## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 1 2 No. 65998 MATTHEW WASHINGTON, 3 **Electronically Filed** Appellant, 4 Jun 02 2015 08:26 a.m. Tracie K. Lindeman v. 5 Clerk of Supreme Court THE STATE OF NEVADA, 6 Respondent. 8 APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME IX PAGES 1731-1951 9 STEVE WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 PHILIP J. KOHN Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610 10 11 12 CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO Attorney for Appellant Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 13 14 (702) 687-3538 15 Counsel for Respondent 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

26

27

28

INDEX MATTHEW WASHINGTON Case No. 65998

CHOU THAT COLD I	PAGE NO.
Amended Criminal Complaint filed 11/20/2013	008-024
Amended Information filed 04/07/2014	
Certificate of Service filed 03/11/2014	
Criminal Complaint filed 11/06/2013	001-007
District Court Minutes from 12/23/2013 through 06/18/2014	
Information filed 12/20/2013	
Instructions to the Jury filed 04/16/2014	
Instructions to the Jury filed 04/16/2014	
Instructions to the Jury filed 04/17/2014	
Judgment of Conviction filed 06/27/2014	
Justice Court Minutes from 11/08/2013 through 12/09/2013	418-425
Memorandum of Ineffective Counsel and Notice of a Complete Breakdown in Co Between Attorney and Client filed 05/19/2014	
Notice of Appeal filed 06/30/2014	
Notice of Appeal filed 07/17/2014	
Notice of Association filed 03/05/2014	
Notice of Department Reassignment filed 04/28/2014	
Notice of Motion and Motion in Limine filed 03/10/2014	641-646
Notice of Motion and Motion to Sever Defendants filed 12/30/2013	441-444
Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 01/06/2014	445-588
Order Appointing Investigator filed 01/27/2014	626-627
Proposed Jury Instruction Not Used at Trial filed 04/15/2014	685-687
Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary A.M. Hearing heard 12/05/2013	025-122
Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Hearing heard 12/09/2013	242-417
Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary P.M. Hearing heard 12/05/2013	123-241
Second Amended Information filed 04/11/2014	672-684

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Sta Sta Su Th	cond Amended Information filed 04/16/2014	
8	T!	hird Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 01/30/2014	
9	- 11		
10	- 11		
11	$\  \cdot \ _{\gamma}$	/erdict filed 04/16/2014781  Verdict filed 04/17/2014781	
12	2 ∦		
13	3 ∦	TRANSCRIPTS	
1.	- 11		
	5 6	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day One Date of Hrg: 04/07/2014	
	17 18	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day Two Date of Hrg: 04/08/2014	
	19 20	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day Three  Date of Hrg: 04/09/2014	- 1
	21 22	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day Four  Date of Hrg: 04/10/2014	
	23 24	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day Five Date of Hrg: 04/11/2014	,
	25	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day Six  Date of Hrg: 04/14/2014	
	26		
	27 28	Jury Trial—Day Seven	5

- 11		
1	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day Eight 1907-1951	
2	<b>Jury Trial—Day Eight</b> Date of Hrg: 04/16/20141907-1951	
3	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day Nine (Penalty Phase)  Date of Hrg: 04/17/2014	
4		
5	Recorder's Transcript, Calendar Call 858-863	
6	Calendar Call Date of Hrg: 01/29/2014	
7	Recorder's Transcript,	
8	Calendar Call Date of Hrg: 02/05/2014	
9	Recorder's Transcript, Calendar Call; Defendant's Motion in Limine 876-882	
10	Calendar Call; Defendant's Motion in Limine Date of Hrg: 04/02/2014	
11	Recorder's Transcript, Defendant's Motion in Limine 874-875	
12	Defendant's Motion in Limine Date of Hrg: 03/24/2014	
13	Recorder's Transcript,	
14	Recorder's Transcript, Motions to Sever Date of Hrg: 01/22/2014	
15	Recorder's Transcript, Motion to Sever Defendants; Status Check: Trial Setting and Death Penalty 840-849	
16	Motion to Sever Defendants; Status Check: Trial Setting and Death Fendity  Date of Hrg: 01/13/2014840-849	
17	Recorder's Transcript,	
18	Recorder's Transcript,   Sentencing   Date of Hrg: 06/18/2014	<b>'</b>
19	Recorder's Transcript, Status Check: Trial Readiness 870-873	,
20	Status Check: Trial Readiness Date of Hrg: 03/05/2014	,
21	Recorder's Transcript, Status Check – Trial Readiness (BOTH) 863-839	ا ۵
22	Status Check – Trial Readiness (BOTH) Date of Hrg: 12/30/2013	
23	Recorder's Transcript, Telephonic Conference RE: Trial Judge 883-88	7
24	Telephonic Conference RE: Trial Judge Date of Hrg: 04/04/2014	1
25	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing,	
26	Initial Arraignment Date of Hrg: 12/23/2013	5
27		
28		
	II	

CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CASE NO. C-294695-1

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

DEPT. NO. I

Plaintiff,

vs.

TRANSCRIPT OF

MATTHEW WASHINGTON,

PROCEEDINGS

Defendant.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH CORY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

JURY TRIAL - DAY 6

MONDAY, APRIL 14, 2014

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE:

DANIELLE K. PIEPER, ESQ.

BARBARA F. SCHIFALACQUA

Chief Deputy District Attorneys

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

DAVID J. OTTO, ESQ.

ROBERTA OHLINGER-JOHNSON, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

BEVERLY SIGURNIK District Court

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC Englewood, CO 80110

(303) 798-0890

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

## INDEX

## <u>WITNESSES</u>

NAME	DIRECT	CROS5	REDIRECT	RECROSS
STATE'S WITNESSES:				
Jocelyn Maldonado	7			
Anya Lester	12	65 <sup>.</sup>	68	75
*	* * '	k *		
•				
	<u>EXHIBIT</u>	<u> </u>	A	DMITTED_
DESCRIPTION:				
STATE'S EXHIBITS:				
Exhibit 86		• • •		10
Exhibits 193 through 201				30

## LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, MONDAY, APRIL 14, 2014, 1:20 P.M.

б

(Outside the presence of the jury)

MR. OTTO: At this point, I'd be making an oral motion for a mistrial based on something that occurred Friday afternoon.

As you will recall, we were here waiting for two jurors to come back and the C.O. -- and I'm not sure who -- to the State's attorney's credit, they jumped up and said we can't have this going on. And it was about one of the officers, either the C.O. -- I think the C.O. and maybe your marshal, talking about what time they got off.

And it may have led to an inference, if the jury heard it, that my client was in custody, which, as you know, under several cases, including <u>Canape v. State</u>, 109 Nevada 864 at 859 -- I'm sorry, 864, and then 859 P.2d 1023, a 1993 case out of a Nevada Supreme Court, the defendant may be prejudiced by that knowledge with the jury. And for that reason, I make this motion.

MS. PIEPER: Judge, in regard to the case law that was just cited, one of the things that they talk about is that the defense has to show some type of prejudice to the defendant.

In regard to this case, the situation that Mr. Otto is speaking of is some of the members of the jury were inside of the courtroom, I think the majority of them, except for

two. We were not on the record. The marshal at the time made a comment to the corrections officer about, what time do you get off of work? The corrections officer responded, 4:30 today, or 4:30 P.M. The marshal then said, we should be able to get you out of here by 4:30.

The jury -- I looked over at them. They were all talking amongst themselves. There was also other type of chatter going on in the courtroom at the time. Nobody that I saw in the jury panel even heard the conversation between the corrections officer and the marshal. And so, for those reasons, counsel for the defense hasn't even shown any type of prejudice prong, or prejudice that would result from that conversation.

I think just hearing those -- the conversation going back and forth between the corrections officer and the marshal, it may not be clear who these people are to the jury in the courtroom. They may not understand the difference, although counsel and this Court understand that there is a corrections officer that goes back and forth between the jail, there's also a marshal. And I think Ms. Schifalacqua wanted to add something else.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And Judge, I think even on its face, the first --

THE COURT: Wait, are you guys going to double team

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Of course we are, Judge. The first thing I think we have to look at is really what was said, which was, what time do you get off, 4:30, I think we can get you out of here. I mean, that in and of itself has no inference whatsoever that the defendant happens to be in custody.

