished with the use of a deadly weapon and substantial bodily harm results to the victim, the person is guilty of Battery with a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.

## INSTRUCTION NO. 20

"Substantial Bodily Harm" means:

1. Bodily injury which creates a substantial risk of death or which causes serious, permanent disfigurement or protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ; or
2. Prolonged physical pain.
"Prolonged physical pain" necessarily encompasses some physical suffering or injury that lasted longer than the pain immediately resulting from the wrongful act.

A person who unlawfully attempts to use physical force against the person of another or intentionally places another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm is guilty of Assault.

To constitute an assault, it is not necessary that any actual injury be inflicted.
A person who commits an assault on another person by or through the use of a deadly weapon is guilty of Assault with a Deadly Weapon.

A person who willfully and maliciously discharges a firearm at or into any house, room, apartment, tenement, shop, warehouse, store, mill, barn, stable, outhouse or other building, tent, vessel, aircraft, vehicle, vehicle trailer, semitrailer or house trailer, railroad locomotive, car or tender that is occupied is guilty of Discharging a Firearm at or Into Occupied Structure, Vehicle, Aircraft, or Watercraft:

A general intent crime is one where an accused meant to do an act prohibited by law. Whether the defendant(s) intended the act's result is irrelevant.

A specific intent crime typically requires that the defendant(s) intentionally commit an act and intend to cause a particular result when committing that act.

Attempt Murder With Use of a Deadly Weapon, Assault with a Deadly Weapon, Discharging Firearm At or Into Occupied Structure are specific intent crimes.

Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm is a general intent crime.

## INSTRUCTION NO. 24

The flight of a person immediately after the commission of a crime, is not sufficient in itself to establish his or her guilt, but is a fact which, if proved, may be considered by you in light of all other proved facts in deciding the question of his or her innocence. Whether or not evidence of flight shows a consciousness of guilt and the significance to be attached to such a circumstance are matters for your deliberation.

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

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

In your deliberation you may not discuss or consider the subject of punishment, as that is a matter which lies solely with the court. Your duty is confined to the determination of the guilt or innocence of the Defendant.

During the course of this trial, and your deliberations, you are not to:
(1) communicate with anyone in any way regarding this case or its merits-either by phone, texxt, Internet, or other means;
(2) read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case;
(3) do any research, such as consulting dictionaries, using the Internet, or using reference materials;
(4) make any investigation, test a theory of the case, re-create any aspect of the case, or in any other way investigate or learn about the case on your own.

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

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

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

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

Play backs of testimony are time-consuming and are not encouraged unless you deem it a necessity. Should you require a play back, you must carefully describe the testimony to be played back so that the court recorder can arrange his/her notes. Remember, the court is not at liberty to supplement the evidence.
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## DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
STATE OF NEVADA
Plaintiffs),
CASE NO. C345584-1
DEPT. NO. 6

## DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS NOT USED AT TRIAL

Attached hereto are the proposed jury instructions which were offered to the Court, but not submitted to the jury in the above entitled action.
DATED: February 13, 2020.

$\square$
A defendant in a criminal action is presumed to be innocent unless ${ }^{1}$ the contrary is proved. This presumption places upon the state the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every material element of the crime charged and that the Defendant is the person who committed the offense.

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

If you have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the Defendant, he is entitled to a verdict of



If the evidence in this case is susceptible to two constructions or interpretations, each of 3 which appears to you to be reasonable, and one of which points to the guilt of the defendant, and the 4 other to his innocence, it is your duty, under the law, to adopt that interpretation which will admit of the defendant's innocence, and reject that which points to his guilt.






## Duse Proffered



If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Donko did then and there willfully, unlawfully, maliciously, and feloniously discharge a firearm at or into a structure, said structure, not having been abandoned, you must find him Not Guilty.

$$
\begin{aligned}
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& \text { - state db. } \\
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\end{aligned}
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DISTRICT COURT


CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, -vs-

TED MICHAEL DONKO, Defendant.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY (INSTRUCTION NO. I) <br> MEMBERS OF THE JURY:

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

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


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

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

A Third Amended Information is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of his guilt.

The Defendant above named, TED MICHAEL DONKO, having committed the crime of OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON (Category B Felony - NRS 202.360 - NOC 51460), on or about the 1st day of October, 2019, within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada,

COUNT 1 - OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON
did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously own, or have in his possession and/or under his custody or control, a firearm, to wit: an unknown 40 caliber semi-automatic firearm, the Defendant being a convicted felon, having in 2014, been convicted of Attempt Burglary, in Case No. C298636 and/or having in 2012, been convicted of Attempt Grand Larceny, in Case No. C274598, in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, felonies under the laws of the State of Nevada.

It is the duty of the jury to apply the rules of law contained in these instructions to the facts of the case and determine whether or not the Defendants are guilty of one or more of the offenses charged.

Each charge and the evidence pertaining to it should be considered separately. The fact that you may find a defendant guilty or not guilty as to one of the offenses charged should not control your verdict as to any other Defendant offense charged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You are here to determine the guilt or innocence of the Defendant from the evidence in the case. You are not called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt or innocence of any other person. So, if the evidence in the case convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the Defendant, you should so find, even though you may believe one or more persons are also guilty.

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

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

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

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

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

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

INSTRUCTION NO. 8
The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the matter to which he or she testified, the reasonableness of his statements and the strength or weakness of his recollections.

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

A person who has been convicted of a felony in this or any other state, or in any political subdivision thereof, or of a felony in violation of the laws of the United States of America, shall not own or have in his possession or under his custody or control any firearm.

A "Firearm" means any device designed to be used as a weapon from which a projectile may be expelled through the barrel by the force of any explosion or other form of combustion.

The State is not required to have recovered the firearm or to produce the firearm in court at trial. Neither the concealment of the firearm nor the carrying of the weapon are necessary elements of the offense.

The law recognizes two kinds of possession: actual possession and constructive possession.

A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing, at a given time, is then in actual possession of it.

A person who, although not in actual possession, knowingly has both the power and the intention, at a given time, to exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is then in constructive possession of it.

The law recognizes also that possession may be sole or joint. If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is joint.

You may find that the element of possession as that term is used in these instructions is present if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that a defendant had actual or constructive possession, either alone or jointly with others.

## INSTRUCTION NO. 11

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

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

It is the constitutional right of a Defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compelled to testify. Thus, the decision as to whether he should testify is left to the Defendant on the advice and counsel of his attorney. You must not draw any inference of guilt from the fact that he does not testify, nor should this fact be discussed by you or enter into your deliberations in any way.

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

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

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

During the course of this trial, and your deliberations, you are not to:
(1) communicate with anyone in any way regarding this case or its merits-either by phone, text, Internet, or other means;
(2) read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case;
(3) do any research, such as consulting dictionaries, using the Internet, or using reference materials;
(4) make any investigation, experimentation at the scene, test a theory of the case, recreate any aspect of the case, or in any other way investigate or learn about the case or anyone involved with the case on your own.
You may, of course, during deliberations, communicate with other members of the jury while you are in the jury deliberation room, after the case has been submitted to you for deliberation.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15
If, during your deliberation, you should desire to be further informed on any point of law or hear again portions of the testimony, you must reduce your request to writing signed by the foreperson. The officer will then return you to court where the information sought will be given you in the presence of, and after notice to, the district attorney and the Defendant and his counsel.

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

GIVEN:
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## DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,
V.

TED MICHAEL DONKO,
Defendant.

CASE NO. C-19-345584-1
DEPT. NO. VI

## NOTICE OF APPEAL

TO: THE STATE OF NEVADA

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA and DEPARTMENT NO. VI OE THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK.

NOTICE is hereby given that Defendant, Ted Michael Donko, presently incarcerated in the Nevada state Prison, appeals to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada from the judgment entered against said Defendant on the 20 day of April, 2020, whereby he was convicted of Counts $1 \& 2$, Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm, Cts. 3, 4, \& 5 - Attempt Murder With use of a Deadly Weapon, Ct. 6 - Assault with a Deadly Weapon, Ct. 7 - Discharging a Firearm at or into Occupied Structure Vehicle Aircraft or Watercraft and Ct. 8 - Ownership or Possession of a Firearm by Prohibited Person and sentenced to $\$ 25$ Admin. Fee; $\$ 150$ DNA analysis fee waived, $\$ 3$ DNA collection fee; $\$ 250$ Indigent Defense Civil Assessment fee; as to Ct. 1 - 24-60
months in prison; ct. 2-24-60 months in prison concurrent with Ct. 1; Ct. 3 - 36-96 months in prison plus a consecutive term of 12-30 months in prison consecutive to Cts. $1 \& 2$ \& Ct. 4 - 36-96 months in prison plus a consecutive term of $12-30$ months consecutive to Ct .3 ; Ct. $5-36-96$ months in prison plus a consecutive term of 12-30 months in prison consecutive to Ct. 4, Ct. 6 - 12-30 months in prison concurrent with Ct. 5; Ct. 7 - 1230 months in prison concurrent with Ct. 6; Ct. 8 - 12-30 months in prison concurrent with Ct. 7; 150 days CTS; jurisdiction retained as to restitution, aggregate including the deadly weapon enhancement is 144 months with a maximum of 378 months. Aggregate not including the deadly weapon enhancement of 108 months to 288 months. Following proceedings, court ordered sentenced Amended as to Aggregate sentence. DATED this 21 day of April, 2020. DARIN F. IMLAY CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER
By: $\frac{\text { /s/Howard S. Brooks }}{\text { HOWARD S. BROOKS, \#3374 }}$ Deputy Public Defender 309 S. Third Street, Ste. 226 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 (702) 455-4685

## DECLARATION OF MAILING

Carrie Connolly, an employee with the Clark County Public Defender's Office, hereby declares that she is, and was when the herein described mailing took place, a citizen of the United States, over 21 years of age, and not a party to, nor interested in, the within action; that on the 21 day of April, 2020, declarant deposited in the United States mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, a copy of the Notice of Appeal in the case of the State of Nevada v. Ted Michael Donko, Case No. C-19-345584-1, enclosed in a sealed envelope upon which first class postage was fully prepaid, addressed to Ted Michael Donko, c/o High Desert State Prison, P.O. Box 650, Indian Springs, NV 89070. That there is a regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and the place so addressed.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED on the 21 day of April, 2020.
An employee of the Clark County
Fublic Defender's office

## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that service of the above and foregoing was made this 21 day of April, 2020, by Electronic Filing to: District Attorneys Office E-Mail Address:

PDMotions@clarkcountyda.com
Jennifer.Garcia@clarkcountyda.com
Eileen. Davis@clarkcountyda.com
$\frac{\text { /s/ Carrie M. Connolly }}{\text { Secretary for the }}$ Public Defender's Office
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309 South Third Street, Suite 226
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(702) 455-4685

Attorney for Defendant

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, )
Plaintiff, ) CASE NO. C-19-345584-1
v. ) DEPT. NO. VI

TED MICHAEL DONKO,
Defendant.

## CASE APPEAL STATEMENT

1. Appellant filing this case appeal statement: Ted Michael Donko.
2. Judge issuing the decision, judgment, or order appealed from: Honorable Jaqueline Bluth.
3. All parties to the proceedings in the district court (the use of et al. To denote parties is prohibited): The State of Nevada, Plaintiff; Ted Michael Donko, Defendant.
4. All parties involved in this appeal (the use of et. al. to denote parties is prohibited): Ted Michael Donko, Appellant; The State of Nevada, Respondent.
5. Name, law firm, address, and telephone number of all counsel on appeal and party or parties whom they represent:

DARIN F. IMLAY
Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street, \#226 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610

Attorney for Appellant
AARON D. FORD
Attorney General
100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538

Counsel for Respondent
6. Whether appellant was represented by appointed or retained counsel in the district court: Appointed.
7. Whether appellant is represented by appointed or retained counsel on appeal: Appointed.
8. Whether appellant was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and the date of entry of the district court order granting such leave: N/A.
9. Date proceedings commenced in the district court (e.g., date complaint, indictment, information, or petition was filed): Information filed 12/19/19.

> DATED this 21 st day of April, 2020.
> DARIN F. IMLAY
> CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

By:

> | $\frac{\text { s/Howard S. Brooks }}{}$ |
| :--- |
| HowARD S. BROOKS, \#3374 |
| Deputy Public Defender |
| 309 S. Third Street, Ste. 226 |
| Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 |
| (702) $455-4685$ |

## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that service of the above and foregoing was made this 21st day of April, 2020, by Electronic Filing to:

```
District Attormeys Office
E-Mail Address:
PDMotions@ccdanv.com
Jennifer.Garcia@ccdanv.com
Eileen.Davis@ccdanv.com
/s/ Carrie M. Connolly
Secretary for the
Public Defender's Office
```

JOC

## DISTRICT COURT

 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADATHE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
-vS-
TED MICHAEL DONKO \#2668752

Defendant.

## JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION

(JURY TRIAL)

The Defendant previously entered a plea of not guilty to the crimes of COUNTS 1 \& 2 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481; COUNTS 3, 4, \& 5 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.330, 193.165; COUNT 6 -. ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.471; COUNT 7 - DISCHARGING FIREARM AT OR INTO OCCUPIED STRUCTURE, VEHICLE, AIRCRAFT, OR WATERCRAFT (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 202.285; and Bifurcated COUNT 1, originally COUNT 8 OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON (Category B Felony) in violation of NR5 202.360; and the matter having been tried before a jury and the Defendant having been found guilty of the crimes of COUNTS $1 \& 2$ - BATTERY WITH USE

OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481; COUNTS 3, 4, \& 5 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.330, 193.165; COUNT 6 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.471; COUNT 7 - DISCHARGING FIREARM AT OR INTO OCCUPIED STRUCTURE, VEHICLE, AIRCRAFT, OR WATERCRAFT (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 202.285; and Bifurcated COUNT 1, originally COUNT 8 - OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 202.360; thereafter, on the $20^{\text {th }}$ day of April, 2020, the Defendant was present in court for sentencing with counsel ROBSON HAUSER, Deputy Public Defender, and good cause appearing,

THE DEFENDANT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED guilty of said offenses and, in addition to the $\$ 25.00$ Administrative Assessment Fee, $\$ 250.00$ Indigent Defense Civil Assessment Fee, \$3.00 DNA Collection Fee, and Jurisdiction retained as to any Restitution, the Defendant is sentenced to the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC) as follows: COUNT 1 - a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of TWENTY-FOUR (24) MONTHS; COUNT 2 - a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TWENTY-FOUR (24) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 1; COUNT 3 - a MAXIMUM of NINETY-SIX (96) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-SIX (36) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of THIRTY (30) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TWELVE (12) MONTHS for the Use of a Deadly Weapon, CONSECUTIVE to COUNTS 1 \& 2; COUNT 4 - a MAXIMUM of NINETY-SIX (96) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-SIX (36) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of THIRTY (30) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TWELVE (12) MONTHS for the Use of a Deadly Weapon, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 3; COUNT 5 - a MAXIMUM of NINETY-SIX (96)

MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-SIX (36) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of THIRTY (30) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TWELVE (12) MONTHS for the Use of a Deadly Weapon, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 4; COUNT 6 - a MAXIMUM of THIRTY (30) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TWELVE (12) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 5; COUNT 7 - a MAXIMUM of THIRTY (30) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TWELVE (12) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 6; and Bifurcated COUNT 1, originally COUNT 8 - a MAXIMUM of THIRTY (30) MONTHS with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TWELVE (12) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 7; with ONE HUNDRED FIFTY (150) DAYS credit for time served. As the $\$ 150.00$ DNA Analysis Fee and Genetic Testing have been previously imposed, the Fee and Testing in the current case are WAIVED. The AGGREGATE TOTAL sentence INCLUDING the Deadly Weapon Enhancement is THREE HUNDRED SEVENTY-EIGHT (378) MONTHS MAXIMUM with a MINIMUM of ONE HUNDRED FORTY-FOUR (144) MONTHS. The AGGREGATE TOTAL sentence NOT INCLUDING the Deadly Weapon Enhancement is TWO HUNDRED EIGHTY-EIGHT (288) MONTHS MAXIMUM with a MINIMUM of ONE HUNDRED EIGHT (108) MONTHS.

DATED this $22^{\text {nd }}$ day of April, 2020 .