We would have to presume, one, that the jurors even understood the corrections officer — who he is or what he does, that he would have to transport the defendant before he got off. Maybe he just gets off at 4:30 for whatever reason, because someone else is going to relieve him.

So, the idea that the statement itself is so innocuous, I don't think that you could even come close to having an inference that relates back to the defendant whatsoever, and I just wanted to make sure that that was highlighted. And obviously, we would oppose any motion for mistrial over something so far reaching, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Ohlinger, you want to weigh in on this?

MS. OHLINGER-JOHNSON: All right. Thank you, Your Honor. This is the first time you've actually heard from me this trial, so I'm proud to actually speak. I'd just like to be clear that under the holding of <u>Canape</u>, we actually don't bear the burden, so burden of the State. That's all.

THE COURT: Okay.

1	MR. OTTO: With that, I would submit it, Your Honor.
2	MS. PIEPER: The burden is to show
3	THE COURT: Okay. The motion is denied. Anything
4	else before we bring our jury?
5	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Not by the State, Judge.
6	MR. OTTO: Not by defense, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Okay, let's bring our jury.
8	(Pause in the proceedings)
9	THE COURT: Do you have two or three witnesses?
10	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Two, Judge.
11	THE COURT: Two witnesses? All right.
12	(Pause in the proceedings)
13	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
14	(Jury reconvened at 1:25 p.m.)
15	THE COURT: Will counsel stipulate to the presence
16	of our jury?
17	MS. PIEPER: Yes, Your Honor.
18	MR. OTTO: Yes. There seems to be oh, no. Yes,
19	
20	
21	
22	passed a pleasant weekend, and we're ready to get back to
23	work.
24	Did anyone have any problem with anyone approaching
25	them, trying to talk to them during about the case at all?

1	Thank you.
2	All right, State may call your next witness.
3	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Your Honor, the State calls
4	Jocelyn Maldonado.
5	THE MARSHAL: Straight ahead to the stand. Watch
6	your step. When you get up there, please remain standing and
7	face the clerk.
8	JOCELYN MALDONADO, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
9	THE CLERK: Please be seated.
10	THE COURT RECORDER: That microphone is buried.
11	THE WITNESS: Is it okay to move it?
12	THE COURT RECORDER: To you, please.
13	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: If I may approach, Judge.
14	THE COURT: Yeah.
15	THE CLERK: Can I have you state your name and spell
16	it for the record, please?
17	THE WITNESS: Jocelyn, J-o-c-e-l-y-n. Maldonado,
.18	M-a-l-d-o-n-a-d-o.
19	THE CLERK: Thank you.
20	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: May I?
21	THE COURT: You may proceed.
22	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you.
23	THE COURT: Um-hum.
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:

1	Q Ms. Maldonado, can you let the members of the jury
2	know how you're employed?
3	A I am a senior crime scene analyst with the Las Vegas
4	Metropolitan Police Department.
5	Q And who long have you been a crime scene analyst
6	with Metro?
7	A A little over 13-and-a-half years.
8	Q Okay. We've heard from a number of crime scene
9	analysts in this particular case. Did you work in that
10	capacity back on November 5th of 2013?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And on that particular day, what shift did you work?
13	A I worked swing shift that day, which is 14:00 hours
14	to 24:00 hours, or 2:00 P.M. to midnight.
15	have occasion to work with a Detective
16	Rogers?
1.7	A Yes, I did.
18	Q And were you tasked with the duty of kind of doing
19	some follow up collection of evidence for this particular
21	case?
2	A Yes.
2	Q And that was under event number 131105-0479?
2	A Yes.
2	Q And on actually on November 5th of 2013, did you
2	go to Ewing Brothers Tow Lot?

1	A	Yes, I did.
2	Q	And did you actually collect some items of evidence
3	and impour	nd those items into evidence for this case?
4	A	Yes, I did.
5	Q	What was that?
6	A	They were two blue latex type gloves.
7	Q	Okay.
8		MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And having shown Mr. Otto what's
9	been prev	iously marked as State's proposed 86, if I may
10	approach,	Judge?
11		THE COURT: You may.
12	BY MS.,SC	HIFALACQUA:
13	Q	Ms. Maldonado, I'm going to show you what's been
14	marked as	State's proposed Exhibit 86. Do you recognize that?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	How do you recognize it?
17	A	This has a label on it with my initials and P
18	1	the event number specific to this case, the address
19		esponded to; and a description of what's inside the
20	package.	It's also sealed on the back with my initials and P
21	number,	and the date.
22	Q	And do you recall when you impounded those blue
23	latex gl	oves impounding them in this package?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	And is this in the same or substantially same

```
condition as it was when you impounded those gloves?
1
             Yes, except for the blue seals on here.
2
             Okay. And are you familiar with those blue seals?
        0
3
             Yes, I am.
        Α
4
             And describe for the members of our jury, what does
5
   that signify to you?
6
             When the package is opened in our forensic lab and
7
        Α
   resealed, the forensic scientists use the blue seals to reseal
8
    the package and initial and date it, and also sign the chain
 9
    of custody.
10
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And Your Honor, at this point,
11
    I'd move for admission of State's proposed 86.
12
              MR. OTTO: No objection.
13
              THE COURT: 86 will be admitted.
14
                    (State's Exhibit 86 is admitted)
15
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Permission to publish, Your
16
    Honor?
17
               THE COURT: You may.
 18
                       (Pause in the proceedings)
 19
               MS. SCHIFALACQUA: All right. Now that we're
 20
     working -- thank you.
 21
     BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
 22
               Showing what's been admitted as State's 86. And is
 23
     this the label that you were referring to, Ms. Maldonado, with
 24
     regard to the identification of what you impounded in here?
 25
```

1	A Yes.
2	Q And on the again, sorry this is a little
3	difficult. But on the bottom, does it show the chain of
4	custody and who would have opened that in this case, Ms. Beata
5	Vida?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Okay.
8	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: I'd pass the witness, Judge.
9	THE COURT: Cross-examination?
10	MR. OTTO: I have no questions, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down. May this
12	witness be excused?
13	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yes.
14	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
15	MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You're excused.
17	State may call your next witness.
18	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you. The State calls Anya
19	Lester.
20	THE MARSHAL: Straight ahead to the stand. Watch
21	your step as you go up. Please remain standing and face the
22	
23	
24	THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state your
25	name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: My name is Anya, A-n-y-a. 1 L-e-s-t-e-r. 2 Thank you. THE CLERK: 3 You may proceed. THE COURT: 4 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Your Honor. 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA: 7 Ms. Lester, please tell the members of the jury how 8 it is you're employed. 9 I'm currently employed as a Forensic Scientist II 10 with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department forensic 11 laboratory, currently assigned to the Firearms and Toolmarks 12 Analysis Unit. 13 And let's start with what type of background, and 14 let's start even with your education, Ms. Lester, of how it is 15 you get to be a firearms and toolmark analyst. 16 I have a bachelor of science degree in forensic 17 science from Michigan State University. T was hired by the 18 Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department in December of 2008 19 as a forensic lab aid. From that position, I promoted to the 20 forensic scientist class in October of 2009, and at that 21 point, I was assigned to the firearms and toolmarks analysis 22 unit. 23 After being assigned to that unit, I completed a 24 comprehensive 2,500-hour training program, which included 25

manufacturers tours of -- tours of manufacturer -- firearm and ammunition manufacturing facilities. Also, manufacturer's armorer's courses, training off-site and on-site in our lab, and training by completing a variety of mock cases underneath the supervision of another experienced examiner.

During those mock cases, I was given actual firearms to shoot, actual questioned ammunition components to compare to those firearms. I used the same software, the same comparison microscope, the same equipment that I use now to do those cases as mock cases, and come up with conclusions and write reports just as if they were actual cases.

After I finished that supervised casework, I completed a series of comprehensive proficiency and competency exams, which allowed me to begin my own independent casework in 2011 as a firearms and toolmarks analyst.

- Q And so, have you been working on your own in that capacity since then after the intensive training?
  - A That is correct.

б

1.2

- Q Okay. With regard to cases that come before you, do you even have an approximate number of how many cases you've worked on?
- A Since I was released for independent casework, I ve completed approximately 450 cases.
- Q Okay. And have you testified previously in the Eighth Judicial District in the area of firearms and

toolmarks?

1.3

A Yes, I have.

Q With regard to proficiency that you talked about, do you do an ongoing kind of proficiency with regard to being a firearms/toolmark analyst?

A Yes. I am required to complete a proficiency exam in the areas of firearms and toolmarks every year.

Q Okay. I want to take a step back, especially for our jurors, and talk about what it is a firearms and toolmarks analyst does generally before we get into the meat of kind of what you're going to be here for. If you could explain to them what it is you do.

A Certainly. Just in general, I examine firearms, ammunition, ammunition components that are booked as evidence, and I compare those ammunition components that are found at the scene to the test fires that I fire from the suspect firearms to determine if they came from that same firearm.

Q And so, generally speaking, if for example a detective, an officer, or a DA submits a request to take items of evidence collected at a scene and specifically have it compared to possibly a firearm, is that something that you generally do?

A Yes, that is correct.

Q Okay. In this particular case, did you have occasion -- or were you requested to actually do an analysis

```
on a number of different items of evidence that were impounded
1
   under our event number 131105-0479?
2
             May I refer to my case file?
3
             Absolutely.
        Q
             Yes, I was requested to examine a number of items
5
   underneath that stated event number.
6
              Okay. And you were checking on the event number, is
7
   that fair to say?
8
              That's correct.
9
              Okay. With regard --
10
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Judge, permission to republish
11
    some items of evidence already before the jury?
12
              THE COURT: You may.
13
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you.
14
    BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
15
               Showing you what's been admitted as State's 78, Ms.
16
    Lester, do you recognize this generally?
17
               Yes, I do.
          Α
18
               Okay. And on the bottom, do you see your signature?
          Q.
19
               Yes, I do.
          Α
20
               Okay. With regard to State's 70 -- there we go --
 21
     8, what's inside State's 78?
 22
               According to the package, there are six cartridge
          Α
 23
     cases.
 24
               Okay. And you saw your signature on the bottom.
 25
                 Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890
```

What does that blue seal signify? That's a laboratory seal that we as the examiner put 2 on the package to seal it up when we're finished analyzing the evidence, and we sign across that seal with our initials, personnel number, and the date in which we sealed it. So, I could go through -- for example, here's 6 State's 80. Did you sign that and go examine evidence that was supplied to you under State's 80? Yes, I did. Α 9 And State's 79, the same? 10 Yes. 11 And so, with regard to this case -- I'll show you 12 physically, but did your analysis include two firearms? 13 Yes, it did. Α 14 As well as cartridge casings? 15 Yes. Α 16 As well as a number of either bullets or metal 17 fragments? 18 Yes, that is correct. Α 19 And were they all under the event number that we 20 listed previously? 21 Yes, they were. 22 When you -- well, let me back up. Can you describe 23 for the members of our jury the difference between a 24 semiautomatic handgun or a firearm and a revolver? 25

A Certainly. A semiautomatic handgun is a type of gun that you hold in your hands, designed to be fired from the hand. And it's designed so that each pull of the trigger fires one cartridge, and one bullet goes down the barrel and out the muzzle. You have to pull the trigger for each shot to fire.

1.

The word "semiautomatic", it's semiautomatic because you don't hold down the trigger and it keeps cycling on its own, you have to pull that trigger. It's semiautomatic because it does use a part of the detonation of that cartridge to perform a cycle in the firing cycle of that gun. Usually, it's the unloading and loading of the next cartridge into the chamber of the gun.

The difference between that and a revolver is, in a revolver, you don't have that cycling action. You have a gun that actually has a cylinder. In that cylinder, there are a number of chambers, and every time you pull the trigger, that cylinder rotates, and the next chamber is aligned with the barrel so that you can go ahead and fire. Those chambers aren't integral to that barrel. They have to be lined up when that cylinder revolves.

Q And cartridge casings from an expended cartridge in a semiautomatic, where do they go if it's in functioning order?

A What happens if it's in functioning order, you have

the firing process. You pull the trigger, the firing pin goes forward, hits the primer of that cartridge case. A spark is created. The powder that's inside that cartridge catches on fire and gas is released. When that gas is released, it pushes that bullet down the barrel and out of the muzzle of the gun. You have a great forward action when that's occurring.

And because of the fact, for every action, you have an equal and opposite reaction, you have the case that's remaining there in the chamber. Now, when that case gets loaded into the chamber when the slide goes forward, there's a little hook on the side that we call the extractor. It's caught around the rim of that cartridge case. You have the bullet going forward, and you have that blast action pushing that cartridge case backwards, and the slide of that gun pushing it backwards.

Because it's hooked to the slide, that cartridge case is pulled backward, and it hits a piece that we call the ejector. When that cartridge case -- that spent case hits the ejector, it's actually kicked out of the gun. There's usually a port called the ejection port on the gun where it's actually kicked out, and then it just leaves -- it ejects -- it goes out of the gun.

And then that slide, from that backwards position, it picks up that next cartridge out of the magazine. If you

```
have it loaded, that magazine, it's spring-loaded from the
1
   bottom. It's kind of like a Pez dispenser. That cartridge
2
   gets picked up by the slide and gets loaded right back into
   the chamber so that you can go ahead, pull the trigger, and
4
   fire it again.
5
             Now, we're -- or you are, I should say, using some
6
   terminology that may not be familiar to the members of our
7
   jury, so I want to walk through some of it.
8
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And also, I don't know if there's
 9
    water up there, Judge.
10
              THE MARSHAL: Yes, there is pitchers.
11
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.
12
              THE MARSHAL: I did fill it up.
13
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: If you need some --
14
               THE WITNESS: Great.
15
               THE COURT: Yes.
16
               MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- Ms. Lester --
17
                             Thank you.
               THE WITNESS:
18
               MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- it is on this --
19
                        (Pause in the proceedings)
 20
               THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 21
     BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
 22
               What -- can you describe for the members of our jury
 23
     what you're referring to? What's a cartridge?
 24
                I have a model, if I may use it to help me describe.
 25
                  Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890
```

- Q Did you -- you brought it with you today?
- A Yes.

Q Fantastic. If you could pull that out.

A Sure. I referred to it a couple times. This is a cartridge. It's a single unit of ammunition. This is what you would load into your gun. A lot of times, people think I load bullets into my gun, but it's not true. You actually load an entire cartridge.

There's four components in general. There's this primer. It's a chemical compound that when the firing pin hits it, it creates a spark, and that ignites the powder that's contained here inside this case. This we refer to as the cartridge case. It's the piece that holds the entire thing.

And the fourth component is your projectile. You may or may not have a projectile. If it was a blank round of ammunition, there would be no projectile. But in general, those are the four components; primer, cartridge case, powder, and your projectile, or in this case, bullet.

Q And so, when we refer to the cartridge case that's ejected out of a semiautomatic firearm, is it that separate part?

A Yes, it would be this piece, analogous to this piece right here. And like -- as I described, during the firing cycle, when you have your bullet going forward, your gas is

expanding. You have your extractor hooked alongside here, your slide going back. This is the piece that actually gets pulled out of the chamber and ejected from the gun.

Q So, when you or I refer to a bullet, it's not in fact what we load into a magazine of a firearm, it's a particular portion or projectile that is within that cartridge?

A That's correct.

Q And when we refer to a bullet or a projectile, is that the piece that gets expelled from the firearm when it cycles through its process?