Upon review of this matter and good cause appearing,
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is hereby directed to statistically close this case for the following reason:

DISPOSITIONS:
$\square$ Nolle Prosequi (before trial)
$\square$ Dismissed (after diversion)
$\square$ Dismissed (before trial)
Guilty Plea with Sentence (before trial)
Transferred (before/during trial)
Bench (Non-Jury) Trial


Dismissed (during trial)
Acquittal
Guilty Plea with Sentence (during tria)
Conviction
$\not \subset$
Trial
Dismissed (during trial)
Acquittal
Guilty Plea with Sentence (during trial) Conviction
$\square \quad$ Other Manner of Disposition
DATED this 24th day of April, 2020.


REQT
DARIN F. IMLAY, PUBLIC DEFENDER
NEVADA BAR No. 5674
309 South Third Street, Suite 226
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
(702) 455-4685

Attorney for Defendant

## DISTRICT COURT <br> CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff, v.

TED MICHAEL DONKO,
Defendant.

## APPELLANT'S REQUEST FOR CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TO: Sharon Nichols
Court Recorder, Department AA
Robert Cangemi
Court Reporter, Department XXV
Victoria Boyd
Court Recorder, Department $X$
De'Awna Takas
Court Recorder, Department VI
Appellant requests preparation, at State expense, of a transcript of the proceedings before the District Court, as follows:

Judge or officer hearing the proceeding: Judge Jacqueline M. Bluth.

Date or dates of proceeding: 12/20/19, 02/03/20, $02 / 07 / 20, \quad 02 / 10 / 20, \quad 02 / 11 / 20, \quad 02 / 12 / 20,02 / 13 / 20,04 / 01 / 20$, 04/20/20.

Portions of the transcript requested: (12/20/19 - Sharon
Nichols) - Any and all proceedings, all transcripts to include word index; (02/03/20 - Robert Cangemi) - Any and all proceedings, all transcripts to include word index; (02/07/20 - Kristine Santi) - Any and all proceedings, all transcripts to include word index; (02/10/20, 02/11/20, 02/12/20, 02/13/20 - De'Awna Takas) - Trial transcripts - All transcripts, include word index - Any and all proceedings, jury voir dire, jury selection, opening statements, testimony, matters heard outside the presence of the jury, settling of instructions, closing arguments, verdict, any and all bench conferences; (04/01/20, 04/20/20 - De'Awna Takas) - Any and all proceedings, all transcripts to include index.

Number of copies required: Two.
I hereby certify that on this date $I$ ordered this transcript from the court reporter named above. I further certify that Appellant is indigent and exempt from paying the required deposit.

EXECUTED on the 6 day of May, 2020.
DARIN F. IMLAY
CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

By: $\frac{\text { /s/ Howard S. Brooks }}{\text { HowARD S. BROOKS, \#3374 }}$ Deputy Public Defender 309 S. Third Street, Ste. 226 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 (702) 455-4685

## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that service of the above and foregoing was made this 6 day of May, 2020, by Electronic Filing to:

District Attormeys office
E-Mail Address:

PDMotions@clarkcountyda.com

Jennifer.Garciadclarkcountyda.com
Eileen. Davis@clarkcountyda.com
nicholss(clarkcountycourts.us
CangemiRobertoyahoo.com
boydveclarkcountycourts.us
takasdgclarkcountycourts.us
/s/ Carrie M. Connolly
Secretary for the
Public Defender's Office

TRAN

IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, ) Plaintiff, )
vs. ) Case No.
C-19-345584-1
Dept. No. 25

CALENDAR CALL

Before the Honorable Kathleen E. Delaney, Monday, February 3, 2020, 9:00 a.m.

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings


APPEARANCES:

For the state: Nicole Cannizzaro, Esq.
Chief Deputy District Attorney

For the Defendant: Robson Hauser, Esq.
Kambiz Shaygan-Fatemi,
Esq .
Deputy Public Defenders

REPORTED BY: ROBERT A. CANGEMI, CCR No. 888

Las Vegas, Nevada, Monday, February 3, 2020

THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Ted
Donko.

I had attempted to call this one earlier,
but Ms. Cannizzaro had stepped out.

Is this going over to Mr. Shaygan's team at this time?

MR. SHAYGAN-FATEMI: No, Your Honor, I will be trying the case with Mr. Hauser.

THE COURT: Okay.
What's our trial readiness?

MR. HAUSER: We are ready to go.
MS. CANNIZZARO: And the State is ready as well.

I would like to make a record of just an offer.

Defense counsel and myself have been talking about negotiations this morning in an attempt to resolve the case.

And, so, the final offer, which defense counsel was able to get me to agree to on this case was for a stipulated sentence of 3 to 10 years in the Nevada Department of Corrections with a plea to

```
2 \text { counts of battery with use of a deadly weapon}
resulting in substantial bodily harm.
    And ownership or possession of a firearm by
a prohibited person, the Defendant being an
ex-felon.
```

And there is also an additional Justice Court case that is pending from around 25 counts, if I remember correctly, of possession of identity of another, and forgery lab.

That is Case 19F24796x, and the State would be at this point willing to dismiss that case as part of the negotiations, and that would run concurrent, so it would be a concurrent 3 to 10 .

But it is my understanding that at this point the Defendant does not want to accept that offer.

THE COURT: Okay.
So, any comments to that record that
Ms. Cannizzaro just made?
MR. HAUSER: Nope. That's correct. That was the offer that was conveyed, and it was rejected.

THE COURT: Okay.
Here is the other issue, I am in the middle of a med-mal trial which was supposed to end on Friday, and it is now quite apparent that it will
continue over into your week of trial. It is not going to finish this Friday.

Right now it is unknown to me how many days it will carry over. Certainly Monday is out of play, possibly Tuesday as well.

I would be shocked if it went past Tuesday, although we are behind, I don't think that we are that far behind, but $I$ can't be sure.

So, how many days of trial do you think you need?

MS. CANNIZZARO: Your Honor, I would need to say 10 to 12 witnesses.

4 to 5 days.
THE COURT: I mean, I hate to do this to you all, but $I$ think $I$ need to send you to overflow, because we took an extra day in jury selection, and we started with the witnesses Thursday and Eriday, and it is a med-mal case, and literally it is all day long for one witness, whether it be the doctor or the expert.

And even though we are only about a half a day behind right now, God only knows what these next few days will hold.

We only have half days for them until Friday of this week, so $I$ am going to send you to overflow.

If it resolves prior to that, no issue. And if there is either no Judge, or you want to come back, or, if we find out that our trial will only go over Monday, and $I$ can have you Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, I am happy to do that.

I would rather keep it, but $I$ don't know how to be sure that that would be the case until we go further in the week.

MS. CANNIZZARO: And that's fine, Your Honor. MR. HAUSER: We are good.

THE COURT: Okay.
So we are going to send you over to the overflow calendar on Friday.

But $I$ promise you this, prior to that appearance, if something changes in my calendar, and I can take the case back, I will do so, and we will keep it, and we will start you promptly on Tuesday.

But I won't know until we have another day or 2 of thistrial.

MS. CANNIZZARO: Of course.
THE CLERK: Department $10,8: 30$, February 7.
THE COURT: Mr. Shaygan just left, but apparently there is a discovery motion.

MR. HAUSER: Oh, there is.
Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: well, that would have been good for everyone to remind us as we were going through the thing.

MR. HAUSER: I completely forgot.

THE COURT: Sorry about that.
So generally with these we know, and we didn't see the opposition from the state, and f frow the State won't typically do a detailed opposition when it appears to be a preserve for appellate purposes.

This is Mr. Donko.

We are recalling Mr. Donko's matter.
Your counsel has filed a motion, as they styled it, to compel production of discovery and Brady material.

My understanding is that we are now at calendar call is that the State has turned over all of the evidence and discovery that it has, and that there isn't anything in particular that we know is outstanding.

But this a motion being filed, andfor the most part it is granted, although there is usually some caveats to what's requested, and what is appropriate to be granted.

And everybody is familiar with what this
final order looks like at the end of the day.
But is anything, Mr. Hauser or Mr. Shaygan, that is of particular concern that you believe is still outstanding that you are seeking to compel, or is this just one of those preserve our rights for appeal issues?

MR. HAUSER: At the time I drafted this there was, but $I$ have since gotten all of the evidence, so the answer is no.

THE COURT: Okay.
Ms. Cannizzaro, is there anything that you want to add?

MS. CANNIZZARO: Just briefly, Your Honor.
The discovery motion $I$ had actualy not received a copy of, which is why I had not responded to it.

I only saw it on this morning's calendar, so I can't speak as to whether or not there is anything else in particular that the state would object to.

Obviously we will comply with our discovery obligations.

Everything that $I$ have in my possession and that I am aware of that was within the Metropolitan Police Department's possession has been turned over to the defense.

They should have everything that $I$ have. I am happy to make sure, if defense would like, to do a file review.

But other than that, they should have copies of everything in this case.

I can't think of anything that is
outstanding at this point.
MR. HAUSER: I agree.
THE COURT: okay.
So what we are going to do, and just for the record, the request number up through, including 37 requests; and again, as we indicated, for the most part, these are granted, with the understanding that the state has provided the information that it has, that there isn't any belief that they believe that there is still anything that is outstanding that needs to be compelled, but it is sort of there in the record to be sure that everybody is on the same page and that that is the case.

Now, where we have a few caveats is as to request number 1,2 and 3 , to the extent they can be read as requiring any notes or work-product disclosures, that that is not going to be granted.

But, otherwise, of course, to the extent that the State is complying with NRS 174.235(A), and
handing over all witnesses and statements that it intends to call in its case in chief, and other information that would be implicated by those 3 requests, that would granted.

But the one area where it will be denied is to the extent that there are any notes being requested that might constitute work-product.

As far as the other requests, I am not sure that we had any others where we had to carve out some caveats.

Let me just make sure that $I$ am not missing something.

Otherwise, Mr. Hauser, I am going to direct you to please prepare the order.

The one that is styled number 20 , this is the law enforcement impeachment information that is styled as a Henthorn request, and a review of the personnel files of the officers involved, I have in the past done my grant and denied in part this way; grant to the extent that the state is required to reveal something that has to do with truthfulness, but deny any independent review of all personnel files.

If there is something in the personnel file, or something that the defense is actually aware of
that should be investigated or looked into, I don't see that referenced here.

But the court would do an in camera review of the personal file for that purpose.

But, otherwise, as a general request, it is typically only granted to the extent that there is something known in particular that needs to be disclosed.

I think that covers them all.
If you have any questions about the order, Mr. Hauser, just run it by us.

MR. HAUSER: Of course.
THE COURT: Thank you. Sorry for that confusion.
(Proceedings concluded.)




| extra $\{4: 16\}$ | ```judicial {1:3} jury (4:16) just {2:17){3:19}{5:22}{7:5) {7:13){8:10}(9:11)(10:11) justice (3:6)``` |
| :---: | :---: |
| F |  |
| familiar (6:25) |  |
| far (4:8) (9:8) february (1:14) (2:1) (5:21) | K |
| few (4:23) (8:20) | kambiz (1:22) |
| file (8:3) (9:24)(10:4) | kathleen $\{1: 1.3\}$ |
| filed (6:13) (6:21) | keep (5:6) (5:17) |
| files (9:18) (9:23) | know $\{5: 6)(5: 18)(6: 6\}(6: 7)\{6: 19)$ |
| final (2:22) (7:1) | known (10:7) |
| financially (11:15) | knows (4:22) |
| find fine (5:3) fin | L |
| finish (4:2\} | lab 13:9\% |
| firearm (3:3) | las $(7,1)(17.70)$ |
| for (1:19)(1:22) (2:24) (4:19) (4:24) (6:2) (5:9)(6:2:) | law (9:16) |
| (7:5) (8:10) (5:12) (10:4) (10:13) (11:9) | left $\{5: 7\rangle$ \} |
| foregoing (12:10\} | let (9:11) |
| forgery (3:9) | like (7:17) (7:1) (8:7) |
| forgot (6:4) | literally (4:18) |
| friday (3:25) (4:2)(4:17) (4:24) (5:5) (5:5) | long (4:19\} |
| from (3:7) (6:7) | looked (10:1) |
| further (5:8)(11:13) | looks (7:1) |
| G | M |
| general (10:5) | ```machine 117:17) made \{3:19\} make \(\{1: 17)(8: 7)\{9: 11\}\) many (4:3) (4:9) material \{6:15\} matter (6:17) mean (4:14) med-mal \((3: 24)(4: 18)\) metropolitan \((7: 23)\) middle \(\{3: 23\) ) right (9:7) missing \(\{9: 11\}\) monday \(\{1: 14\}(2: 1)(4: 4)(5: 5)\) morning \(\{2: 20\}\) thorning's \(\quad(7: 17)\) most \(\{6: 22\}\{8: 12\}\) motion \(\{5: 23\}(6: 13\}(6: 21)(7: 14\}\) tyyself \(\quad\{2: 19\}\)``` |
| generally (6:6) |  |
| get (2:23) |  |
| god (4:27) |  |
| going $(2: 8)(4: 2)\{4: 25)(5: 12)(6: 2)(8:: 0)(8: 23)(9:: 3)$ |  |
| gotten (7:8) |  |
| grant (9:19)(9:20) |  |
| granted (6:22)(6:24)(8:13) (8:23)(9:4)( 0 (0:6) |  |
| H |  |
| had (2:6) (2:7) (7:14) (7:15) (9:9) |  |
| half (4:21)(4:24) |  |
| handing (9:1) |  |
| happy (E:5) (6:2) |  |
| harth (3:2) |  |
| has (6:13) (6:17) (6:18) (7:24) (8: -4$\}(9: 2)$ ) |  |
| hate $(4: 14)$ |  |
| hauser (1:22) \{2:11) (2:14) (3:20) (5: - 0) (5:24) (6:4) (7:2) (7:7) (8:8) $(9: 13)(10: 11)(10: 12\}$ | N |
| have (2:19)(4:24)(5:4)(5:18) (6: - ) (7:8) (7:22) (8: -7 | ```need \(\{4: 10\}(4: 11\}(4: 15)\) needs (8:17) (10:7) negotiations (2:20) (3:12) nevada (1:3)(1:6) (2:1) (2:4) (2:25) (11:3) (11:9) (12:2) (12:20) next (4:22\} nicole (1:19\} nope \(\{3: 20\}\) nor \(\{11: 15\}\) not \((3: 15)(4: 1)(9: 15)(\%: 1 b)(\%: 18)(8: 23)(9: 9)(9: 11)\) (11:10)(11:13) notes (8:22) (9:6) \{12:12) now \((3: 26)(4: 3)(4: 22)(6: 16)(6: 20)\) nrs (s:2b) \{11:10) number \((8: 11)(3: 21)(9: 15)(11: 11\}\)``` |
| (8:4) (8:20) (5:18) (10:10) (11:10\} |  |
| henthorn $\{9: 17\}$ |  |
| here (3:23)(10:2) |  |
| hereby (11:9) \{12:9) |  |
| hold (4:23) |  |
| honor (2:10) (4:11) (6:9)(5:25) (\%:-3) |  |
| honorable \{1:13\} |  |
| how (4:3) (4:9) (2:6) |  |
| I |  |
| ```identity \(\{3: 8\}\) impeachment (9:16) implicated ( \(3: 3\) ) included (11:11) including (8:11) independent (9:22) indicated (8:12) information (8:14)(9:3)(9:16) intends (9:2) interested (ll:lう) into (4:1)(10:1) investigated \(\{10: 1\}\) involved (9:18)(11:14) isn't (6:19) (8:15) issue (3:23)(5:1) issues \{7:6\} its (9:2)``` |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 0 |
|  | ```object (i:19) obligations (i:21) obviously \(\{:, 20\}\) offer (2:18)(2:22)(3:16)(3:21) officers \(\{9: 18\}\) okay \(\{2: 12\}(3: 17\}(3: 22\}\{5: 11\}(7: 10\}\{8: 9\}\) one \(\{2: 6\}(4: 19\}(7: 5)\{9: 5\}\{9: 15\}\) only \((4: 21)(4: 22)(5: 24)(5: 3)(7: 17)(1 C: 6)\) opposition \(\{6: 7)(6: 8\}\) order \(\{7: 1\}\{9: 14\}\{10: 10\}\) original (12:12) other \(\{3: 23)(8: 4\}\{9: 2)(9: 8)\) others \(19: 9\), otherwise \((8: 24)(9: 13)(10: 5)\)``` |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| J |  |
| judge (5:2) |  |