A It's the piece that's propelled down the barrel by the gas, and it leaves the muzzle, and this is the part that flies at you if someone shoots toward you. The part -- it gets expelled and then it flies outward, but in a semiautomatic firearm, the cartridge case also in the slide cycles would be expelled from the firearm.

Q Fair enough. Both of them get expelled, and that was a poor term on my part. Thank you, Ms. Lester. Let me ask you this. With regard to cartridge casings and cartridges in general, what's a headstamp refer to?

A The headstamp is marks put by the manufacturer here on this area, it's called the headstamp area. Usually, it has a manufacturer's name or symbol, and it may also have the caliber of this particular cartridge on that area.

With regard to headstamps, are those significant at 1 all with regard to whether or not a particular manufacturer's 2 cartridge is used to shoot a firearm? 3 Only in that you want to make sure that your caliber of your cartridge matches the caliber of the gun. But there can be a variety of different manufacturers that manufacture 6 the same caliber of cartridge, and you would be able to use 7 those all in your firearm. 8 Let's -- I want to turn your attention back to this 9 particular case. With regard to the two firearms that were 10 submitted for analysis in this particular case, Ms. Lester, 11 did you have occasion to examine both of those firearms? 12 Yes, I did. 13 Α What was -- let's start with -- was the first a 14 Glock .40 caliber firearm? 15 A Yes, it was. 16 And what was the other? 17 The other one was a Smith and Wesson 9 millimeter 18 Luger caliber semiautomatic pistol. 19 Okay. Were both -- were both handguns or pistols? 20 Pistols. 21 Were both of them -- yes? Okay, and were they both 22 semiautomatics? 23 Yes, they were. Α 24 And I want to start first talking about the Glock 25

.40 caliber. Describe for the members of our jury what it is you do first when you get this request with regard to the firearms?

A The first thing that was requested was for me to do a firearms exam and a function test on this particular firearm. When I do the firearms exam, there's a variety of different things that I do. I measure the overall length of the gun, I measure the length of the barrel, I look at any external safeties that it may have. I just sort of look it over to see what kind of condition it's in, if it's damaged, if there's any cracks, that type of thing.

I'd verify the serial number, take a photo of it, photograph the entire gun. And then I actually dry fire it, pull the trigger without actually loading it. I do all those things just to basically make sure that the gun is safe for me to go ahead and test fire it before I actually load it up and go ahead and test fire the gun.

- Q With regard to this .40 caliber Glock, was the -- did you do those first kind of initial examination for that particular -- this particular Glock?
  - A Yes, I did.

- $\ensuremath{\mathbb{Q}}$  And thereafter, did you actually do a test fire of this firearm?
  - A Yes, I did.
  - Q Describe for the members of our jury what it is you

did when you do this more intensive test firing of the gun?

1.1

1.2

1.5

1.8

21.

A I test fired the gun first by -- I took the magazine that was submitted with the gun. I loaded it with -- I used six cartridges from our firearms laboratory general supply, loaded up that magazine.

And before I do that, I actually mark them. I mark them with an engraver. I mark the side of the cartridge case and the side of the bullet with the item number of the gun and a letter designator. So, for these ones, the item number of the gun was 6, so I numbered them 6A, 6B, 6C, et cetera, up through 6F.

The first three shots I fired into a water tank. We have a stainless steel tank, has a pneumatic lid, has a shooting port that I can shoot into. It's filled with approximately 600 gallons of water. Water, since it's denser than air, when you step up to the shooting port and shoot the gun, the bullet, it proceeds through the water and it just slows down, slows down, slows down, and then it just falls right down to the bottom of the tank.

That allows us to maintain a pristine sample test fired bullet from that particular gun so that I have those for comparison examination purposes. Also around that shooting port, there's a net, and that net catches the ejected cartridge cases as they come out of the gun.

Q And do you also do any other firing with regard to

-- or in this particular case, with regard to the .40 caliber?

A In this particular case, I did shoot it three times into the water tank, and then it shot it three times downrange. We do have an indoor firing range in our laboratory. I shot it from a distance of approximately 18 feet towards the target. Shot it three times just in general, just to make sure that the gun is really going the direction that you're shooting it in.

I'm not a sharp shooter, I'm not trying to get a bull's-eye, but all I'm trying to do is really just sort of see the directionality of the gun. Sometimes, I might shoot a gun again to test fire it for a variety of different reasons. This particular gun, I did shoot it initially on January 22nd, and I did shoot it again on the 24th three more times using a different kind of ammunition, just to look at a different ammunition and kind of see how it marked in relation to the gun.

Q With regard to the Glock .40 caliber that was impounded under this particular event number, did you find it to be operational?

A Yes, I did.

Q What was the trigger pull on this Glock .40 caliber firearm?

A The trigger pull per my measurements was found to be three-and-a-half to three-and-three-quarters pounds.

Q And describe for the members of our jury if -- what's trigger pull mean? What does that mean?

1.2

1.7

A It's the actual pounds, the amount of pressure that it would take for you to pull the trigger to make the gun fire. The triggers sometimes have a little bit of give, you can put a little bit of pressure on and it won't give, but it's the actual amount of pressure that is required when you pull that trigger to make the gun fire.

- Q Now, the magazine that was submitted with this firearm, what was the capacity of that magazine?
  - A That was a ten-cartridge capacity.
- Q Okay. And when -- kind of going back to trigger pull, are there safeties on Glocks, and particularly the one that you examined, so that it doesn't just fire?

A There are actually -- on Glocks, there are three safeties. None of them are manual switch safeties. The two can move. There are three safeties a Glock has built into its firearms, they're sort of a passive safety system.

There is a trigger safety, and what that is is, on the trigger, it's not just one little curved piece, there's actually an additional part that kind of sticks out. And when you — you have to pull on that little part, compress it, and compress the trigger in order to make that trigger actually fire the gun. If you just sort of press on the side of it, it won't go. You have to press on the whole thing.

Glock does also integrate a firing pin safety into its guns. And what that is, that is when you pull the trigger, there's a block that's located in the slide that's actuated by the trigger bar. When you actually pull the trigger, the bar hits it and it moves out of the way, and that allows a firing pin to go forward. It's actually a block so that that firing pin is blocked and can't actually go forward unless the trigger is pulled.

There's a third safety, which is a drop safety, and that safety actually holds the striker, the firing pin striker part. It holds it onto a shelf, holds it in place so that if you drop the gun, it can't go forward. Again, when you pull the trigger, there's a part that's moved out of the way, and that allows that striker to go forward.

Q And in this case, were all of those safeties in working condition, if you will?

A I did test the trigger safety and the firing pin safety. I did not actually do a drop test and test the drop safety on the gun, but those two safeties that I did check were in working order.

Q With regard to this particular case, after you obtained pristine examples from firing the Glock, what do you do after that with regard to testing in this matter?

A Well, what I always do when I first test fire a gun is I take the samples, the test fires that I actually shot

from the gun, and I compare them to each other. It's like microscope, it's called a comparison microscope. two compound microscopes which are hooked together with what we call an optical bridge. It's lenses and mirrors that allow me to look down the microscope and see two items side by side together under the microscope at the same time.

- Let me --
- So --Α

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

- Before you go on to that -- I'm sorry, Ms. Lester, Q because we're going to get into some things. Were you also submitted, and we saw up here, but a number of cartridge casings from this case to do some analysis on?
- Yes, I was. Α
- 13 Okay. So I can take a step back, were you submitted 14 seven .40 caliber cartridge casings? 15
- Yes, I was. Α 16
  - And six 9 millimeter cartridge casings? 0
    - And that is correct.
    - With regard to either metal fragments, or maybe even some bullets, but metal fragments, were you submitted a number of those to see if you could do an analysis with regard to identity of those metal fragments in this case?
  - Yes, I was. Α 23
    - Was there a total of 16 that were submitted to you? Q
  - If I may refer to my notes for one moment. 25

```
Please do.
        Q
1
             Yes, that's correct. There were 16.
2
             Okay.
        0
3
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And having already shown, so I
4
   can use some of these, Mr. Otto what's been marked as State's
5
   proposed Exhibits 193 to 201 that have been previously
6
   provided in discovery, if I may approach the witness, Your
7
   Honor?
8
                         You may.
              THE COURT:
 9
   BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
10
              Ms. Lester, I'm going to show you what's been marked
11
    as State's proposed Exhibits 193 to 201. If you could look at
12
    each one of those, and when you're done, go ahead and look up
1.3
1.4
    at me.
              Yes.
         Α
15
               And do you recognize all of those?
16
               Yes. Those are all photo collage sheets that I
17
    actually -- or copies of the photo collage sheets that I
18
     actually put together during my analysis in this case.
 19
               Okay. And then, those include all of the items that
 20
     we referred to that you analyzed, including the firearms
 21
     themselves, the metal fragments, as well as the cartridge
 22
     casings, and photographs of the analysis that you did on a few
 23
     of these submitted items?
 24
               Yes, that is correct.
```

Α

25

```
Do they fairly and accurately depict those that you
        Q
1
   did in real life when doing the analysis under this event
2
3
   number?
             Yes, they do.
        Α
4
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: I'd move for their admission at
5
   this time, Judge.
6
             MR. OTTO: No objection.
7
              THE COURT: 193 to 201 are admitted.
 8
           (State's Exhibits 193 through 201 are admitted)
 9
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Your Honor.
10
    Permission to publish?
11
              THE COURT: You may.
12
    BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
1.3
              Referring to -- I'll start with the Glock. Showing
14
    you what's been admitted as State's 193. Can you describe, or
15
    at least, let's see, maybe indicate on this -- the photograph
16
    of the Glock that you actually examined, can you show the
17
    members of our jury, first of all, where is the magazine on
    here?
19
               The photo of the magazine is down here at the
          Α
20
              There's a side view and a back view.
     bottom.
 21
               Okay. And the serial number on that firearm?
 22
               The serial number photo is in this area right here,
 23
     and I have an arrow pointing to it. That serial number photo
     was on the bottom front of the frame where that red arrow
 25
```

1	1 points.	
2	2 Q And there	is a picture of a headstamp. Can you
3	3 indicate where that	is?
4	4 A There are	two.
5	5 Q I'm sorry.	There we go. If you can
6	6	Pause in the proceedings)
7	7 BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:	
8	8 Q If you car	show the members of the jury what we're
9	9 talking about when w	e're talking about headstamps?
LO	O A Um-hum. T	here's one right here in this area, and
.1	1 there's another one	here in this area. This shows the
.2	2 manufacturer's marki	ngs, as well as the caliber.
.3	3 Q And this p	articular firearm was submitted with that
4	4 magazine, is that co	rrect?
.5	5 A Yes, they	were in the same package.
.6	6 Q Were there	any cartridges submitted with that
7	7 magazine?	
.8	8 A If I may j	ust look at my notes for one moment.
9	9 Q Please do.	
0	O A With the G	lock magazine, there was also one
1	1 headstamp R-P 40 Smi	th and Wesson caliber cartridge submitted.
2	2 Q And was th	ere anything else on this Glock when you
3		
4	A I think yo	u're referring to the laser laser sight
5	5 in this area	

Okay. Describe for the members of our jury, what's 1 a laser sight? 2 It's a sight. It's something that someone can put 3 on their gun. This is on the bottom rail, this part down here, this rail part of the gun. It's a sight. Has a button 5 on it, and I'll point to it right here. This particular one, there was a button on both sides, so it's ambidextrous. If the shooter was right or left-handed, that laser could be 8 actuated with either hand, either finger, and there's a button on both sides. 1.0 So, this one that I pointed to, this is the right 11 side of the gun. If you look up here to the left side, you'll 12 see there's a button here as well. 13 So, this particular laser, I wasn't requested to do 1.4 15

so, this particular laser, I wasn't requested to do an in-depth function test as far as was the laser accurate, or anything like that. So, all we usually do in this case is just check to see that the laser is functional. I did test in this case that the laser was functional. It did emit a green dot when you pushed the button.

- Q Okay. So, you didn't do an analysis of whether or not, for example, it was sighted properly?
  - A That's correct, I did not.
  - Q But it was in working condition?
- A Yes, it was.

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. With regard to the cartridge casings

submitted for analysis, the seven .40 caliber cartridge casings, I'm going to show you what's been admitted as State's 195. Are we looking at what you physically had before you when you did the analysis of these cartridge casings?

A Yes. Those are my photos that I took of the evidence that I physically had before me when I did the analysis.

1.3

Q And with regard to the item numbers on here, we see item 8, 9, 10, and so on. Are those -- and I should show you. For example, they're not all in order. Are those item numbers that were designated by crime scene analysts on the scene?

A Those are actually laboratory designated item numbers.

Q And do those correspond then with the items that were submitted to you physically?

A They correspond with them. They may not necessarily have the same numbers because all of the evidence is renumbered when we get it into the laboratory. For example, a crime scene analyst may impound something that is not firearms related, and that might be number 4, and I wouldn't look at that. So, my numbers would just be 1, 2, 3, 5, that kind of a thing.

Q I understand. With regard to the pristine examples that -- and let's go back and talk about what it is you do in order to be able to make -- well, let me withdraw that. What

type of conclusions can you draw, if any, when you're submitted, for example, a firearm and cartridge casings? What are we asking you to do?

1.1

1.6

A I use a theory of identification that's put forth by the Association of Firearm and Toolmark Examiners. It's an international agency, of which I am a member of. And all firearm and toolmark examiners that work in accredited laboratories are only allowed to come up with the same conclusions.

There's three conclusions. I can either say that there is an identification, that is, I have identified this particular item to this particular firearm. I can say there is an elimination, which is where I can say it did not come from this firearm. Or there's an inconclusive. I can say, it may or may not have come from this firearm, I particularly am not able to tell at this time.

I can also discern that something is not suitable to be examined, it doesn't have any microscopic marks, the type that I'm looking for for my exam. But I only have a choice of three conclusions. It's either an ID, it's an elimination, or it's an inconclusive.

Q Now, going back to the .40 caliber pristine examples that you have, describe for the members of the jury, what's your first process or the first steps you take after you do that -- those test fires?

A When I test fire, the first thing that I always do and that we all -- all of us do before we actually take that test fire and compare it to the evidence is I take the two test fires and I look at them in comparison to each other. I want to make sure that there is sufficient microscopic information on there for me to be able to determine an identification or an elimination.

Some guns, they don't mark very well. Some types of ammo doesn't mark very well. I might put it under my microscope and not be able to see a lot of microscopic information.

So, I use that comparison microscope like I was referring to before, which is the two microscopes that allow me to see two things side by side. And I'll take, say, for example, in this particular case, two bullets or two cartridge cases that I actually test fired myself from that submitted firearm. I know they came from that gun, I fired them myself from the gun.

I'll take them, put them under the two different stages of my microscopes, and compare them to each other and determine, again, if there is enough sufficient microscopic information on there for me to be able to use them to do a comparison to an unknown.

Q And when you first look at the two knowns, what are you looking for? Let's start with kind of the general -- the

class characteristics. Describe for the members of our jury what class characteristics are.

2.3

A Certainly. Class characteristics are the general overall characteristics. Those are put there by the manufacturer. I'm looking — very first, you're looking for things such as caliber. I'm looking for the general shape of the firing pin impression, is it circular, is it rectangular, is it square.

I'm looking for the general types of markings that are here on this area. We call this the breech face area, or here in this primer area. Those markings might be parallel, they might be circular, they might be arcs. They might be what we call granular, which look like little pockmarks. So, I'm just looking at those sort of general overall characteristics.

Once I know that I have agreement in all those general overall characteristics, I then can take my magnification on my microscope and go up higher, and start looking at the smaller individual microscopic marks to see if those have significant agreement.