| ```our {2:13)(5:3) {7:5)(7:20) out {2:7)(4:4)(5:3)(5:9)``` | S |
| :---: | :---: |
| outstanding (6:20)(7:4)(8:7)(9:16) | said $\{11: 14)(11: 15)(12: 12)$ |
| over (2:8)(4:1)(4:4)(5:4)(5:12)(6: -7) (7:24)(9:-) | same (8:18) (12:11) |
| overflow (4:15) (4:25) (5:13) | saw (7:17) |
| ownership \{3:3\} | say (4:12) |
| P | security (11:11) |
| page $\{8: 19\}$ | seeking 17:4) |
| part (3:12)(6:22) (8:13) (9:19) | selection (4:16) |
| particular (6:19)(7:3)(7:19)(10:7) | send $(4: 15)(4: 25)(5: 12)$ |
| party (11:14) | sentence ( $2: 24$ ) |
| past (4:6) (9:19) | shaygan $\{5: 22\}$ (7:2\} |
| pending (3:7) | shaygan-fatemi (1:22) (2:10) |
| person (3:4)(11:11)(11:15) | shaygan's 12:8) |
| personal (10:4) | shocked (4:6) |
| personnel (9:18) (9,22) (3:24) | shorthand (12:12) |
| Place (12:13) | should $\{8: 1\}(8: 4\}\{10: 1\}$ |
| Plaintiff (1:7) | signed $\{11: 18)(12: 16\}$ |
| Play (4:5) | since (7:8) |
| Plea (2:25) | social (11:11) |
| Please (9:14) | some $\{6: 23\}$ (9:10\} |
| point (3:11) (3:15) (8:7) | something $(5 ; 15)(9: 12)(9: 21)(9: 24)(9: 25)(10 ; 7)$ |
| Police (7:24) | sorry (6:5) $110: 13\}$ |
| possession (3:3)(3:8) (7:22) (7:24) | sort (8:17) |
| possibly (4:5) | speak (7:18) |
| Prepare (9:14) | start (5:17) |
| Preserve (6:9) (7:5) | started (4:17) |
| Prior (5:1) (5:14) | state (1:6) $(1: 19)(2: 4)(2: 15)(3: 10)(6: 7)(6: 8)(6: 17)$ |
| proceedings (1:15)(10:16)(12:10) production (6:14) | $(7: 19)(8: 14)(8: 25)(9: 20)(11: 3)(11: 9)(12: 2)$ |
| prohibited (3:4) | stepped 12:7) |
| Promise (5:14) | still (7:4\} \{ $8: 16\}$ |
| promptly \{ 5 :17) | stipulated $\{2: 24\}$ |
| provided (8:14) | styled $(5: 14)$ (9:15\} (9:17) |
| Public (1:23) | substantial $\{3: 2\}$ |
| purpose (10:4) | supposed (3:24) |
| Purposes \{6:10, | sure (4:8) (5:7)(8:2)(8:18) (9:8) (9:11) |
| pursuant (11:16) | T |
| $Q$ | take (5:16) |
| questions (16:10\} | taken (12:12) |
| quite $\{3: 25\}$ | talking $\{2: 19\}$ |
| R | $\begin{aligned} & \text { team } \quad\{2: 8\} \\ & \text { ted }\{1: 9\}(2: 4\} \end{aligned}$ |
| rather (5:6) | than (9:4) |
| read (8:22) | thank (10:13) |
| readiness (2:13) | that (3:7) (3:10) (3:11) (3:12) (3:16) \{3:15) (3:18) (3:20) |
| ready (2:14)(2:15) | (3:21) (3:25) (4:7) (4:8) (5:1) (5:3) (5:5) (5:7) (5: 14 ( $6: 1$ ) |
| recalling (6:12) | (6:5) $(6: 16)(6: 17)(6: 18)(6: 19)(7: 3)(7: 4\}(7: 11)(7: 19)$ |
| received \{ $1: 15\}$ | (\%:22) (::23) (8:1) (8:4) (8:6) (8:13) (8:14) (8:15) (8:16) |
| record $\{2: 1 \%$ (3:18) (8:11) (8:18) | $(8: 18)(8: 19)(8: 23)(8: 26)(9: 1)(9: 3)(9: 4)(9: 6)(9: 7)(9: 9)$ |
| referenced (10:2) | (9:11) (9:15) (9:16) (9:20) (9:21) (9:25) (10:1) (10:2) (10:4) |
| reflected $\{12: 11\}$ | (10:6)(10:\%)(10:9) (10:13) (11:10) (11:13) (12:10) (12:11) |
| rejected $\{3: 21\}$ | that's $\{3: 20\}\{5: 9\}$ |
| relative (11:13) | the $(1: 3)(1: 6)(1: 13)(1: 19)(1: 22)\{2: 5)(2: 11)(2: 12)$ |
| remember (3:8) | (2:15) (2:21) (2:22) (2:2b) (3:4) (3:10) (3:12) (3:15) (3:1才) |
| remind (6:2) | (3:21) (3:22) (3:23) (4:14) (4:17) (4:19) (4:20) (b: ?) (b:8) |
| reported \{1:25) (12:10) | (b:11) (b:12) (b:16) (b:21) (b:22) (6:1) (6:3) (6:5) (6:7) |
| reporter (11:9) (12:19) | (6:8) (6:1\% (6:18) (6:21) (\%:1) (\%:7) (\%:8) (\%:9) (\%:10) |
| reporter's (1:15)(11:1) | ( $(: 14)(\%: 19)(\%: 23)(6: 25)(8: 9)(8: 10)(8: 11)(8: 12)(8: 13)$ |
| request (8:11)(8:21)(9:1:)(10: $)$ | (8:14) (8:18) (8:19) (8:21) (8:24) (8:26) (9:5) (9:6) (9:8) |
| requested (6:23) (9:7) | (9:14)(9:15) (9:16) (9:17) (9:18) (9:19) (9:20) (9:24) (9:2b) |
| requests (8:12) (9:4)(9:8) | (10:3) (10:4) (10:6) (10:10\} (10:13) (11:9\} (11:11) (12:10) |
| required (9:20) | (12:11) |
| requiring (9:22) | them $\{4: 24\}\{10: 9\}$ |
| resolve (2:21) | there (3:6) $5: 2\}(5: 23)(5: 25)(6: 19\}\{6: 22\}(\%: 1)(1: 11)$ |
| resolves $\{5: 1$ \} | (7:18) (8:1b) (8:16) (8:1\%) $(9: 6)(9: 24)(10: 6)$ |
| responded (7:15) | these $(4: 22)(6: 6)(8: 13)$ |
| resulting $\{3: 2\}$ | they $\{6: 13)(8: 1)\{8: 4\}(8: 15)(8: 21)$ |
| reveal (9:21) | thing (6:3) |
| review (8:3)(9:17) (9:22)(10:3) | think (4:7)(4:9) ( $5: 15\}(8: 6)(10: 9)$ |
| right (4:3)(4:22) | this $\{2: 6\}\{2: 8\}\{2: 9\}\{2: 20\}\{2: 23)\{3: 11\}\{3: 14\}\{4: 2\}$ |
| rights (T:5) | $(4: 14)(4: 25)(5: 14)(5: 19)(6: 11)(6: 21)(6: 25)(7: 5)(7: 7)$ |
| robert (1:25)(11:9)(11:19)(11:20) (-2:9) (-2:-6) (-2:20) | (7:17) (8:5) (8:7) (9:15) (9:19)(11:12) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { robson }(1: 22\} \\ & \text { run }(3: 12)(10: 11) \end{aligned}$ | those (7:5) (9:3) <br> though $14: 21$ ) |


| ```through (6:2)(8:11) thursday (4:17)(5:5) time (2:9)(7:7)(12:13) took (4:16\} tran (1:1) transcript \{1:15\} trial (2:13)(3:24)(4:1)(4:9) (5:3) (5:-9) true (12:11) truthfulness (9:21\} trying \{2:11\} tuesday (4:5)(4:6)(5:4)(5:17) turned (6:17)(7:24) typically (6:8) (1C:6)``` |
| :---: |
| U |
| ```understanding (3:14)(6:16)(8:13) unknown (4:3) until (4;24) (5:7) (5:18) use (3:1) usually (6:27)``` |
| V |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { vegas }(2: 1)(12: 20) \\ & \text { versus }(2: 4) \end{aligned}$ |
| W |
| ```want \((3: 15)(5: 2)(7: 12)\) was (2:23) (2:24) (3:20) (3:21) (3:24)(7:8)(7:23) way \((9: 19)\) weapon (3:1) wednesclay (5:4) week (4:1) (4:25) (5:8) well (2:16) (4:5) (6:1) went (4:6) were (6:2) what (4:22)(6:23)(6:25)(8:10) what's (2:13) (6:23) when (6:9) where (8:20)(9:3)(9:9) whether (4:19)(7:18) which (2:22)(3:24)(7:15) why (7:15) will (2:10)(3:25)(4:4)(4:23)(5:3)(5:-6)(5:-7)(7:20) (9:5) willing \{3:1l\} with (2:11)(2:25) (3:1) (4:17) (6:6) (6:25) (7:20) (8: 3 . 3 ) (8:25) (9:21) within (7:23)(11:12) witness (4:19) witnesses \(\{4: 12)(4: 17)(9: 1\}\) won't (5:18) (6:8) work-product (8:22) (9:3) would \(\{2: 1 \%(3: 10)(3: 12)(3: 13)(4: 6)(4: 2-)(5: 6)(b: 7)\) (6:1) (: \(: 19\) ) (8:2) (9:3) (9:4) (10:3)``` |
| $Y$ |
| ```years {2:24} yes {5:2う) you (4:9)(4:15)(4:25)(5:2)(5:4)(5:こ2) (b:こ4) (匕:こ7) (?:3)(%:4)(%:11) (9:14) (10:10){10:13) your (2:10)(4:1)(4:11)(0:9)(5:25)(6:-3)(7:-3)``` |



Las Vegas, Nevada; Friday, December 20, 2020
[Hearing commenced at 12:51 p.m.]

THE COURT: Page 66. Tedd Donko, C345584.
MR. RICHARDS: Daren Richards, 5103 on behalf of Mr. Donko, who's present, in custody, Judge -

THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
MR. RICHARDS: -- this is a not guilty plea. We will be invoking time.

THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning or good afternoon, Mr. Donko. What is your true, full name, please?

THE DEFENDANT: Ted Michael Donko.
THE COURT: How old are you?
THE DEFENDANT: Thirty years old.
THE COURT: Did you receive a copy of the Information stating the charges against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma’am.
THE COURT: Did you review it and understand it?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma’am.
THE COURT: And are you waiving a formal reading of the charges?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: How do you plead to the charges?
THE DEFENDANT: Not guilty.
THE COURT: You have a right to a speedy trial within 60
days. It's my understanding you're invoking that right, correct?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: So your speedy trial date will be...
THE CLERK: Your calendar call is February $3^{\text {rd }}$ at 9:30.
THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. Happy holidays.
THE COURT: Hold on.
THE DEFENDANT: Trial date is February $10^{\text {th }}, 10: 30$,
Department 25.
THE COURT: And, Counsel, you have 21 days from today's date or the filing of transcripts to file any writs and I'll order Discovery and reciprocal to Discovery pursuant to statute and local rules.

MR. RICHARDS: Thanks, Judge.
THE COURT: Thank you. And then I show -- Let's see -THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.
[Hearing concluded at 12:52 p.m.]
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## STATE'S NOTICE OF MOTION

 AND MOTION TO ADDRESS AGGREGATE SENTENCE CALCULATIONSDATE OF HEARING:
TIME OF HEARING:
HEARING REQUESTED
COMES NOW, the State of Nevada, by STEVEN B. WOLFSON, Clark County District Attorney, through NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO, Chief Deputy District Attorney, and files this Notice Of Motion And Motion To Address Aggregate Sentence Calculations.

This Motion 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.

## NOTICE OF HEARING

YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the undersigned will bring the foregoing motion on for setting before the above entitled Court, in Department VI thereof, on the $\qquad$ day of June, 2020, at the hour of $\qquad$ o'clock AM/PM, or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard.

DATED this 3rd day of June, 2020.
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#001565

BY /s/ NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO
NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#11930

## POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

On or about May 20, 2020, the State of Nevada, by way of the District Attorney's Office, was sent a letter on behalf of the Nevada Department of Corrections seeking clarification on the aggregate sentence totals from the sentencing on the instant case. See, Letter from the State of Nevada Department of Corrections, dated May 20, 2020, attached hereto as "Exhibit l". Pursuant to the Judgment of Conviction, the total aggregate sentence is a minimum of one hundred forty-four (144) months to a maximum of three hundred seventyeight (378) months. However, the total aggregate sentence based upon the charges at sentencing reflect a total of a minimum of one hundred sixty-eight (168) months to a maximum of four hundred thirty-eight (438) months. The State calculated the same amount reflected by the Nevada Department of Corrections and is seeking clarification from this Court as to the
total aggregate sentence and a request to file an Amended Judgment of Conviction reflecting the correct aggregate sentence.

DATED this 3rd day of June, 2020.
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#001565

- BY /s/ NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO

NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar \#11930

## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC MAIL

I hereby certify that service of the foregoing, was made this 3rd day of June, 2020, by Electronic Mail to:

PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE E-mail Address: pdclerk@ClarkCountyNV.gov

/s/ Laura Mullinax
Secretary for the District $\wedge$ ttorney's Office

## EXHIBIT 1

> Northern Administration 5500 Snyder Ave.
> Carson City, NV 89701 (775) 887-3285

Southern Administration 3955 W. Russell Rd. Las Vegas, NV 89118 (702) 486-9938

State of Nevada
Department of Corrections

Steve Sisolak Governor

Charles Daniels Director

Shannon Moyle Offender Management Administrator

May 20, 2020

Clark County District Attorney's Office
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Re: NDOC \#1080899 DONKO, Ted
Criminal Case \# C-19-345584-1
Department: VI

Dear Sir/Madam:

The Nevada Department of Corrections has received a conflicting Judgment of Conviction in the above referenced case. We are unable to determine the proper sentence structure without additional or corrected information. Please review the information and advise us that the judgment will not be changed or forward a certified copy of the corrected judgment to:

Description of Discrepancy; The Judgment of Conviction reflects a possible error with the aggregated sentence totals. The JOC reflects the aggregate term of a minimum 144 months and a maximum of 378 months. The NDOC calculations reflects a minimum aggregate term of 168 months and a maximum aggregate term of 438 months. Please advise? Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Nevada Department of Corrections
Offender Management
P.O. Box 7011

Carson City, Nevada 89701
Attn: Michael G. Johnson

Thank you for your prompt attention in this matter.
Sincerely,
Michael G. Johnson / Administrative Assistant IV
(775) 977-5621

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY，NEVADA

必必必

State of Nevada
vs
Ted Donko

Case No．：C－19－345584－1

Department 6

## NOTICE OF HEARING

Please be advised that the State＇s Notice of Motion and Motion to Address Aggregate Sentence Calculations in the above－entitled matter is set for hearing as follows：
Date：June 15， 2020
Time：10：15 AM
Location：RJC Courtroom 10C
Regional Justice Center
200 Lewis Ave．
Las Vegas，NV 89101
NOTE：Under NEFCR $9(\mathrm{~d})$ ，if a party is not receiving electronic service through the Eighth Judicial District Court Electronic Filing System，the movant requesting a hearing must serve this notice on the party by traditional means．

STEVEN D．GRIERSON，CEO／Clerk of the Court

By：$\frac{\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{s} / \text { Kadira Beckom }}{\text { Deputy Clerk of the Court }}$

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that pursuant to Rule 9（b）of the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules a copy of this Notice of Hearing was electronically served to all registered users on this case in the Eighth Judicial District Court Electronic Filing System．

By：／s／Kadira Beckom
Deputy Clerk of the Court
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## DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
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VS.
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CHAD N. LEXIS, ESQ. LAURA ROSE GOODMAN, ESQ.
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ROBSON M. HAUSER, ESQ. KAMBIZ SHAYGAN-FATEMI, ESQ.
(Deputy Public Defenders)

RECORDED BY: DE'AWNA TAKAS, COURT RECORDER

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2020 [Proceeding commenced at 1:58 p.m.]
[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel.] THE COURT: All right. We are on the record in C-345584-1, State of Nevada versus Ted Michael -- do I pronounce it Donko?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Okay. He is present with both his attorneys, Mr. Shaygan and Mr. Hauser, Ms. Rose Goodman and Mr. Lexis on behalf of the State. The jury is outside lined up. And amended information has been filed today.

Mr. Lexis, you had showed that previously to Mr. Hauser and Mr. Shaygan; is that right?

MR. LEXIS: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything we need to take care outside the presence of the jury before I bring them in?