- Q Those individual microscopic marks, are those unique then to the firearm that actually fired the cartridge?
- A Yes. Those marks are actually imparted on the different pieces of the firearm during the manufacturing process. If you think about machines and manufacturing, you

have different kinds of tools. Tools might cut, they might sand. Those tools — every time they actually make a mark, those tools are being changed on a very small microscopic level, because every time you have a harder object and a softer object and you make a mark, the harder object's going to leave its impression on that softer object. So, you have a tool. It's making parts, parts of a gun, and every time it makes a part, it changes a little bit microscopically.

Also, if that tool is cutting or sanding, in any way removing metal pieces of material, it's creating what we call chips, just little pieces, shards, like sawdust of metal when it cuts. Those are different every single time. When you're moving a tool along a piece of metal and those chips are forming, those chips are getting underneath the edge of the blade, they're moving around, and those contribute to that as well.

Those individual microscopic marks that are made during the manufacturing process of the parts of the firearm, those marks are the marks that get imparted to the cartridge cases and the bullets when they're fired in the gun, and those are the marks that we look for to identify these components back to the firearm.

Q Now, with regard to the Glock and the Glock barrel, was there something significant to you, having dealt with firearms, that allowed you to be able to even come to any type

of analysis in this particular case?

2.0

A Well, the first thing is, this gun, the Glock, it did not have a Glock manufactured barrel on it. It had an aftermarket barrel. The barrel was manufactured by a company called -- I want to make sure I get it right. Storm Lake.

Q And why is that significant that this had an aftermarket barrel on it?

A Well, the first thing is, when you're looking at identifying a bullet to a barrel, you're looking at the riffling impressions. And as you may or may not know, when a bullet's going down that barrel, you want that bullet to spin. Inside that barrel, we have spiral grooves, kind of like a candy cane, called riffling, that's inside that barrel and that's imparting a spin on that bullet.

It's kind of like when you throw a football, if you don't spin it, it wobbles all over the place, but if you put spin on it, it provides stability as it's flying through the air. So, that rifling, as it's put inside the barrel by manufacturers with that tool, that creates class characteristics on the bullet as it's traveling down the barrel.

So, this particular barrel that was on this Glock, it did exhibit six lands and grooves, and it exhibited a left-handed twist, the spiral was going counterclockwise to the left as opposed to the right. And the riffling was what

we call conventional, which means it was cut. The riffling was actually cut with a tool which is called a broach, which is — it's kind of a long rod, it has teeth on the edge of it. It gets pulled or pushed through a barrel blank, and it cuts those grooves inside that barrel to make that riffling.

1.4

So, this particular barrel, the Storm Lake barrel, was manufactured in that method. And Glock barrels are not particularly manufactured in that method, which sometimes makes it so that Glock bullets, which come from Glock barrels, are difficult to identify.

But this one, due to the fact that it did have this cut riffling inside the barrel, when I put the two tests together on my microscope, it did exhibit a large amount of microscopic information that I determined was sufficient enough for me to be able to take those tests and compare them to the evidence to see if I could determine if they came from that gun.

Q So, with this Glock having an aftermarket barrel, and you being able to have specific microscopic detail that could relate back to the firearm, allowed you to do an analysis that maybe normally under a Glock barrel, you may or may not -- you may or not would have been able to complete, or?

A I would always attempt to complete the analysis, of course. I would put the two bullets side by side on my

comparison microscope. But more often than not, with a Glock barrel, I would come up with a conclusion of inconclusive.

Q Let me ask you then to go back to, after you have your two knowns that are fired from our .40 caliber Glock, which we know is now using an aftermarket barrel that has microscopic detail, what do you do next, Ms. Lester?

A Just like I said, I'm going to take those -- are we starting with bullets? I'll take the bullets from that water tank, put those two knowns together on my microscope, again, looking for all the class characteristics.

I'm looking for six lands and grooves. I'm looking for a left-handed twist. I'm looking for the width of those impressions to see if it matches up. And again, I'm looking for a significant amount of that microscopic detail for me to be able to say, yeah, there's enough there for me to be able to compare an unknown to this one that I test fired myself.

Q Can we start -- and let me go back. I know we were talking about bullets. If we -- did you do the same getting the same pristine samples with cartridge casings?

- A Yes, I did.
- Q Can we start with those, and then --
- A Sure.

1.6

Q -- go to bullets? With regard to cartridge casings, after -- were you able to determine that your known pristine cartridge casings had enough microscopic detail in order to

make an identification, or at least make a comparison to the unknowns?

A Yes. I did determine that my test fires did have significant microscopic detail for me to be able to perform the comparison.

Q What do you do physically, can you describe for the members of our jury, after you know you have enough microscopic detail to do the analysis?

A I have my microscope. And at first, I have my two knowns on the microscope, one cartridge case over here on the left, and one on the right. And then, what I do is you take off the one that's over here on the right, and I take an unknown and I put it on my microscope.

So, I go ahead and do the exact same comparison that I did with the test to test, but this time, I'm going with test to evidence. So, I do my microscopic comparison, look at the marks, make my determination, and then I remove that one and go to the next piece of evidence. So, I'm comparing that known to each individual unknown piece of evidence one at a time.

Q And in this particular case, showing you again State's 195, these are the -- the photograph of the cartridge casings, the unknowns that were submitted to you to do an analysis with regard to the known -- the pristine known, is that right?

1 A Yes, that's correct.

3.

1.4

Q Okay. And did you do the analysis for each of these cartridge casings that are depicted here in State's 195?

A Yes. I compared each one of those to one of the test fires that I test fired from the submitted Glock pistol.

Q Okay. And I'm going to ask you to talk about, what are some of the things you look for? For example, you talked about the primer area, and other specific areas. Can you describe that for the members of our jury, what those areas are and what you're looking for?

A Certainly. On cartridge cases, there's a variety of different areas that we can look at for marks. I talked about this primer area before, and I talked about how the cartridge case, when the cartridge was fired, it's pushed back against the back part of the slide. We call that the breech face area.

There's marks here on that area that are imparted from the back of that slide from when it hits back there, so there's marks that we look at there. Also, inside the firing pin impression where that firing pin actually hits, depending on the wear on the end of that firing pin, there might be microscopic marks in there.

I talked about that extractor. The hook which actually can pull the cartridge case -- the fired cartridge case out of the chamber, that hook -- that extractor

underneath the rim can make marks in that area as well. When the slide cycles back, the cartridge case is pulled put, and it hits against that item that we call the ejector to kick it out of the gun. That ejector can also make a mark here on this breech face area of the gun.

Around this side here of the cartridge case, you can get marks. These can be marks either from feeding, from when the unfired cartridge is fed into the chamber or extracted out of the chamber, scrapes, if you will, along the side when it's pushed or pulled.

Or there can be chamber marks which result from the expansion for when that firing pin hits and you get that spark, and your powder is burning and the gas is expanding, the sides, the actual walls of this cartridge case, expand against the inside walls of the chamber and you can get marks on it from there as well.

When the cartridge case is extracted and it's kicked out of the gun, when it goes out of that ejection port, that little cutout in the slide where it goes out, it can hit against the side of there and make a ding, and it can get an ejection port mark as well.

And finally, when you have that barrel and the slide together, when you -- when the firing pin hits and that firing process starts, that slide and that barrel are locked together for a quick second, just until that bullet has a chance to be

expelled from the muzzle, because you don't -- you don't want a gap right here because that would release your gas. You want all that gas to be behind the muzzle, propelling that bullet out.

So, that bullet and the slide are locked together for a quick moment. And after the bullet exits and the slide starts to travel backwards, the barrel actually moves. It tips just a tiny bit when the slide moves back, and you can get a scraping or a shear right on the primer area as well from that motion.

So, all those marks are different types of marks that I can look for on a cartridge case to see if I can ID it back to a firearm.

- Q And when we're talking about this, this is on a microscopic level, is that fair to say?
  - A Yes, that's correct.

1.0

- Q So, we look at these, for example, you know, what's depicted as our cartridge casings here, and it's not something that I'm going to be able to look down and see, is that fair?
  - A Not from this view here, no.
- Q Showing you what's been admitted as State's 194 -- well, let me go back. Did you have occasion to take examples of these microscopic details and photograph them?
  - A Yes, I did.
  - O Okay. Showing you what's been admitted as State's

194. And let's start --

1.7

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Court's indulgence. Okay. BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:

Q Starting at the top, the primer area, can you describe for the members of our jury what we're looking at here?