MR. LEXIS: No, ma'am.
MR. HAUSER: Nothing from the defense.
THE COURT: All right. Bring them in, please, Dean.
[Prospective jury panel convened at 1:59 p.m.]
THE COURT: Wonderful. Thank you.
Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. This is the time set for trial in Case Number C-345584-1, State of Nevada versus Ted Michael Donko. The record will reflect the defendant, Mr. Donko,
with both of his attorneys, Mr. Shaygan and Mr. Hauser, as well as both deputy district attorneys, Mr. Lexis, as well as Ms. Rose Goodman.

Both parties do stipulate to the prospective jury panel?
MR. HAUSER: Yes, Your Honor.
MS. GOODMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. LEXIS: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. And the parties are ready to proceed to trial?

MR. HAUSER: Yes.
MR. LEXIS: Yes, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, you are in Department 6 of the Eighth Judicial District Court. My name is Jacqueline Bluth, I'm the presiding judge in this department.

You have been called upon today to serve as a juror in a criminal case. The charges in this case are as follows:

Battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm;

Attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon;
Assault with a deadly weapon;
And discharging a firearm at or into an occupied structure vehicle, aircraft, or watercraft.

We expect this trial to last five to six days at the longest, which means it would carry us past the long weekend into the Tuesday. Our trials generally start in the afternoons, Monday,

Tuesday, and Wednesday, and then on Thursdays and Fridays, they begin at 9:00 a.m. I usually stop right at or near 5:00, because so many people have childcare issues after 5:00. So I try to make sure to conclude right at 5:00 to get you guys where you need to be. Ultimately, 14 of you will be selected in going forward with us as jurors and alternate jurors in this case.

As many of you know, in this country we place great faith in our citizens as jurors to reach fair and objective decisions. Part of what you're doing here is you are being good citizens for our country and community. Juror duty is a civic responsibility, like obeying laws, voting, and paying taxes. We appreciate the fact that you responded to the jury summons and showed up, willing to do this job. It's important what you are doing here, and I hope that you enjoy the experience as a juror and find it rewarding.

Even with all of that, I know that many of you are sitting here frustrated that you're here and that you have to be here, answer these questions, because I know that you have jobs, family members, other things that you need to be doing.

So l'd ask you to consider two things. Number one, think if you were involved in a case and if it was going to go in front of a jury, how important it would be to you to have 14 people of our community that could be fair and impartial to both sides. It's important to both sides that they find those individuals.

Second, you might get out of my jury in here, but that could mean that you would go back down to jury services and be
assigned to a different jury panel. In the last year or two, we have had juries selected for a year-long trial. So five or six days might seem long, but in the way of trials go, it's actually a rather short trial that we're going to be hearing in this case.

So we will not have a jury selected today. It will definitely not be selected until tomorrow. So at the very minimum, you will be here through tomorrow if you're not selected as a juror in this case.

So l'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to you my court staff. You have already met Officer O'Kelley, he's our marshal. His job is to maintain order and security in the courtroom. He's also my representative to the jury. Anything you need or any problems that you have during the course of this trial should be brought to his attention. However, please keep in mind that the marshal cannot talk to you about the case or answer any questions about your -- about this case.

So anything you -- if you need, if your pen runs out of ink or you need to use the restroom, any type of issues that you're having that you need to communicate to him or to me, just raise your hand and tell the marshal, and the marshal will communicate that to me. Just make sure you're not talking about the case, because he can't talk about the case and he can't answer any questions.

To my far left is my court recorder, Ms. Takas. She sees that everything we are talking about in trial is recorded. You used
to see court reporters, or you sometimes see court reporters on TV that sit in front of the judge and type out everything that you're saying. In most courtrooms now, everything that we're saying is recorded and then at a later time, it's transcribed and everything that we say is written down -- typed out, rather.

You'll also see court cameras within my courtroom. Please be aware that those are more for security measures and for keeping a record. You will never -- your faces will never be on camera or released to the public. So jurors are always serving -- । don't want to say in secret, right? Because it's a public proceeding. But your faces are never on any types of cameras.

On my immediate left is Keith Reed. He is my court clerk. He swears in witnesses, marks exhibits, and keeps track of evidence and prepares minutes of the court proceedings that are happening and puts those into the record.

From time to time you may also see my judicial executive assistant, Crystal Jacobs. She works in the back in our office and in chambers. She comes to and from the courtroom helping us make sure everything's running smoothly up front.

To my right is my intern, Ms. Huggins. She'll be here watching court. And then you'll also see another individual, another female who'll sit to my right by the name of Nicole. She is my law clerk. And so they help me throughout my calendars in the morning and watch and observe trial as well.

So now l'd like to take this opportunity for the State to
introduce to them -- introduce themselves. They are going to read a list of witnesses and give you a synopsis of their case, which will be very short. Also, please pay attention to the names on the list that they are going to read out loud, because in a moment l'm going to ask you if you recognize any of those names.

So with that, State?
MS. GOODMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
Good afternoon. My name is Laura Goodman and this is Chad Lexis, and we're the deputy district attorneys assigned to prosecute the State of Nevada versus Ted Donko.

In this case, Mr. Donko is charged with three counts of attempt murder with the use of deadly weapon, two counts of battery with the use of deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm, one count of assault with a deadly weapon, and one count of discharging into or at a structure.

In this case, the State's alleging on October 1st, 2019, Mr. Donko went to the location of 56 Linn Lane, where he discharged his firearm at the -- both the house and at three other individuals, which -- ultimately striking two of them.

Please listen to the following names, as the State intends to call some of these as witnesses.

Joseph Auilos; D. Alatorre, with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Joseph Alicastro; Cathryn All; Randall All; Daniel Alvarado; Brian Artis; Officer C. Beal; Officer J. Beatty; Nichola Biano; Officer Brian Boxler; Officer W. Bridges;

Officer Buencamino; Officer D. Callen; Officer J. Casper; Officer M. Casper; Officer Ceniza; Officer J. Close; Officer J. Corbett; Officer J. Cortez; Officer Raymond Cruz; Rodney Dixon; Officer Kimberly Dannenberger; Officer Keegan Doty; Fernando Espinoza; Eric Fenrich; Officer Jordan Fox; Officer Gadea; Officer Godfrey; Officer Grammas; Officer M. Hanning; Officer Casey Hausman; Officer Allen Hennig; Officer E. Hervis; Officer T. Ivie; Officer B. Jackson; Officer J. Jacobs; Officer Christina Jersey; Officer J. Jimenez; Officer Hunter Junge; Officer J. Keen; Officer Bernstein Kommel; Officer M. Krueger; Officer Alfredo Lara-Marquea; Gilbert, last name unknown; Officer C. Luna; Officer Marlon Magsaysay; Officer J. Marin; Edgar Miller; Officer M. Miramontes; Officer B. Moore; Officer J. Moss; Officer S. Murphy; Officer V. Noriega-Perez; Mark Patterson; Officer S. Perry, Officer Harrison Porter; Marco Rafalovich; Genaro Ramos-Grajeda; Officer Kevin Randy; Officer B. Rocha; Officer -- or l'm sorry -- Jonathan Sanchez-Loza; Mary Skelton; Officer S. Sowers; Officer J. Spurling; Officer E. Stafford, Officer Jeffrey Stuart; Officer Ashley Trail; Officer Christopher Valdez; Officer Bradley Van Pamel; Officer B. Walford; DeAndre Woods; Kathryn Aoyama; Stephanie Chen-Hunyh; Kellie Gauthier; Bradley Grover; Dr. Allison McNickle; Maeleen Morrison; Allison Rubino; Jennifer Strumillo; Amanda Wright.

And that is all from the State. Thank you.
THE COURT: Counsel for the defendant, will you please introduce yourselves and any witnesses you wish to call.

MR. HAUSER: Absolutely, Judge. Thank you very much. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Robson Hauser. This is my co-counsel, Kambi Shaygan. We represent Mr. Ted Donko. We don't have a whole lot of witnesses to call in this case. We look forward to establishing Ted Donko was not the person who committed the shooting, because the person who committed the shooting is a Mexican man with no tattoos, and not Mr. Donko.

The only additional witnesses -- addition to any the State might call would be Anna Nells [phonetic].

Thank you very much.
THE COURT: Thank you.
All right. So now ladies and gentlemen, I am going to do a roll call. Please just answer present or here when I call your name.
[Jury roll called.]
THE COURT: Is there anyone present whose name I did not call? Showing no response. All right.

So, ladies and gentlemen, what we're about to do is called voir dire. And this is the part of the case where the parties and their lawyers have the opportunity to get to know a little bit about you in order to help them come to their own conclusions about your ability to be fair and impartial to both sides, so that they can decide who they think would be the best jurors for this case. This process is done under oath, so will you all please stand and raise your right
hand so the clerk can administer the oath, please.
[Prospective jury panel sworn.]
THE COURT: All right. So let me talk to you a little bit about how the process goes. So first, l'll ask some general questions while you are seated in the spots that you are in. These questions will be directed to everyone in the jury box to my right, as well as those of you out in the crowd.

After those general questions, the focus of the questions will then turn just to the people, the 24 of you to my right. I will ask individual questions of those of you seated in the jury box to my right, and then each of the lawyers will have more specific questions that they will ask you.

Please know that the questions that you will be asked during this process are not intended to embarrass you or unnecessarily pry into your personal affairs. But they are important and it is important that the parties and their attorneys know enough about you to make this important decision for their case.

There are no right or wrong answers to the questions that will be asked of you. The only thing I ask if that you answer the questions as honestly and as completely as you can. You will -- you take an oath to answer all the questions truthfully and you must do so. Remaining silent when you have information you should disclose is a violation of the oath. If a juror violates this oath, it not only may result in having to try the case all over again, but also can result in penalties against the juror personally. So again, it is very
important that you be as honest and complete with your answers as possible.

If you don't understand the question, please ask for an explanation or clarification. At some point during the process of selecting a jury, the attorneys for both sides will have the right to ask that a particular person not serve as a juror. That is called a challenge.

There are two types of challenge. The first type of challenge is what's referred to as a challenge for cause. A challenge for cause is a request to excuse a juror because the juror might have a difficult time being fair and impartial in this particular case.

The second type of challenge is what's referred to as a peremptory challenge. A peremptory challenge means that a juror can be excused from duty without counsel having to give a reason for the excusal. In this case, each side will have five peremptory challenges.

Please do not be offended should you be excused by either of the challenging procedures. They are simply a part of the procedures designed to assist the parties and their attorneys to select a fair and impartial jury.

Once all of the challenges are exercised, we will have 14 qualified jurors remaining. Two of the 14 will be designated as alternates, and the 12 remaining jurors will deliberate in the case.

I'm now going to ask you some questions of the entire
group. If you wish to respond to a question, please raise your hand. When I get to you, please give your name and your badge number, so the last three digits of your badge number that's on the badge that you should be wearing.

Okay. So first question: Is there anyone who has a disability or a medical issue that might impact their ability to serve as a juror? A disability or a medical issue? Showing one hand.

Yes, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: I'm currently pregnant.
THE COURT: And what's your badge number?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: 794.
THE COURT: All right. So 794, Ms. Amanda Miller. Okay.
And how does that affect your ability to serve, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: I just don't know about my ability to be able to sit for long periods of time and I'll need lots of breaks. That's all.

THE COURT: Okay. And how far along are you?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: 27 weeks.
THE COURT: Perfect. Thank you.
Anyone else? One in the box, please.
And then if we could pass it to Juror Number 6, Badge Number 709, Douglas Haynes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Yes.
THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Haynes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: I'm pretty hard of
hearing.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: I couldn't hear hardly anything during the -- when I was sitting out there. But if I had some sort of device, I would be willing to serve.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
Would you get him the hearing things?
THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Just one second.
THE MARSHAL: It's going to be up against the wall, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right.
THE MARSHAL: Yeah, as soon as we get up there, that's getting out of the zone.

THE COURT: Let's see what we could do here. Why don't we move a chair down to this front row and leave that one empty, and I'll just -- we'll just -- that -- so I'm going to put a chair in the front row at the very end, and then that will be Juror Number 6.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: How's that? Does that work a little bit better?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Yeah. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Perfect. You're welcome.

All right. Anybody else with a medical reason? Yes, sir. Behind you, please, Marshal O'Kelley.

That would be Juror Number 3, Badge Number 596, Juan Valenzuela-Cardenas.

Yes, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 596: Excuse me. It's not a medical problem. I don't understand everything in English. I just speak around I think about 50 percent English. I don't understand 100 percent.

THE COURT: What do you do for work?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 596: I have a little company for tree trimmers, this is what they do.

THE COURT: What do they do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 596: Tree trimmer.
THE COURT: Tree trimmer. Got it. Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 596: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you. Yes.
And how long have you been in the United States, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 596: Oh, 14, 15 years.
THE COURT: Okay. And I think you already answered this, but out of 100 percent, how much, generally, do you understand in English? Do you understand 50 percent of what I'm saying? 75? What would you say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 596: I think around 60 percent.
THE COURT: 60 percent? 6-0?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 596: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Anyone else?
To your right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Taking medication for high blood pressure and a heart condition.

THE COURT: Okay. What is your name and your badge number?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: William Liu.
THE COURT: All right. William Liu is Juror Number 29, Badge Number 781. 781. Tell me -- say it again, your heart condition and what?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: I'm taking medication for a heart condition and high blood pressure.

THE COURT: Okay. And does that medication affect you in any way adversely?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: I'm not quite sure.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, how long have you been taking it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: For, like, six months.
THE COURT: Six months?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, have you -- do you have problems staying awake or understanding things?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: I'm okay.

THE COURT: You're okay?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: That's the only issue, I want to let you know, is I'm taking the medication for high blood pressure and the medication. Just want to make sure it's okay.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you for letting me know. I appreciate that, sir.

Anyone else?
Next we're going to go to Badge Number 8 -- excuse me, Juror Number 8, Badge Number 718, Audreen Connors.

Yes, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Yes. I also have high blood pressure, diabetes, I have heart issues.

THE COURT: So the only reason -- so I guess I should say if you have a medical condition, the only reason I need to know about it is if you feel like it would affect you in being able to sit as a juror. Do you feel like any of those things would affect you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: They will not affect me. Everything's under control and I really got a good advice from my doctor and he's taking care of me.

THE COURT: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you.
All right. Anyone else who has a medical condition that you feel like would affect you from being fair and impartial?

Yes, Mr. Trejo? Badge Number 245.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: I'm not sure if the -- I'm getting sick right now, so l'm not sure.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: I'm not sure about that.
Sorry.
THE COURT: That's okay. Okay. Thank you.
All right. Okay. Is there anyone here who has been convicted of a felony? By a showing of hands, if you've been convicted of a felony. Okay.

Is that Mr. Razo?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: I'm not sure if it is, domestic violence.

THE COURT: Well, was it a misdemeanor or was there jail time or prison time associated with it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Prison time.
THE COURT: Did you go to prison for it? Okay. And what year was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: 2006.
THE COURT: Okay. Do you know whether or not you've had your civil rights restored?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: No.
THE COURT: You don't know whether you have?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: No, I don't.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. And I just want to make sure it was prison. Do you know which prison it was? Where were
you housed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Here in Vegas.
THE COURT: At -- just at the Clark County Detention Center?

## PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So did you ever -- sorry for all these questions, I just have to make sure. How long were you in -- at the Clark County Detention Center for?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: A week.
THE COURT: A week? Okay. And then after that, after you were at -- it's called CCDC, after you were at CCDC, were you at -- did you ever go somewhere else in Nevada, like a different city?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: No.
THE COURT: Okay. So that was just -- that should just be a misdemeanor. So did you -- did -- afterwards, did you either -- did it get dismissed or did you have to plead and you had to do a bunch of counseling and classes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: I did counseling, domestic, you know, violence. I had to talk to a counselor.

THE COURT: Okay. So that was just a misdemeanor, then. Okay. But thank you for being honest, I appreciate that, sir.

Anyone else who's been convicted of a felony? Okay. All right.

All right. So like I stated, we anticipate the case to actually
be done this week. But in case we run overboard, I always like to give it an extra day. So Monday's a holiday, so that means we would probably go into Tuesday if, in fact, we didn't finish this week.

So I recognize that serving on a jury is almost always a personal hardship. And for that reason, just so you know, it can be a -- obviously, I recognize it can also be a financial hardship. But the Eight Judicial District Court does not recognize financial hardship as a reason to get out of jury duty.