A Um-hum. As you can see, this is a photo collage that I made. I actually took the photos from my microscope. And you'll see it says, All photos: test fire 6C from the Glock pistol on the left, and item 9 on the right.

So, in the photo, there's actually a line right down the middle. That's the dividing line in my microscope. On the lefthand side, you have the test fire letter C from item 6, which was the Glock pistol on the lefthand side, and on the right hand side is the evidence submitted cartridge case item 9.

What you're looking at is the overall primer area. This area that I've been describing here contains that firing pin impression, some shear, and some parallel marks. And again, you have your test fire on the left and the evidence on the right.

Q With regard to a firing pin, describe the type of marking that a firing pin makes for the members of our jury.

A A firing pin makes a mark that -- we call it an impressed mark. We look at different types of marks here in

our business. The impressed mark, it's just like a hammer hitting a nail. It's a one-dimensional mark. The firing pin, it's just a pin that goes forward and hits that primer, spring-loaded. Just pops that primer. So, it's just an impression. So, what you see here, you see this negative impression of what the tip of that firing pin actually looks like.

O Now --

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Ms. Pieper, if you could clear that. Okay.

BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:

Q Let's then look at some of the other microscopic detail that you were looking at. What are we looking at here, Ms. Lester?

A This is a shear. And again, all the photos on this page are test fire 6, letter C from the Glock on the left, and item 9 on the right. Again, you'll see there is a dividing line right down the middle. Test fire on the left, evidence is on the right.

That shear, that comes from around the area where the firing pin protrudes through the slide. There's a little hole in the slide. The firing pin's contained in the slide. When you pull the trigger, that firing pin protrudes forward through that hole to hit that primer area of the cartridge.

That hole, it's called an aperture, firing pin

aperture. It's just a hole where the firing pin goes through.

And on the edge of that -- around the edge of that hole,

sometimes there can be some little rough spots from where it

was cut.

2.

And that shear that you're looking at there in the photo, that is the -- from the action that I described from where you have the barrel and the slide locked together during that shooting mechanism, and when the bullet comes out of the muzzle end of the barrel, before the slide moves backwards, it kind of moves back and tips down just a little bit, and it makes just a little shear, a little scrape right along the edge of that aperture. So, that's what you're seeing here on this photo.

Q And when you're referring to your pristine test fires and comparing it to, microscopically, at least, item number 9, we see item number 9, all of these were items of evidence that were collected at 2655 Sherwood and submitted to you for analysis?

A I can't testify as to where they were collected from. I just know they were submitted to me for analysis. But, again, like I described, I put each one on, one at a time and look at it against my test fire, and that these are the photos of the ones that I did actually look at.

Q Okay. So, this -- what we're looking at is an example of one that you did. We're not going to put up -- you

know, there were 13 cartridge cases submitted to you for 1 analysis. You did analysis on each one, is that fair to say? That's correct, and photos of all of them are in my 3 case file. Okay. Now, with regard to -- what are we looking at Q here that says "Ext"? What does that mean? 6 This one over here, "Ext"? 7 Um-hum. 8 This is an extractor mark. So, this is the mark, 9 like I talked about from that hook, which is the extractor, 10 which grabs the cartridge or cartridge case right underneath 11 the rim side, and then pulls it backwards out of the chamber 12 out of the barrel after the firing process. 1.3 So, that mark is actually located on the underside 14 of the rim. And again, on the lefthand side, you have test 15 fire 6C from the Glock. You'll see there is a line right down 16 the middle, and then on the right hand side is item 9. 17 And so, if I do this, what we're seeing is the 18 pristine test fire? 19 Correct. 20 And that is then placed next to or shown of the 21 actual cartridge case, and that was collected? That's correct. Α 23 And these are all of the microscopic detail that 24 we're looking at for you to be able to make an identification,

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

25

or an exclusion, or be inconclusive, is that right? 1 Yes, that's right. Α 2 And then I'm going to show you, what does "CM's" 3 mean? Those are chamber marks. Those are marks like I 5 talked about which you can get around this outside area of the 6 cartridge case either during that feeding process into the chamber, out of the chamber, or during the firing process when the sides of the cartridge case expand against the inside of the chamber. 10 So, these are actually two different areas. 11. it's just like all the others. There's a centerline here and 12 a centerline here, just like all the others. Test fire is on 13 the lefthand side, and then the evidence is on the right hand 14 side, and these are two different areas on the cartridge case. 15 So, again, for purposes of our jury, this is the 16 test fire? 17 That's correct. 1.8 And that is the actual cartridge casing that was 19 submitted to you? 20 Item 9, yes. · A 21 Correct. And again, this -- so our jurors can see, 22 that's the test fire, and thereafter is the cartridge casing? That's correct. Α 24 What is "EPM"? And one more area. 25

A This is what we've referred to as the ejection port mark. So, like I described earlier, when that cartridge case is being extracted, hits that ejector, flies out of the ejection port. Along that cutout on the slide, you have that ejection port, and it can hit against the side there and make a mark.

This mark right here, it's very indicative of a Glock. Glocks for some reason tend to have these marks. They tend to hit on that ejection port when they're being extracted and ejected. But just like all the others, you see there's a centerline. On the lefthand side is the test fire from the Glock, and on the right hand side, you're looking at the magnified photo of the ejection port mark from item 9.

Q With regard to then the seven cartridge casings, showing you 195, that were submitted to you for analysis and to be compared to the firearm that was also submitted in this case, were you able to draw any conclusions with regard to this State's 193, the Glock, and the evidence that was collected from our scene?

 $_{\rm A}$   $_{\rm I}$  was able to identify those seven cartridge cases as having been fired by the submitted Glock pistol.

Q So, these cartridge casings were fired by this Glock?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Now, were you also asked to do an analysis

with regard to metal fragments that were collected, and there were a number of metal fragments and/or bullets that were collected?

A Yes, I was.

Q And we -- I know you indicated earlier that there were a total of -- 16 total either fragments and/or bullets that were submitted to you, is that right?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q And showing you what's been admitted as State's 196, Ms. Lester, what are we looking at here?

A These are bullets, or metal fragments, or bullet jacket fragments which were submitted to me for analysis under this case.

Q Describe the process that you took with regard to doing the analysis of the metal fragments or bullets that were submitted?

A It's the exact same thing like I did with the cartridge cases. I test fired the gun. I took the pristine samples, put them under my comparison microscope, did the comparison of the test to test to determine if there was sufficient agreement in the microscopic markings for me to be able to use those to make a comparison to the ones that were submitted by evidence. For these, I determined that there was, and I compared the test fired bullets, which I fired from the Glock, to the evidence ones that were submitted to me.

Q And specifically, describe for -- because we're about to see State's 197. What's the term "LIMP" or "GIMP" mean?

A I talked about the riffling impressions, and how the riffling is actually cut inside the barrel. And when the riffling is cut, you end up with a groove. It's -- inside the barrel, it's actually a groove that's cut to make that spiral, so that's called a groove. When the bullet travels down the barrel, you're getting a negative impression of that on your bullet.

So, the thing that's actually like cut down, it's a groove on the barrel that actually comes up on the bullet.

And vice versa, the area that's in between those grooves, we call those lands. So, that area that kind of comes up inside the barrel, it transfers to a divotted area on the bullet.

So, per our abbreviations, LIMP, that's a land impression, and GIMP, that's a groove impression.

Q So, showing you then and the members of our jury — let me go back up one. What are we looking at here, again, under these — oops, excuse me. We have a blank page to make it helpful. Which portion are we showing the members of our jury now?