So in a moment I'm going to ask you is there anyone who has a hardship that feels they will not be able to serve? So let me give you an example of hardships that usually are excusable. For instance, if you are a full-time student; if you have a trip where you either have a hotel or a plane ticket or a bus ticket to show me where you're going and that you'll be out of town when this trial -during this period of trial. So those are the types of things that are hardships that would -- that you would be excused from jury duty.

So is there anyone who has some of those things? All right. So let's start at top.

Mr. Lafia, Badge Number 438, yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 438: Yes, Your Honor. I'm an attorney and I have a deposition in Arizona that is noticed for Wednesday. I've brought a copy of that with me.

THE COURT: Wednesday this week?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 438: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And if you would just show that to my marshal, I appreciate it.

And then if you could just pass the mic down, Dean.
Name and badge number?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 727: Glynese Peralta, 727.
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 727: I'm a full-time nursing student.

THE COURT: Okay. And what days do you go to class?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 727: Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursdays --

THE COURT: And what are --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 727: -- at Arizona College of Nursing.

THE COURT: What are the hours?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 727: 5:00 to 9:00, and then 5:00 to 10:00 for lab.

THE COURT: Okay. Where is that at?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 727: Arizona College of
Nursing?
THE COURT: Yeah.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 727: It's by Chick-fil-A on Sahara.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 724: I'm Jacqueline

Hernandez, Badge Number 724. I'm a full-time student at CSN.
THE COURT: And what days and times are your classes?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 724: I go Monday through
Thursday. Mondays from, like, 4:00 to 10:00, Tuesdays from 4:00 to 6:00, same with Thursdays, and then Wednesdays from 8:00 to $10: 00$.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody else to my right raise their hand?
Front row, please. If you could pass the microphone to her.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 763: Emily Pachner, Badge Number 763. I work at a consulting firm and I actually have a client trip scheduled tomorrow through Thursday. So I'm going to be in Cincinnati.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 763: And I can show you the ticket and everything.

THE COURT: Yeah, if you wouldn't mind.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 763: Sure.
THE COURT: You can just show it to my marshal, he can confirm.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 763: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Anyone else in that row?
And then back behind, I saw one hand.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 796: Yeah, I be out for -- out of town for a month.

THE COURT: For a month?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 796: Yeah.
THE COURT: When are you leaving?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 796: I'm leaving on Thursday.
THE COURT: This Thursday?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 796: Yes.
THE COURT: And where are you going, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 796: I'm not going to China.
THE COURT: You're not going to China?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 796: No. I'm going --
THE COURT: Yeah, I know, l --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 796: I'm going back home to the Philippines.

THE COURT: That's the -- okay. Do you have proof of your ticket so I -- can you just show my marshal so he can confirm that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 796: Here's my --
THE COURT: And I apologize, tell me your name and badge number again?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 796: Rennee Abelon, 0796.
THE COURT: 0796. All right.
Anyone else that I missed? All right.
Attorneys meet me in the back, please. We'll be right
back.
[Off-record bench conference.]
THE COURT: All right. So if I call your name, if you could please pack up your stuff and go back down to the third floor and let them know you have been excused.

Badge Number 438, Michael Lafia; Badge Number 596, Juan Valenzuela-Cardenas; Badge Number 724, Jacqueline Hernandez; Badge Number 727, Glynese Peralta; Badge Number 763, Emily Pachner; Badge Number 796, Rennee Abelon.

All right. And then Mr. Reed, if you could please fill the seat, keeping in mind that Seat Number 6 we've actually -- we're going to keep vacant. All right. And if you could fill those seats, please.

THE CLERK: We're going to keep that one vacant?
THE COURT: Yeah.
THE CLERK: Meaning he's still there?
THE COURT: Yeah.
THE CLERK: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. Next in Seat Number 2 will be Badge Number 772, Jose Razo; Seat Number 3, Badge Number 777, Dailey Arias; Seat Number 11, Badge Number 778, Rafael Nevarez; Seat Number 12, Badge Number 781, William Liu.

THE COURT: Oh, wait.
THE CLERK: Sorry?
THE COURT: We skipped somebody. Are you guys --

THE CLERK: We excused 779.
THE COURT: What's your name, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Yandia.
THE COURT: What's your last name?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Arocha.
THE CLERK: 79. I'm sorry.
THE COURT: That's okay. All right.
So Yandia, you're next.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: All right.
THE COURT: And then Mr. Liu, right?
THE CLERK: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, come on up, Mr. Liu.
You'll be right here in the front. All right.
All right. So l'm going to continue on with questions for everybody.

Are any of you acquainted with me or of any of my court staff? Showing your hands. All right.

Sherry, raise your hand.
All right. If we could have the microphone, please. We're giving this to Ms. Tate, Badge Number 759.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Yes. Used to work here.
THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Know you from court.
THE COURT: Yes. So Ms. Tate used to work for the courts and many of us practiced in front of the judge she worked
for.
Am I the only one you know? Or do you know some of the attorneys as well?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Couple of people.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. So you know everybody?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Yeah.
THE COURT: Knowing so many of us, any reason why you can't be fair and impartial? Or for other reasons, do you feel like you can't be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: For other reasons.
THE COURT: All right. Everybody and Sherry approach. [Bench conference transcribed as follows.]

THE COURT: All right. So we're always on the record up here. We just have to -- especially since there's three males and, I mean, when Laura is talking, we don't need to -- she doesn't need to identify herself, but when one of the three of you is talking, make sure.

So, Sherry, if you wouldn't mind switching with Laura. And talk to me about what you feel.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: I just don't want to be here. I've been here long enough. I'm retired. I will be here in the court system no more.

THE COURT: But can you be fair?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: What's the -THE COURT: Huh?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: What -- no.
THE COURT: No?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: No, I can't lie. I know I could be fair if I had to.

THE COURT: You could be fair if you had to?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Yes. God. I can't lie.
THE COURT: All right. Anybody have any feelings about this? No? Okay. Great. Everybody go back to their seats then.

You're staying, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Oh, thanks.
[End of bench conference.]
THE COURT: Anybody else know myself or my court staff? Showing no response.

Are any of you acquainted with one another? Do you know each other? Showing no response.

Are any of you acquainted with Mr. Donko, the defendant, or any of his attorneys?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I have a question and it's probably irrelevant, but I have been nonstop looking at him since we got in here, because he looks so familiar, and I live off of Linn Lane and l've worked at Dotty's for, like, over 10 years.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm always there at Dotty's.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I knew I knew you. I think I know him.

THE COURT: Okay. What is your name and badge
number?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Gina Riendeau. It's -- I'm sorry, 7681.

THE COURT: 714. That's your ID number, but badge number --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Oh, I'm sorry.
THE COURT: That's okay. All right.
So -- all right. So you, just through your place of employment, you recognize the defendant; is that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Yes. Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. And is there anything about that that makes you feel like it would affect you on whether or not you could be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I don't think so. We deal with a lot of, I don't know how to say it, riffraff and we deal with a Iot of kind of criminal kind of stuff at work. So I don't know. I don't think so, but I know l've met him more than once.

THE COURT: Okay. Now -- but simply because Mr. Donko might frequent there, it doesn't mean in your mind you think he's riffraff or a criminal, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No. No.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Absolutely not.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No.

THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No.
THE COURT: I just wanted to make sure. Okay. Thank you, ma'am, for letting me know.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Okay.
THE COURT: Anyone else who has an answer to that question?

Do any of you know either of the deputy district attorneys? Showing no response.

Do any of you know the district attorney, Steve Wolfson, or any other individual that works at the district attorney's office? Showing no response.

Are any of you acquainted with any of the witnesses that were read by the State or by defense counsel? Showing no response.

Have any of you or anyone close to you ever worked in law enforcement? All right.

So let's start with Ms. Rinedeau again, please. Badge number --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: My niece's boss, Vegas Metro.

THE COURT: -- 714.
Okay. And what does she do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I mean, I don't know. She's a police officer.

THE COURT: Okay. But you don't know, like, what division or anything?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No, I do not.
THE COURT: Okay. That's all right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: All right.
THE COURT: How often would you say that you talk with her, if at all, about her actual work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: All the time. We're a very close family and it's usually all we talk about on Thanksgiving and stuff, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that relationship that makes you feel like it would affect whether or not you could be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I do not think so, no.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you so much.
Did I miss any other hands? All right. Let's go behind first.

Badge number, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: 777.
THE COURT: 777. All right. Ms. Arias, go ahead.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: I have a cousin named
Laura Perez. She's a parole officer. I'm not sure if that is involved.
THE COURT: Yeah, that's fine. Is that in Nevada?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. And how often do you talk to her
about her work?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: When I see her, maybe, like, once a month.

THE COURT: Is there anything about anything she's told you or about your relationship with her that makes you feel like you can't be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: No, I don't believe so.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
I saw another hand right up here. Oh.
THE MARSHAL: Did you raise your hand, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: I did.
THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Connors, right?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Yes.
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: My brother was a former police officer for Oceanside, California, as well as served as a sheriff's department for Vista, California.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: That was many years ago.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about anything your brother told you or about your relationship with your brother that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: No, we're good. He doesn't talk about his -- what he does at work. He never did.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Yeah.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Okay.
UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My sister-in-law's father was a chief of detectives. But I -- he's retired and we don't talk about that.

THE COURT: And you're Ms. Howell --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes.
THE COURT: -- Badge Number 719?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes, sorry.
THE COURT: All right. Tell me again your -- tell me the relationship again? Your --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: My sister-in-law's father.
THE COURT: Sister-in-law's father.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: John Sullivan.
THE COURT: Okay. And where was that at?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Here in Las Vegas.
THE COURT: All right. And was it Metro?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes.
THE COURT: Anything about that relationship that you feel like may infect you in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: No.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
And then if you could pass that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: 755.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wilks?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Talk to me about that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: My brother's in corrections in California.

THE COURT: Okay. As a CO?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes.
THE COURT: Anything about things that he's told you or about your relationship with your brother that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Any other hands I missed to my right? Oh.
Yes, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Badge Number 756. I have an uncle who's a retired Metro detective. I also have three neighbors who were in law enforcement, one highway patrol, two with Metro. And I also work with the sergeant in my area on a regular basis through work.

THE COURT: In what way? Can you tell me about that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: He -- I work with him on the emergency preparedness in our area.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. And emergency preparedness, is that through a church or through just general public safety?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: No, he's the officer in command of emergencies in our area.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Which coincides with my job.

THE COURT: Which is?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: I work for a power company.

THE COURT: Oh, wonderful. Okay. Thank you so much.
Anything about those relationships or the working relationship that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: No.
THE COURT: Thank you. If you wouldn't mind passing it all the way back.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: Badge 729, Rebecca Ricu. So just my uncle. He's a retired detective in Columbus, Ohio.

THE COURT: All right. Anything about your relationship that makes you feel like you wouldn't be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: No.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Anyone else to my right?
Anybody back there? Yes, one hand? Okay. Thank you. Is that Mr. Borbhetti?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 811: Badge Number 811.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 811: My father is a New York City police officer, retired. And my brother-in-law is a captain, he's got 26 years.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, he's a captain what?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 811: Scotch Plains, New Jersey.

THE COURT: All right. Anything about those relationships that makes you feel like you would not be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 811: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Any hands that I missed? All right.
I know you were given such little information about the case. So this question sometimes is hard to answer with such little information, but that's all we can really give you at this point in time. But is there anybody who thinks that they may know something about this case, have heard something about this case before coming here today? Showing no response.

All right. Does anyone have any philosophical, religious, or other beliefs that prevent them from serving as an impartial juror? Any types of beliefs that makes you feel like you cannot serve as a juror? Showing no response.

Oh, I'm sorry, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: I filled --

THE COURT: Just one second. Let me wait for the mic. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: That's okay. And give me your name and badge number, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Gazmir Markja, 060760.
THE COURT: All right. Give me the last three of your badge.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: 760.
THE COURT: 760?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Sorry. All right. Go ahead.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Yeah, I feel personally in my heart, like, I don't want to be somebody to put somebody else on the line on that critical case or any reason, just because depend on wherever information we get from witness from both parties --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: -- I feel like I do have three kids, and I kind of -- I feel, like, unfair to make that judgment to make that decision. Because since we talking right now, I know people, they are innocent and they are locked up in jail for their life.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: And I feel like I'm not -- I don't trust much human. I do trust more electronics, camera stuff, than human being.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me ask you a few follow-up
questions, okay?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Correct.
THE COURT: So as a juror, sometimes it helps individuals who express what you're saying right now to know that it's not just you by yourself when you get back there, right? It's you and 11 other people. So you're making that decision collectively. So that's one thing that I want to talk about.

And the second thing is, and this is important for everybody, is that a juror's job only deals with, Hey, has the State proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed these crimes? If they have, then the jury comes back with a guilty verdict. But the jury never deals with sentencing, what the punishment should be; that's always up to the judge. So I want to make sure that that's clear, as well.

Do either of those two things make you feel any better or you still feel the same?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: I feel the same. I just don't trust -- I don't feel like based on information we'll get here, it will be everything correct. So I just don't feel correct, don't feel -don't -- I don't feel that person to make that decision, somebody else life, on information we get in here.

THE COURT: Okay. So, basically, what you're saying is, is it doesn't really matter what the State brought in, you would have feel uncomfortable and you --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Correct.

THE COURT: -- wouldn't be able to --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Correct.
THE COURT: -- to render a decision.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Correct. I can -- I'm not going to be able to make decision based on information that are here.

THE COURT: So I guess what does -- what information would you need, then?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: So, like, I don't trust human. Just like I said, it's now people locked up all their life on their own on the prison, and they are innocent.

THE COURT: So --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: And we know. So I kind of -- based on that, I don't feel right I to make that decision based on circumstances, whatever information we got in here.

THE COURT: So what -- and I'm not talking about this case, but let's take it out of this case.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: In general.
THE COURT: Like, in a case, if there were cameras and it was caught on camera and you had DNA and things like that, are you still saying that you can't be a juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: If everything -- yes.
Everything in camera. I believe more, I trust more in camera than human.

THE COURT: So unless the case is -- someone is caught
doing something on camera, you would never find them guilty? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: If -- I believe more on that.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Than on human. Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you for your answers.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 760: Yep.
THE COURT: Anybody else? Any other types of religious, philosophical, any of those types of beliefs that make you feel that you cannot be fair and impartial or you cannot sit in judgment of another? Showing no response. All right.

Have you ever been in a situation where you felt like -- we call them negative contacts with law enforcement. So have you ever been in a situation where you felt like you weren't treated with the dignity and respect in which you deserve to be treated? So let's say you get pulled over for a traffic ticket and you felt like you weren't treated the way you should have been treated by a police officer? Or maybe you were in a store and you weren't doing anything wrong and you were stopped by security, and they thought you were stealing something? Something like that, basically, where you leave interactions with a law enforcement officer where you feel like you weren't treated the way that you should have been treated as a citizen within our community? Anybody have any answers to that?

Yes, sir.

This is Mr. Cooper, Badge Number 756.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: 756.
THE COURT: Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: I have a brother that was shot and killed by the highway patrol. And I was very unhappy with the process that occurred and the follow-up to that. But I have no problems with the law enforcement people that I know now or the process. It's just that one situation.

THE COURT: How long ago was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: About 10 years ago.
THE COURT: I'm sorry. Was that here locally?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: It was in Overton.
THE COURT: In Overton. Okay. Did that change your way you viewed law enforcement globally?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything about that situation you feel may impact you here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: No.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.
Any other answers to that question in regards to feeling like you -- yes, ma'am?

To your right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: I used to work as an investigator for the public defender in D.C.

THE COURT: And, sorry, what's your name and badge
number?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: Oh, sorry.
THE COURT: That's okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: Amanda Miller, it's 794.
THE COURT: 794.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: And there were a couple of instances during that experience in which, because of my role as -- with the public defender's office, there were instances where cops would not share public information with me for any other things, not available --

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: -- that should have been.
THE COURT: And how long did you work in that position?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: It was a summer position, so it was about three or four months of 2010, 2011, something like that.

THE COURT: Okay. Did that change the way you viewed law enforcement globally?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: It made me aware that there could be some issues with certain officers, but I would say it didn't change my overall respect for officers in general.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you recall like officers are like any other profession where we have good apples and bad apples?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: Yes.
THE COURT: Do you feel like that may affect you in any
way in being a juror on this case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 794: No, I don't think so.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Any other answers in regards to that? Negative contacts with law enforcement where you felt you weren't treated fairly. All right. Showing no response -- no further response.

Okay. Are there -- State and Defense, are there any witnesses that would require a Spanish interpreter in this case?

MS. GOODMAN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. So the next set of questions are going to be just to those of you on my right, but I can guarantee you some of you sitting back there will be the next to come up here, so I would definitely be listening so we don't have to go from the very beginning with all these. All right?

So in my department and in most departments within the Eighth Judicial District Court, jurors are actually allowed to ask questions of the witnesses. So how it happens is the attorneys will ask questions first, and then once they are done asking questions, I'll turn to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury and I'll ask if you have any questions for this witness.

The trick to it is, is you'll each have a notepad and a pen. And so let's say you write out a question. You will write out your question, you need to sign it and give your juror badge number, and then my marshal will bring it to me and the attorneys will approach.

The interesting thing about juror questions is that they are subject to the same types of rules as other lawyers' questions. So some of those questions, because of the rules of evidence, I may not be able to ask the witness. And it's not anything that you did wrong, I mean, you shouldn't know the rules of evidence, right? But let's say there's a hearsay objection or something like that, I cannot ask the question and so the question will not be asked of the witness.

So what I need to make sure it that when you guys ask these questions and they can't be asked, I don't want you to hold it against one party or the other party because you think they're hiding something from you. It's simply because the rules do not allow it.

Is there anybody who would have a hard time understanding that or trusting that in the process? Showing no response.

Under our system, certain principles apply in every criminal trial. They are, number one, that the charging document filed in this case is merely an accusation and is not in evidence of any way of guilt; that the defendant is presumed innocent; and that the State must prove that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Does anyone have any issues with those three principles of our criminal justice system? Okay.

Is there anyone who would have trouble following the
instructions on the law that I give you regardless of whether or not you agree with that law? As jurors, you will take an oath to follow the law, even if you disagree with the law. Is there anyone who would have issues following the law even if they disagreed with it? Showing no response. All right.

So now we are going to go to -- I'm going to have some individual questions to ask you. So let's start with Mr. Trejo, please.

The marshal's going to bring you the mic.
How long have you lived in Clark County, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Since I was born.
THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: 1999.
THE COURT: All right. And how far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: To high school.
THE COURT: Are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yeah.
THE COURT: What do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Desert Plastering, when I clean outside of the house, when the cements are dried on the roof, on the age of it.

THE COURT: Okay. And are you married, in a significant relationship, or single?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Single.
THE COURT: Do you have any children?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: No.
THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been accused of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever served as a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything about the nature of this case that you've heard already that makes you feel like you would not be able to be fair and impartial on both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: No.
THE COURT: Can you base your verdict solely on the evidence that's presented during the trial and wait in forming an opinion until the matter is given to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes, I think.
THE COURT: Okay. When you -- do you have reservations about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Like you're saying, but only on shows on proof, that's what l'm saying. Only --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, say it again?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: It's only shows as proof and evidence that he or -- he's committed?

THE COURT: Yeah. So, basically, you can't -- let's say
you hear something about this case outside of the courtroom. So, number one, you'd have to report that to the marshal, and number two, you can't consider it. So the only things that you can consider as evidence in this case is things that actually happen in here. So witnesses who testify, evidence that is received, things like that.

You have to base your verdict solely on those things; do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes.
THE COURT: And do you feel comfortable with that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes.
THE COURT: And then can you wait in forming your ultimate decision until the end of the case, and you're back with your fellow jurors and discussing it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you.
And, lastly, can you be fair to both sides?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Wonderful. Thank you so much.
Would you mind passing it, please, to Mr. Razo?
All right. Mr. Razo, tell me your badge number again.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: 772.
THE COURT: 772, wonderful. Thank you.
How long have you been in Clark County, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: 34 years.
THE COURT: How far did you go in school?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Before bachelor's degree, what is the other one?

THE COURT: Associate's?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. And what was your associate's in?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Hotel and casino management.

THE COURT: Okay. And are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Yes.
THE COURT: What is it that you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: I'm a bartender.
THE COURT: All right. And how long have you been bartending?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: 14 years.
THE COURT: Are you married, single, or in a significant --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Married.
THE COURT: Married? And what does your spouse do? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: She's a cashier in the cage.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: At a casino.
THE COURT: And do the two of you have any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: We are in the process of adopting her granddaughter.

THE COURT: Okay. And how old is the granddaughter?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Two years.
THE COURT: You and anyone close to you, have you ever been a victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Myself.
THE COURT: All right. Can you tell me a little bit about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: More than a year ago, I got beat up by three guys inside my garage. I'm still waiting to go to the court.

THE COURT: Did you know them?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: No, I did not.
THE COURT: All right. So it was completely random?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: No. I do believe my niece, who was very mad at me, because she's involved with the gangs and drugs and I found out she was doing all that stuff while she was living with me.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: So I ask her to leave the house. She got mad at me, and one day these three guys showed up, they tried to open the front door, but I changed the locks. And I usually go see my sister on Sundays around 12:00 noon or 1:00, and that's when they showed up.

THE COURT: How bad were your injuries?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: I had a few stitches on my head. This scar. Since then I don't feel right, I feel dizzy at
times. I think my chemical balance is out of sync.
THE COURT: Did you call the police immediately?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Yes, I did.
THE COURT: All right. And did they respond?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: They did.
THE COURT: How do you feel like they dealt with the situation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: They did good.
THE COURT: And you said that it's currently awaiting trial.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Yes.
THE COURT: Is that here in the Clark County District Attorney's Office?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Yes, it is.
THE COURT: Now, obviously, these attorneys right here work for the Clark County District Attorney's Office. Because they work for the DA's office, are you going to automatically side with them just because other attorneys are helping you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: I think so.
THE COURT: Okay. And why do you think that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Because I am extremely angry of what happened to me and they caught one of the guys.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: And I know the guy. He should -- they should not be a trial, but they are -- the State is trying
to help him. Help him to get out of jail with all this stuff. I know he did it.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Okay. And he should not be trial. He should just be put in jail.

THE COURT: Sure. But you understand that that's a completely different case than what we're here for today, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: Yes.
THE COURT: So I guess what I'm trying to clarify is are you -- you're going to automatically side with what the State does just because of your case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 772: I believe so.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.
And then if you could pass that onto Ms. Arias, right?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: Badge Number 777. All right, ma'am. So let's go back with you.

How long have you been in Clark County?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Ever since I was born.
THE COURT: Okay. And how far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: I'm currently in college.
THE COURT: All right. And are you a full-time student?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: I mean, I don't -- not -- | only go to class, like, in person twice a week.

THE COURT: What days are those?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Monday and Wednesday.
THE COURT: And what times?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: 2:00 to 3:30.
THE COURT: Okay. And what are you studying?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: I'm studying criminal justice.

THE COURT: Okay. And what do you -- what would you like to do with that degree?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: I plan on being an investigator.

THE COURT: In what way?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: I'm not 100 percent sure yet.

THE COURT: Okay. Like, when you say investigator, like a police officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: Is that a yes?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Now, are you married or in a significant relationship?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: No, I'm currently single.
THE COURT: And do you have any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: No.
THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been charged or accused with a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: I've only had a family member accused of domestic violence.

THE COURT: Okay. When was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Two years ago.
THE COURT: Was that here in Las Vegas?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Yes.
THE COURT: And were the police called?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: I believe so.
THE COURT: And do you have personal knowledge of what happened or you just know that someone was arrested?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: I just know someone was arrested.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that situation that you feel may affect you whether or not you could be fair here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: No.
THE COURT: Do you have any thoughts one way or the other about how the police did in that investigation, how the prosecutors treated it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else who's been accused of a crime that you're close to?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: No.

THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about the nature of this case and anything you've heard thus far that makes you feel like you would not be able to be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: No.
THE COURT: And can you base your verdict solely on the evidence that's presented in this case and wait in forming your final opinion until the case is submitted to you to deliberate with your -submitted to you to deliberate with your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Yes.
THE COURT: And can you be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 777: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, I appreciate that.
If you could pass the microphone.
Ma'am, give me your name and badge number again, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: Briana Barin, and Badge Number 0691.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Ms. Barin, how long have you been in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: About 11, 12 years.
THE COURT: All right. And where were you before Las

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: Long Beach, California. THE COURT: And how long were you in Long Beach for? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: About 12 years. THE COURT: Okay. And how far did you go in school? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: Bachelor's degree. THE COURT: And what did you study?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: Biological sciences. THE COURT: Are you employed?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: I have a paid internship at UMC.

THE COURT: Okay. And what -- tell me about what you do there.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: It's in the pediatric department. Basically, just, like, comfort them, kind of shadow doctors, stuff like that.

THE COURT: And the internship is through what program? Like, are you in school or?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: It's kind of by UMC. It's, like, five minutes away. It's through One Stop Career Center.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. Are you married or in a significant relationship?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: No.
THE COURT: And do you have any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: No.
THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you ever been
the victim of a crime?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: No.
THE COURT: You or any close to you ever been accused of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever served as a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything about the nature of this case or anything you've heard thus far that makes you feel like you would not be able to be fair to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Can you base your verdict solely on the evidence that you see and hear in the courtroom and wait in forming your opinion until this matter is submitted to you to discuss with your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: Yeah.
THE COURT: And can you be fair to both sides of this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 691: Yeah.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I appreciate that.
Name and badge number, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Tim Usher, 702.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Usher, how long have you been in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Coming up on five years.

THE COURT: Okay. Where were you before Las Vegas? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Tampa, Florida.

THE COURT: And how long were you in Tampa, Florida, for?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Three years.
THE COURT: Okay. And then before that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: North Carolina.
THE COURT: And how long there?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Four years.
THE COURT: All right. So I'm supposed to establish about 10 years, so I think we're there. Why do you move around so much?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: I went to college in North Carolina, then got a job in Florida.

THE COURT: Okay. And the moved to Vegas why?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: For work.
THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Got another job.
THE COURT: And how far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Bachelor's degree.
THE COURT: And what was your degree in?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Geology.
THE COURT: And tell me what you do for work?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: I am a construction
inspector.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you married or in a significant relationship?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: I will be getting married in two months.

THE COURT: Okay. Congratulations.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Thank you.
THE COURT: Do you have any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: No.
THE COURT: Are you -- you or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a serious crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been charged or accused with a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever served as a juror before? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Yes.

THE COURT: Can you tell me what year and where that was?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: That was summer of 2005
in --
THE COURT: So where were you then?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: California.
THE COURT: Was it a criminal or civil trial? Were the fighting over money or --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: It was -- I believe it was a
criminal trial.
THE COURT: All right. And without telling me what the verdict was, did you guys reach a verdict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Yes.
THE COURT: And were you the foreperson?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: No.
THE COURT: Any other times or just that once?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Just that once.
THE COURT: All right. Anything about that jury -previous juror service that you feel, like, would affect you here in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about the nature of the case or anything you've heard thus far that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: No.
THE COURT: And can you base your verdict solely on the evidence presented during this trial and wait in forming your final opinion until the case is submitted to you and you have opportunity to discuss it with your other fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Yes.
THE COURT: And you believe you can be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 702: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. I appreciate that.

All right. Let me find -- all right. Ms. Riendeau, Badge Number 714. No? Where's the -- oh, yeah, you're right. Sorry, I forgot about you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Doug Haynes, 709.
THE COURT: Thank you. Good thing my marshal --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Thanks for the headphones.

THE COURT: Good thing my marshal knows what's going on. Okay.

All right. Sir, how long have you lived in Clark County?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: 15 years.
THE COURT: All right. And how far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Three semesters of
college.
THE COURT: And what were you studying?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Building construction and technology.

THE COURT: Are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: No.
THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: I'm retired 10 years.
THE COURT: Okay. And what are you retired from?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: The carpenters union.
THE COURT: Wonderful. Are you married or in a significant relationship?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: I'm in a significant relationship.

THE COURT: And do you have any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: I have three children, eight grandchildren, two great-grandchildren.

THE COURT: Oh, wow. The --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: I'm bragging.
THE COURT: The three children, I'm assuming that they're adults.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Yes.
THE COURT: What do they do for work?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: My son works for the
Department of Defense. My daughter is a nurse in northern California. And my youngest daughter is a banker in Milwaukee.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. And the individual that you're in a significant relationship, does that person work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: No, she's retired as well.
THE COURT: And what did she do when she wasn't retired?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: She worked for the school system in California.

THE COURT: Okay. You or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: I'm been very fortunate. No.

THE COURT: Good. You or anyone close to you ever been accused or charged with a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything about the nature of this case or anything you've heard thus far that makes you feel like you would not be able to be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: No.
THE COURT: Can you wait in forming your opinion until the matter is ultimately given to you and your fellow jurors to discuss?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Yes.
THE COURT: And can you base your verdict solely on the evidence that's presented here in the courtroom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Yes.
THE COURT: And you can be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 709: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. I appreciate that.
All right. Ms. Riendeau, okay, here we are.
How long have you been in Clark County, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: About 29 years.
THE COURT: Okay. And how far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I did not graduate. I was
on my own when I was 14.
THE COURT: Okay. And then you've stated that you're employed at Dotty's; is that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I am, yes.
THE COURT: And how long have you been doing that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Over 10 years.
THE COURT: And are you married or in a significant relationship?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I am divorced.
THE COURT: And what did your spouse do when you were married?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: He's in the Air Force.
THE COURT: Okay. Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I have two adult daughters, they're both in the military and full-time students.

THE COURT: Okay. In regards to the question about being a victim, you or anyone close to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I was a victim of domestic violence. Not my ex-husband, but the father of my daughters. I did put him in jail.

THE COURT: The domestic violence, was that a one-time occurrence or something that happened quite often -- not often, but more than once, I guess I should say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: It only happened once. Once is too many.

THE COURT: Yeah, I agree. Did you -- you, obviously, called the police, then?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Yes.
THE COURT: And how did you feel they handled that situation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I mean, I was just glad they took him away, then I left him, so.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Yeah.
THE COURT: But did it work its way through the system? Like, did you have to go to court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I did not.
THE COURT: Did he?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No, he did a very short jail stay.

THE COURT: Do you feel like that was handled properly by the prosecutors, if you have any opinions one way or the other?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Oh, no. Everything worked out fine, you know. Yeah.

THE COURT: Anything about that situation that you feel may affect you or impact you here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Absolutely not.
THE COURT: All right. Any other incidents where you or anyone close to you has been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No.

THE COURT: Okay. In regards to -- you've stated that you'd been on your own since you were 14?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Yes.
THE COURT: Was that as a result of being victimized in any way or?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No. It's a very long story that, you know, clearly we don't have time for.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: But my parents left us when I was 14.

THE COURT: Were you the oldest?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: The youngest.
THE COURT: You were the youngest? Okay. So then your siblings kind of took over?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I had my own apartment and a full-time job in a casino when I was 15.

THE COURT: Okay. You or anyone close to you ever been charged with a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: No one in my side of the family. Sorry, I don't mean to be emotional, because I never talk about it.

THE COURT: No, I'm sorry.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: It's okay. Nobody in my side of the family, but -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: That's okay.
Dean, could we have some tissues, please?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Sorry. It's just a sore subject, but --

THE COURT: Don't say -- don't say you're sorry.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: We never really talk
about -- okay.
There's no criminals on my side of the family, but the father of my daughters, his family's just full of criminals. Like, they were in the Dirty Dozen and all kinds -- l've seen a lot of crimes.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about them or some of the things that you saw make you feel like it would impact you here in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I do not think so. I do have a lot of empathy for people, for sure.

THE COURT: Okay. And did you hear what I was saying in regards to the gentleman earlier about, you know, it's not just on your -- it's not just you, it's a collective decision by you and your fellow jurors and not if the defendant were found guilty, sentencing is always up to the judge. The jury has nothing to do with that. So does that make you feel a little bit more comfortable about the role of a juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I feel comfortable with it, I believe.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I am okay with it.
THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Okay.
THE COURT: Thank you. All right.
Let's turn the -- actually, no. You know what, I'm sorry.
There's a few other things that I --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Oh. Okay.
THE COURT: I can't let you off the hook yet.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Okay.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I was called for jury duty once, but I did not serve.

THE COURT: All right. And anything about the nature of this case or anything we've talked about so far or that you've heard so far that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: I do not believe so. This happened, like, right down the street from my house.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: But no.
THE COURT: Can you base your verdict solely upon the evidence that is presented today -- or, sorry, solely on the evidence that's presented throughout the trial and wait in forming your
opinion until the matter is submitted?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. And you can be fair to both sides?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 714: Absolutely, yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Let's pass it to Ms. Connors, Badge Number 718.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Hi, ma'am. How are you?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Okay.
THE COURT: How long have you been in Clark County? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: 12 years.

THE COURT: All right. And how far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Graduated high school.
THE COURT: And are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: I am retired, six months
now.
THE COURT: And what are you retired from?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: I worked in the warehouse as a stock pick trainer. And as a union representative for my union.

THE COURT: And I'm -- what union was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: SCIU, local 7-Eleven manufacturing.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
And are you married or in a significant relationship?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Married going on 21 years.

THE COURT: Congratulations.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Thank you.
THE COURT: What did your spouse do, if they worked or when they worked?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: My husband is currently a general engineer with Palace Station. Prior to us coming here, he worked for the San Diego local county union plumber-pipefitter union.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any children? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: I have three grown children.

THE COURT: And what do they do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Well, two are housewives, and one -- I believe she's, like, a -- what do they call those people that come after you because your credit's bad? Well, anyway, that's what she does.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: That's what she does.
THE COURT: Okay. That's good. All right.
So you or anyone close to you been the victim of a crime?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Yes.
THE COURT: Tell me about that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: I myself was a victim of a
crime.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: In the first marriage.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: So it was in the '70s, to give you respect -- project the setting for that, was that this is a time where abuse was not a thing that women -- you know, they had very little for women and children. So the -- I was just fortunate that it was, you know, it went through and the courts believed me, but not before, through the course of the abuse and the violence, that him and I were brought up on charges of I want to say defrauding the welfare government, because we were on welfare at the time.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: So at that time you have to sign certain things if you're on aid. I don't know what it is today, but back then, that's what you had to do. So it required his signature and mine, and he would beat me to force me to sign to fraud the government.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Because he was working on the side and you're supposed to report all that.

THE COURT: Got it.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: So, yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that situation
that you feel like would impact you in any way here?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Oh, no. That is the reason why I advocate for domestic women, I was homeless behind it with two kids. So I advocate -- I am an advocate for shelters, so I could -- I am very much involved with all of that, so it doesn't happen to anybody else.

THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.
Anyone else that's close to you that's been a victim in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: No. But my uncle was charged with -- I want to say assault. He did something that was really bad. He spent eight years in a state Oahu prison.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you know anything about that? Or it would -- would it affect you in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: No.
THE COURT: All right. Have you ever been a juror before?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: I was called but never served.

THE COURT: All right. And is there anything about the nature of this case or anything you've heard thus far that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: No, I would absolutely be fair.

THE COURT: All right. And can you base your verdict
solely on the evidence that is presented here in the courtroom and wait in forming your opinion until the matter is submitted to you to discuss with your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: I absolutely would.
THE COURT: And you can be fair to both sides?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: You can be fair to both sides?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 718: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I appreciate that.
Ms. Howell, Badge Number 719. How long have you been in Clark County, ma'am?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: I'm from here. I went away to graduate school, and l've been back about 30 years.

THE COURT: All right. And so you went to graduate school?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes.
THE COURT: And what was that in?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Sculpture and drawing.
THE COURT: All right. And are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes.
THE COURT: What do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: I'm a cultural programmer for Nevada Humanities.

THE COURT: And are you married, in a serious relationship?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Single.
THE COURT: And do you have any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Just house burglaries.
THE COURT: And were -- was that here in Las Vegas?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes.
THE COURT: And when you -- you said burglaries, so how many times would you say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Oh, a couple of times over the course of, you know, long -- many years.

THE COURT: Have -- each time, have you reported it to police?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes.
THE COURT: How do you feel like that was handled?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Well, the last time we never actually saw a policeman, so --

THE COURT: They didn't come at all?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: No, they sent -- just sent someone with a paper that we filled out.

THE COURT: Okay. How do you feel like those were handled?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Okay. When it didn't -we didn't have anything the burglars wanted, so we lucked out.

THE COURT: Do you feel like that affected, though, your view of how police conduct investigations, the fact that they just sent someone with the paperwork, or anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: I think it made -- I think regular -- feel like maybe regular citizens might be a little more vulnerable. Just didn't -- because of our city's -- so much demand on our law enforcement.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: I mean, it wasn't -- and we didn't pursue it because it wasn't, you know, bad. Just had to fix the door and pick up some boxes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. You or anyone close to you ever been accused of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: I have a nephew right now with a case pending.

THE COURT: Is that here?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. And what type of case it is?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: I know it's a felony case, but I don't know the circumstances --

THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: -- totally.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that -- do you have any feelings about how the police handled $i t$, how the prosecutors are handling it, how the defense attorneys are handling
it; anything like that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: I don't know any of those particulars. It just kind of happened. So I don't know anything.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you ever been a juror before? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: I've been called, but not selected.

THE COURT: And is there anything about this case that you've heard thus far or the nature of this case that makes you feel like it -- you wouldn't be able to be fair to either side or both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: No.
THE COURT: All right. And can you base your verdict solely on the evidence that is presented in the courtroom and wait in forming your opinion until the case is submitted to you to discuss with your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes.
THE COURT: And you believe you can be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 719: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I appreciate that.
All right. Ma'am, your name and badge number?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Cheryl Kovacs, 723.
THE COURT: Thank you. How long have you been in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: 28 years.
THE COURT: And how far did you go in school?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Bachelor of science degree in medical technology.

THE COURT: Are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Yes.
THE COURT: And what do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: I work in molecular pathology at Aurora Diagnostics LMC Pathology.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you married, single, significant relationship?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Married.
THE COURT: And what does your spouse do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Currently, he's training to be a pilot.

THE COURT: Okay. What did he do before he --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: He was a medical technologist also, and he worked for about a year at our church in building maintenance.

THE COURT: Okay. Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: One.
THE COURT: And is that child an adult or a minor?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Minor.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been
charged with a crime?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Yes.
THE COURT: Tell me when and where?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Here in Clark County, I
don't remember how long ago it was.
THE COURT: All right. Are we talking, like, older than a decade ago?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: I believe so, yeah.
THE COURT: All right. Was it a criminal or civil trial?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Criminal.
THE COURT: Without telling me the verdict, was a verdict reached?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: No.
THE COURT: All right. Was there a mistrial or the parties negotiated?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Mistrial.
THE COURT: And how far into the process were you before the mistrial was granted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: It was a hung jury.
THE COURT: Okay. So it was a hung jury at the end of it?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Yeah.
THE COURT: Got it. Were you the foreperson?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that process that would affect you in any way here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: No.
THE COURT: Anything about the nature of the case or is there anything you've heard this far that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: No.
THE COURT: And can you wait in forming your opinion and only base that opinion on the evidence that's presented in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. And you can be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 723: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Name and badge number, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: 778, Rafael Nevarez.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Nevarez.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: [Indiscernible].
THE COURT: Tilt it towards your mouth.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Okay.
THE COURT: Now try.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Can you hear me? Fine so far?

THE COURT: No. Did you hit -- did he -- is the light on?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I think it might have died. THE COURT: You think it might have died?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Here we go.
THE COURT: There you go.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: It's 778. I don't know what's up with it.

THE COURT: Will you look at it for a second, Dean?
[Pause in proceedings.]
THE COURT: Let's give that a try. Nope. All right.
THE MARSHAL: Need a new battery.
THE COURT: All right. That's okay. So, you know what, I was going to take a recess right after Ms. -- what's your --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Arocha?
THE COURT: Arocha. So we will just take that now.
So during the recess, you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves with -- or with anyone -- sorry.

Among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected to this trial, or read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial of any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, to newspapers, television, the Internet, and radio, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

So you could just be out of these doors at 3:40, please.
[Prospective jury panel recessed at 3:26 p.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anybody you guys want to talk about thus far?

I don't know how Mr. -- let me get to him.
MR. LEXIS: Number 760, Judge.
THE COURT: Yeah. How -- Mr. Gazmir. I was trying to kind of understand where he was coming from, but --

MR. SHAYGAN-FATEMI: Is he the one that doesn't trust humans, Your Honor?

MR. HAUSER: Yes.
MR. LEXIS: Yes.
THE COURT: He doesn't trust humans. That's a good way --

MR. LEXIS: I'd ask to kick him, Judge.
THE COURT: What's your position?
MR. SHAYGAN-FATEMI: We'll submit it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. I think he laid a pretty thorough record in regards to first he felt it was unfair -- personally can't judge unfair to make judgment, people, he knows a lot of people that are innocent and are locked away, and he doesn't trust humans. So I'm going to grant the State's motion in regards to Badge Number 760. And we'll need to fill in that seat.

Was there anyone else that missed?
MS. GOODMAN: And, Your Honor, the only other one that the State's a little concerned about is $714, \mathrm{Ms}$. Riendeau. The fact that she knows the -- she recognizes the defendant, she lives in
the neighborhood, I believe would possibly potentially impair her ability. I understand she hasn't vocally raised that, but I haven't been -- and, Your Honor, and to be honest, I have no clue how that works, when you recognize and you know the defendant, whether or not they're able to serve on the jury.

THE COURT: I mean, I think as long as they can be fair and impartial, that's fine. The only thing I worry about a little bit is things that she might spurt out. She makes me a little -- I'm happy to do whatever you guys want me to do. But --

MR. SHAYGAN-FATEMI: We -- Your Honor, I don't see a reason for kicking her at this point. There is one that we do have a concern with.

THE COURT: All right. So l'll let both sides talk to Ms. Riendeau.

And who are you talking -- who was your issue?
MR. SHAYGAN-FATEMI: Your Honor, it's Badge Number 772, Jose Razo. He's sitting at the top there in Seat Number 2. He said that no one should have a trial and that he's going to side with the DA.

THE COURT: Yeah, I think that's pretty -- what he said.
MR. LEXIS: I was going to ask him some questions, Judge.

THE COURT: Yeah, I mean, always allow the opportunity for a traverse. I'll allow both sides. So I'll let him go, but I do think he laid a pretty good record in regards to that the would
automatically vote with you guys. But I'm happy to have you ask him a few questions.

MR. LEXIS: Okay.
MR. SHAYGAN-FATEMI: That's fine, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Sounds good. So l'll see you guys in about 10 minutes. Okay?

MR. SHAYGAN-FATEMI: Thank you.
MR. LEXIS: Thanks, Judge.
MS. GOODMAN: Thanks, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Yeah.
[Court recessed at 3:30 p.m., until 3:43 p.m.]
[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel.]
THE COURT: All right. You guys, we are back on the record in C-345584-1, State of Nevada versus Ted Michael Donko, seeing parties and attorneys present. Marshal O'Kelley is just -- I believe they're lined up. It looked like he was coming in, so sorry. [Pause in proceedings.]
[Prospective jury panel reconvened at 3:44 p.m.]
THE COURT: Do the parties stipulate to the presence of the prospective jury?

MR. LEXIS: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. SHAYGAN-FATEMI: Yes.
MR. HAUSER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. All right.

So we were at you, I think, Mr. Nevarez, right? Badge Number 778?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yes.
THE COURT: Do you have the mic yet? Nope. All right.
I think we've got the situation under control. Good. All right.

Mr. Nevarez, how long have you lived in Clark County, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Since 1999, so 29 years.
THE COURT: Okay. Hold it just a little bit further. Now we've got a lot going on. That's all right. It's a happy medium.

Okay. How far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I have an associate's.
THE COURT: What's your associate's in?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Automotive technology and sheet metal fabrication.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you currently employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yes.
THE COURT: What do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I'm a tattooer now.
THE COURT: A tattoo artist?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. How long have you been doing that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I've been in it for five years.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you in a significant relationship or married?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yes, seven years.
THE COURT: For which one?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Significant relationship.
THE COURT: All right. And what does that person do for work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: We're both tattooers.
THE COURT: All right. Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: No. Three dogs.
THE COURT: Three dogs? Have you ever been the victim of a crime or anyone close to you been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yes.
THE COURT: Tell me about that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: It's been multiple occasions. I just --

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: It's -- I mean, what do you really consider a crime?

THE COURT: I guess anything against the law.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I've been jumped before, I've been shot at, lot of stuff. I mean --

THE COURT: Okay. So just start with the most recent and we'll just work backwards.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I've been jumped.

THE COURT: All right. Tell me when was that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: It was around, I think, 2011.

THE COURT: And that was here?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yes, it was here.
THE COURT: And was it random?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yeah, I got jumped for my money out of Bank of America.

THE COURT: Oh, all right. So you were -- were you robbed, then?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yeah.
THE COURT: All right. Were there any weapons?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Hands.
THE COURT: Were -- was anyone caught?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: No.
THE COURT: Did you call 911?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: No.
THE COURT: You didn't? Why didn't you call 911?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: It's part of the show, being alive, I guess.

THE COURT: Just -- say it again?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: It's just part of being alive. Stuff happens.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. What about the time you were shot at?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I think that was just a random thing at a skate park.

THE COURT: Okay. When was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Maybe 2008.
THE COURT: And were there other people there and, like, the gun went off? Or tell me a little bit about it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: It was a drive-by at a skate park.

THE COURT: Okay. Were you the only one there or were there a bunch of kids around?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: There was a bunch of people.

THE COURT: Were the police called that time that you know of?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I don't know.
THE COURT: What -- any other things come to mind?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: [No audible response.]
THE COURT: Were you ever the victim of a crime and police were called that you remember?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Not that I can think of.
THE COURT: Okay. Are there any other incidents that come to your mind that I should know about in regards to you being a victim or anyone close to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Not that I think would be -- make me impartial to anything or beneficial to you or to
anyone else.
THE COURT: Okay. What about being accused of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: When I was younger, I got pulled over for being accused of doing graffiti. But that was -nothing happened.

THE COURT: Okay. Once the police pulled you over, do you feel like they treated you fairly or not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I think that's a matter of perspective.

THE COURT: Well, what's your perspective?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: No.
THE COURT: That they didn't treat you fairly?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. Why do you feel that way?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Because I was walking down the street.

THE COURT: Uh-huh. And how did that situation end? Like did --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: It ended fine. They patted me down and I left. They just kind of left me more confused than anything. I was a young kid.

THE COURT: Like, why was I stopped?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. Any other situations you can think of?

You or anyone close to you?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I got a lot of stuff in my family, but nothing -- more or less, my brother's been in and out of trouble his whole life, so I kind of seen it through his problems.

THE COURT: Okay. Are his problems more drug-related?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yeah.
THE COURT: And is he older or younger?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: He's my older brother.
THE COURT: And would you -- do you feel like you know a lot about the situations where he has gotten in trouble or you just know, hey, he got in trouble?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: I don't know that I would say that I know too much about each particular situation. It's just a culmination of things that he went through.

THE COURT: In general, how would you feel like the court systems have treated -- the court system has treated him or law enforcement has treated him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Fairly. At the end of it all, I guess, I would say fairly.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you've seen your brother go through that makes you feel like it would affect you here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: No.
THE COURT: Anything else you feel like the parties should know in regards to those issues?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: No.
THE COURT: All right. Have you ever been a juror before?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: No.
THE COURT: Anything about the facts of this case or that nature of this case that you've heard thus far that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: No.
THE COURT: And can you wait in forming your opinion until the case is finally submitted to you and your fellow jurors after the case is done?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yes.
THE COURT: And can you base your opinion solely on the evidence and testimony that's presented in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Yes.
THE COURT: And you believe you can be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 778: Of course.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Nevarez. I appreciate that.

All right. Ms. Arocha, Badge Number 779.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Yes. Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. How long have you been in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: I've been here for close to two and a half years.

THE COURT: Where were you before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: I was in Miami.
THE COURT: And how long in Miami?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Three years.
THE COURT: And before Miami?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: In Cuba.
THE COURT: All right. And what brought you from Miami to Las Vegas?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: The hospitality industry.
THE COURT: Did -- how far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: I went to complete college in Cuba for hospitality industry for four years.

THE COURT: All right. And are you employed now?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Yes.
THE COURT: What do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: I work front desk agent lead at the Palazzo Hotel.

THE COURT: And are you in a married, serious relationship, single?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Significant relationship.
THE COURT: What does that person do for work?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: He works also in hospitality industry at the Mirage.

THE COURT: Do you have any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: No children.
THE COURT: Have you ever been the victim of a crime or anyone close to you been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Myself.
THE COURT: Okay. Can you tell me about that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: I was sexually abused when I was 12 years old.

THE COURT: And was that a one-time thing or reoccurring thing?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: It was, like, twice.
THE COURT: And was that by a family member?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: It was by my neighbor.
THE COURT: And how did it end up stopping?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Because I guess that I got [indiscernible]. He start, like emotional blackmailing me that he will harm my family, my dad, my mom. And then one day I say, You will not do none of that. So I told my mom what was going on. And we went to the police, we report it. And they took him away until the trial happened. And he took literally two weeks, they gave him 20 years in prison, because I was not the only kid that he was abusing.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: He was also abusing other kids in the same neighborhood.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Yeah.
THE COURT: How do you feel that that matter was handled by both law enforcement as well as the criminal justice system in Cuba?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: It was well handled, it was well investigated. They took their time. But they did what they had to do. And they put him on the place that he had to be.

THE COURT: Do you feel like there's anything about that that would affect you here in this trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Not at all.
THE COURT: All right. Any other situations where you or anyone close to you has been a victim?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: No.
THE COURT: What about accused of a crime, you or anyone close to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Never.
THE COURT: Can you base your verdict solely on the things that you hear and see in the courtroom as part of this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Yes.
THE COURT: And can you wait in forming your opinion until the case is over and submitted to you to discuss with your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Absolutely.
THE COURT: And you can be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 779: Of course.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I appreciate that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: Badge 729, Rebecca Ricu.
THE COURT: Thank you. How long have you been in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: Since '04.
THE COURT: All right. And are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: Yes.
THE COURT: What do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: I'm a homeowners claims adjuster.

THE COURT: And married, significant relationship, single?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: Married.
THE COURT: What does your spouse do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: He works for a company that decontaminates water at the casinos and hospitals.

THE COURT: Okay. Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: No.
THE COURT: And you or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: No.

THE COURT: Oh, same question, but in regards to accused or charged with a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: Yes.

THE COURT: Tell me about that; what year and when?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: That was a long time ago.
It was in the '90s when I lived in Florida in Osceola County. It was child abuse.

THE COURT: And without telling me what the verdict was, was a verdict reached?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: Yes.
THE COURT: And were you the foreperson?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything about your previous jury service that makes you feel like it would affect you here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: No.
THE COURT: Anything that you've heard thus far or anything about the nature of this case that makes you feel like you would not be able to be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: No.
THE COURT: Can you base your verdict solely on the evidence that is presented in this case and wait in forming your decision until the matter is ultimately submitted to you to discuss with your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. And you could be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 729: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you. Appreciate that.
Is it Mr. Luvera?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: Mr. Mena-Luvera.
THE COURT: Mr. Mena --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: Badge Number 733.
THE COURT: Thank you.
How long have you been in Clark County, sir?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: I have been here since |
was 5. And I'm 29 now.
THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: So 24 years.
THE COURT: Okay. And how far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: I have a Bachelor's of
Science in computer science.
THE COURT: Are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: Yes.
THE COURT: What do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: I am a programmer analyst for Caesar's Entertainment.

THE COURT: Married, significant relationship, single?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: Married as of November.

THE COURT: Congratulations. Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been charged with a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: I have been called for service, but not selected.

THE COURT: Is there anything about the nature of this case or anything you've heard this far that makes you feel like you would not be able to be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: I can be fair to both sides.
THE COURT: And can you wait in forming your opinion and only base your verdict solely on the things that you hear and see in this courtroom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: Yes.
THE COURT: You can be fair, like you stated?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 733: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Can you pass that onto -- is it Ms. Bermudez?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. How long have you been -- lived in

Clark County, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: About 20 years.
THE COURT: And are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Yes.
THE COURT: Well, first I should ask you how far you went in school?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Bachelor's degree.
THE COURT: And what was that in?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Interior design.
THE COURT: And you are employed, what do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Project engineer for construction company.

THE COURT: And are you married, in a significant relationship, or single?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Significant relationship.
THE COURT: And what does that person do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Photographer.
THE COURT: Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever been the victim of a crime or has anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: No.
THE COURT: Same type of question, but in regards to accused of a crime.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: No.

THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: No.

THE COURT: Can you wait in basing your opinion until the matter is ultimately submitted to you to discuss with your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Yes.
THE COURT: And can you only base your verdict solely on the things that you hear and see as evidence and witnesses in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Yes.
THE COURT: And you believe you can be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 747: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I appreciate that. And if you could pass that to -- is it Ms. Sweeney? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, ma'am.
How long have you lived in Clark County?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: 23 years.
THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: Associate's.
THE COURT: And what was your associate's in?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: Ultrasound.
THE COURT: And are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: Yes.

THE COURT: What is it that you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: I'm an echocardiographer at St. Rose.

THE COURT: And married or in a significant relationship?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: Relationship.
THE COURT: And what does that individual do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: CPA.
THE COURT: Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: No.
THE COURT: Ever been the victim of a crime or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: No.
THE COURT: What about accused of a crime?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: No.
THE COURT: Ever been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything about the nature of this case or anything you've heard this far that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: No.
THE COURT: And can you wait in forming your opinion until the case is ultimately submitted to you to discuss with your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: Yes.
THE COURT: And can you base your verdict solely on the
things that you hear and see as evidence through either exhibits or trial testimony, et cetera, and base your verdict solely on those things?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: Yes.
THE COURT: And you can be fair to both sides?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 752: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Wilks?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. How long have you been in Clark County, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: 14 years.
THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: High school graduate.
THE COURT: And are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes, gaming --
THE COURT: What --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Gaming industry.
THE COURT: Gaming industry? Married, significant relationship, or single?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Married.
THE COURT: And what does your spouse do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Gaming industry.
THE COURT: Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Three.

THE COURT: And are they minors or adults?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: One adult. And she's a pharmacy tech.

THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes.
THE COURT: Can you tell me about that, please?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yeah. Without going into detail, it doesn't affect my judgment on anything.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Would you do me a favor, would you approach, please? Would you come to me with the attorneys.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yep.
[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
THE COURT: All right. Let me just ask you a few follow-up. When you were -- when this happened, how old were you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: 30.
THE COURT: Oh, 30? Oh. Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: And it didn't happen to me. Happened to my brother.

THE COURT: Your brother. Is the [indiscernible]?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: Is he alive?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I didn't know if he was -PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yeah, so it was multiple. My brother and my cousin. My cousin's not alive and my brother is.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: And it was in California.
THE COURT: All right. So it was, like, a murder and attempt murder?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Uh-huh. Two different occasions.

THE COURT: Two different? And then your cousin was murdered?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: And then your brother survived?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: He was paralyzed.
THE COURT: Is paralyzed. Okay. Were these random or is there -- were they living in a bad part of town? Was it gang activity? Like, how --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: I believe my brother's is random and my cousin's was gang activity.

THE COURT: Okay. Were you a part of either of those trials, anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: [No audible response.]
THE COURT: Do you feel like it was investigated fairly by law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes.
THE COURT: Do you feel like the prosecutors involved, the defense attorneys acted very appropriately and did what they were supposed to do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Anything about it -- I know you stated already that you didn't feel like it would impact you, but it's important that I understand that it won't. And it's okay if it does, I just need to know what your -- do you feel like it would impact you in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: No.
THE COURT: All right. Does anybody have any follow-up questions in regard to that? Because I don't want him to have to talk about it in front of the group.

MR. LEXIS: Chad Lexis for the State. No.
THE COURT: Nothing from the defense?
Thank you, I appreciate it.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Absolutely. Thank you, Judge.
[End of bench conference.]
THE COURT: Mr. Wilks, anyone close to you or yourself ever been accused of a crime, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes, myself. Domestic violence.

THE COURT: All right. And when was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: 2000.
THE COURT: And -- sorry, in 2000 were you living here or -- no --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: It was California.
THE COURT: California. All right.
How do you feel like the law enforcement treated you throughout that process?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: It was unfair.
THE COURT: Unfair?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: I don't think that I should have been arrested. I was in the confines of my own apartment and just due to the fact that she was the one who made the phone call, I was the one arrested. I think overall it made me a better person. You know, I went to domestic violence classes and I learned that I had decision-making issues, not anger management issues. So it was unfair initially just due to the fact that I was arrested. But ultimately it taught me a lesson.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that situation you feel like would affect you here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: No.
THE COURT: Did it change the way you viewed law enforcement globally, since you felt like, hey, that wasn't really that fair, how I was treated?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Any other incidents where you or
anyone close to you has been accused?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Have you ever been a juror before? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about the facts of this case or anything you've heard this far that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: No.
THE COURT: And can you base your verdict solely on the evidence that's presented in this case and wait in forming your opinion until the case goes to you and your fellow jurors to decide? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes.

THE COURT: Feel like you can be fair to both sides? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 755: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Wilks. I appreciate that.

If you could pass it to Mr. Cooper, Badge Number 756. Good afternoon, sir. How long have you been in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: I've lived in Clark County my whole life, 60 years. I've been away for just two short instances.

THE COURT: Okay. And how far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Fifth year senior in college.

THE COURT: All right. And what were you studying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Engineering. I started off in criminal justice and then finished up in engineering.

THE COURT: All right. And we talked a little bit about your employment. But tell me again, give me just a --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: I'm the general manager, CEO of a power company.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you married, significant relationship, or single?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Married 37 years.
THE COURT: Congratulations. Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Four adult children.
THE COURT: And can you tell me what they do for a living, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: One's a schoolteacher, one is a administrative assistant, I have a son that's an attorney that works in tax and business law, and then I have a son that's also an account, CPA.

THE COURT: Your son that's is -- he -- that is an attorney, is he an attorney locally here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. You or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Yes.
THE COURT: Can you tell me about that, please.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: When I was younger, a
man from Las Vegas came out to our valley and tried to force his way into our home.

THE COURT: Out in Overton?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Yes.
THE COURT: And what -- well, you said tried. So what prevented --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: My dad intercepted him.
THE COURT: Okay. Were the police called?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Yes, they were. They got there just in time to save the guy.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you feel like that was handled appropriately by law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Yes, it was.
THE COURT: And what about -- was there a law -- I mean, excuse me, was there a case? Was he arrested and --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: He was arrested. I don't -- I was in, you know, middle school at the time, so I'm not aware of if there was a case that my parents had to go to.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that that you feel would impact you here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: No.
THE COURT: Any other incidents where you've been a victim or anyone close to you has been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: You know, at work I encounter a lot of different things. Things like power theft, copper
theft. We've had trucks stolen from where I work. But other than that, nothing.

THE COURT: Okay. What about accused of a crime? You or anyone close to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: No. I talked about my brother earlier. He was accused of a crime as well, before the incident. But that's it.

THE COURT: All right. Do you feel like your brother, through his situation, was treated fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Yes.
THE COURT: Anything about that that you feel would affect you in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything about the case or anything that you've heard thus far that makes you feel like you would not be able to be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: I've heard nothing about it, so l could be fair.

THE COURT: Okay. And can you base your verdict solely on the evidence that is presented to you here in the courtroom and then wait in forming your opinion until the case is given to you and your fellow jurors to deliberate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Yes.

THE COURT: And you believe you can be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Appreciate
it.
All right. Ms. Tate, Badge Number 759. How long have you been in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 756: 36 years.
THE COURT: All right. And retired, correct?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Yes.
THE COURT: And I just want everyone to know, Ms. Tate, when I was a baby attorney, would yell at me all of the time. All of the time. But she taught me to be a better lawyer, so.

So I know what you did for a living. Are you married, significant --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Yes.
THE COURT: What does your spouse to?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Medical assistant.
THE COURT: Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Stepchildren.
THE COURT: Okay. What -- if any of them are adults, what are their jobs?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Oh, they're in California.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. And in regards to -- how far did you go in school?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: 13.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been accused of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: No.
THE COURT: Every been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: I want to say yes, but it was so long ago, and if it was, it was a civil trial.

THE COURT: All right. But not sure really?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: No, I'm not. It was so long ago.

THE COURT: Anything about the nature of this case or anything you've heard thus far that you feel would make it difficult for you to sit as a juror or be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: No.
THE COURT: And can you wait in forming your opinion until the case is submitted to you to discuss with the other jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Yes.
THE COURT: And can you base your verdict solely on the evidence and testimony that's presented during the trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Yes.
THE COURT: And you can be fair to both sides?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 759: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Mr. -- if you could pass it to Mr. Marshal.

All right. So if you wouldn't mind passing that to -passing it onto the person next to you, please.

And that's you, Mr. Liu, correct?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Yeah.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Liu, are you -- how long have you been in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Six years.
THE COURT: And where were you before that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Dallas, Texas.
THE COURT: And how long were you in Dallas?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: 20 years.
THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: College courses.
THE COURT: And what did you study in college?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Languages and literature.
THE COURT: Are you employed? Oh, we talked --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Self-employ.
THE COURT: Self-employed. What do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: I own a company.
THE COURT: What type of --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: A publication company.
THE COURT: All right. Are you married, in a significant relationship, or single?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Single.
THE COURT: Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Daughter and granddaughter.

THE COURT: All right. And your daughter, what does she do for a living?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: CPA.
THE COURT: Have you ever been the victim of a crime or anyone close to you been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: I, myself.
THE COURT: Okay. Tell me about that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: About 20 years ago, I was battery, assaulted, and robbed.

THE COURT: Robbed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Robbed and assaulted.
THE COURT: Okay. And where was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: In California.
THE COURT: In California?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Yeah.
THE COURT: Was the -- were the suspects caught? Or the suspect, were they caught?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: I call the police. The police officer just give me a case number.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Then after that
[indiscernible].
THE COURT: So how do you feel like that handled by law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: They handled nothing. They just give me a case number.

THE COURT: Okay. In regards to -- did that change the way that you felt about law enforcement? Did it change your views?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: No, it didn't have -- more than 20 years, too long time already. If you did ask me, l almost have forgotten about it.

THE COURT: Okay. Any other instances where you or anyone close to you has been the victim?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: No.
THE COURT: What about accused of a crime, you or anyone close to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything that you've heard thus far about the case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Nothing I don't.
THE COURT: That makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: I'Il be fair.

THE COURT: Okay. And can you base your verdict solely on the evidence and testimony that you hear in this trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Yeah.
THE COURT: And can you wait in forming your ultimate opinion until the case is given to you at the end of the case and your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Of course.
THE COURT: And you can be fair to both sides?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 781: Sure.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Liu. I appreciate that.

If you wouldn't mind passing the microphone. Thank you.
Name and badge number?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Tamara Jacquez, 767.
THE COURT: Thank you.
All right. Ms. Jacquez, how long have you been in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: For about four years.
THE COURT: Where were you before that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: In California.
THE COURT: For how long?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Since I was born.
THE COURT: All right. How far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Some college.
THE COURT: What were you studying when you were in
college?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Just general courses.
THE COURT: And are you employed?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Yes.
THE COURT: What is it that you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: I work for Amazon for the
last two months.
THE COURT: And you -- in what capacity?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Warehouse.
THE COURT: All right. Single, married?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Married, 25 years.
THE COURT: And what does your spouse do for a living?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: He works for Wyndham Worldwide, maintenance technician.

THE COURT: Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been a victim before?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: No.
THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been accused of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Just called, but never served.

THE COURT: Is there anything that you heard this far or anything that's been presented that makes you feel like you wouldn't be able to be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: No.
THE COURT: Can you wait in forming your opinion until the case is submitted to you and your fellow jurors to discuss?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Yes.
THE COURT: And can you base your verdict solely on the evidence and testimony that you hear in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Yes.
THE COURT: And you believe you can be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 767: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I appreciate that.
Can you pass that?
Name and badge number, please.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Lanai Cross, 768.
THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Cross.
How long have you been in Clark County?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: 15 years.
THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Graduate. High school graduate.

THE COURT: All right. And are you employed? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Yes.

THE COURT: What do you do, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: I work for the school
district?
THE COURT: And what do you do with the school district? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Work for the transportation department.

THE COURT: Okay. Married, single --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Single.
THE COURT: Any children?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Two minors.
THE COURT: All right. And their ages, please?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: 13 and 8.
THE COURT: Okay. You or anyone close to you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: No.
THE COURT: Same question, but in regards to accused of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Yes.
THE COURT: Can you tell me about that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: I have a cousin on trial for murder.

THE COURT: And is that locally?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Arizona.
THE COURT: And is the trial happening right now? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Yes.

THE COURT: Like, they're in court right now?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Not this second, but yes.
THE COURT: Okay. How would you say your relationship is with that cousin?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: He called me every day.
THE COURT: And do you know a lot about the facts of that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Yes.
THE COURT: Do you feel -- how do you feel like he's been treated by law enforcement as well as the criminal justice system in regards to his case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Unfairly.
THE COURT: And why do you say that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Because he's been charged for something he didn't commit.

THE COURT: Do you think that that would affect you here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: Yes.
THE COURT: In what way?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: I see him being innocent.
THE COURT: I'm sorry, say it again?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: I see him being innocent.
I picture my cousin sitting in the chair.
THE COURT: Okay. Any other instances?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 768: No.
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