A And these are all photos that I took from my microscope -- copies of the photos that I took. And on the lefthand side is the test fire. It was number 6, letter A

from the Glock pistol, and compared it to on the right hand 1 side item number 29. So, the -- right where you had the line, 2 that's the line on the comparison microscope. I'm actually 3 looking at two things side by side, test fire on the lefthand side and the submitted evidence item on the right hand side. And again, showing the members of our jury the groove impressions. Is that again what we're looking at, Ms. 7 The lefthand side --Lester? 8 Yes. Α -- is your pristine test fired recovered bullet? Q 10 Α Yes. 11 And then, on the right hand side would be the item 12 of evidence that was submitted for either identification or 13 exclusion? 14 Item 29 that was submitted for comparison to that 15 16 pistol, yes. With regard to -- and so we know which ones we're 17 talking about -- what's been admitted as State's 196, with 18 regard to metal fragment items number 21, 22, 23, item 27, 29, 19 30, 31, and 33, were you able to draw any conclusions about 20 these submitted fragments? I was able to draw conclusions about those 22

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ◆ 303-798-0890

And what was -- what were those conclusions?

Seven of those items, item 21, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31,

fragments, yes.

23

24

25

and 33 -- just making sure -- were identified as having been fired from the submitted Glock pistol. Item 22, I determined that it was inconclusive, and I could not make a determination either way whether it was fired from or not fired from the submitted Glock pistol.

Q Okay. So, with regard to item 22 that's depicted

- Q Okay. So, with regard to item 22 that's depicted here, you could not make an identification, or it did not have enough detail?
  - A That's correct.

- Q So, it was inconclusive or not suitable to make the identification, is that fair?
- A It was inconclusive due to damage and lack of microscopic information.
  - Q With regard to 21, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, and 33, those items of evidence were all fired from the Glock that was submitted to you?
- A Yes, that's correct.
- Q Okay. Did you then move on to the 9 millimeter firearm that was submitted for analysis?
  - A Are we starting with the firearm?
- Q Yes, the 9 -- I'm sorry, the 9 millimeter. Did you also do -- let me back up. Did you also do, first of all, that dry run of the firearm and make sure that it's safe and that it worked?
  - A Yes, I did a firearms function exam. Everything the

exact same thing I did with the Glock, where I measured it,
measured its length, measured the barrel length, looked at the
serial number, measured the trigger pull, looked at the
safeties, made sure that it was safe in order -- dry fired it,
all of those things before I actually went ahead and test
fired it.

Q And showing you what's been admitted as State's 199,

- Q And showing you what's been admitted as State's 199, again, is that the Smith and Wesson 9 millimeter firearm that you ended up doing the analysis on?
  - A Yes. That's a photo of it, yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Okay. Yeah, fair to say it's not the actual gun. Sorry. That also had a magazine. Can you circle where that is in the photograph, Ms. Lester?
  - A Certainly. The magazine is here in this area.
- Q Okay. With regard to that magazine, did that also have -- or were you submitted any cartridge -- 9 millimeter cartridges with this?
- A That magazine was submitted with eight R-P 9 millimeter Luger cartridges.
- Q Okay. And what -- how -- what's the capacity of this magazine? For the 9 millimeter.
  - A That has a capacity of 15 cartridges.
- Q Okay. And that is -- if you could read the serial number into the record.
  - A It's TBB2817.

And you have that blown up there, but it's actually 1 depicted on the firearm, is that right? 2 This is from the left side of the frame. 3 see I have a red arrow right there. It's actually showing it 5 from this part of the frame right here. And what was the trigger pull of the Smith and 6 Wesson 9 millimeter? 7 If I can just look at my notes for one moment. 8 Please do. 9 The Smith and Wesson was a type of gun that could be 10 fired in two different actions, single-action or 11 double-action. The trigger pull in single-action was measured 12 to be five-and-a-half to five-and-three-quarter pounds, and 13 double-action was measured to be 11-and-one-quarter to 14 15 11-and-three-quarter pounds. And was this also then operational and safe for you 16 to do a further analysis? 17 Yes, it was. 18

Q Did you perform -- you walked through with us that at first, you shot into the water tank, as it were. Did you do the same types of things with this that you did with the Glock pistol?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A I did. I took some ammunition from our firearms general supply, and I engraved it, the cartridge cases and the bullets, with item 4, letters A through F. The first three,

which I fired into our water tank, just like I described like I did with the Glock. The second -- the second two -- actually, when I test fired it the first time, I had -- the fourth one didn't completely feed into the chamber, it actually fell out into the water tank.

So, I just did the first three into the tank. The fourth one didn't fire. The fifth one and the sixth one I shot downrange towards a target, just like I described with the Glock. And I did that on January 21st, and I shot it again three more times into the water tank on January 27th using a different brand of ammunition.

Q With regard to the 9 millimeter, were you also submitted -- showing what's been admitted as State's 200, cartridge casings -- six cartridge casings from this particular event number to do an analysis on with regard to this firearm?

A Yes, I was.

Q And did you in fact take the known or pristine cartridge casings from -- or cartridge cases from the 9 millimeter and compare them ultimately to the evidence that was submitted to you?

A Yes, I did.

Q Prior to doing that, did you walk through the same process that we've told this jury about, taking the knowns first to see if there was enough detail in order to go on with

the analysis?

- A Yes, I did.
- Q And was there enough detail in this case?
- A For the cartridge cases, yes, there was.
- Q Okay. And describe then what you did after you had that known pristine example, and how it is you walked through the analysis of the unknowns or the items submitted to you.

A Same way that I did with the cartridge cases from the Glock. I took the two test fired cartridge cases that I had fired, put them side by side on my microscope, looked at them, looked at those general overall class characteristics, the general shape of the firing pin, shape of the marks on the breech face, and making sure that they're generally there, that they're repeating, which we test, and test, and test, and that, again, I had enough microscopic information for me to go ahead and compare it to the evidence.

So, from my microscope, if I had two test fires, one on each side, a test fire on the left, a test fire on the right, I would go ahead and remove the test fire from the right, take the evidence cartridge case and put it on the right hand side, and do a direct comparison to the test fire. And then I repeated that with each one of the submitted 9 millimeter Luger cartridge cases.

Q And were you able to make any conclusions or identifications with regard to the six cartridge casings that

were collected from 2655 Sherwood and submitted to you under event number 131105-0479?

A Yes, I was.

Q And what conclusions, if any, did you make, Ms. Lester?

A I concluded that those six 9 millimeter Luger cartridge cases were submitted -- or, excuse me, were identified as having been fired by the submitted Smith and Wesson pistol.

Q So, the six that are depicted here in State's admitted 200 were fired by what's been admitted as State's 199?

A That's correct.

2.0

Q Okay. Now, again, to show the comparison to the jury, did you also make examples of the comparisons that you did, just like you did with the .40 caliber cartridge casings?

A Yes, I did. I made a photo collage sheet, the exact same way like I did with the Glock cartridge cases, of some representative photos of the comparisons that I did between the test fires and the submitted evidence.

Q And showing you what's been admitted as State's 198, if we again look at the primer, which is the pristine example, and which is the comparison or the submitted evidence?

A Like it says on the top, you have the 9 millimeter Luger cartridge cases. Test fires from the Smith and Wesson

pistol, item 4, are on the lefthand side. You see there's a centerline. This says, "Test fire 4I" in red right here.
This is item 16.

So, on this particular collage, everything is item

16, but there's a couple of photos. One has item letter

designator I, and two that have letter designator G of my test

fires. But on here, what you're seeing is the primer area.

Test fire from item 4, letter designator I primer area on the

lefthand side, and the primer area from item 16 submitted

cartridge case on the right hand side.

Q And showing the members of the jury, you did the primer as well as -- are we looking at the breech face depicted here? Which area am I showing?

A That's the -- it's an up close, magnified shot of that primer area. Just like before, the last photo was kind of the overall. This is -- the lefthand side over here, what you see is the test fire from item 4 with letter designator I. You see there's a line right down the middle where you had your paper. And on the right hand side, you have that breech face area, magnified primer area from item 16.

Q And showing the members of our jury the chamber marks, what are we looking at here then, Ms. Lester?

A Just like I described with the Glock, chamber marks are the ones that are located around this particular part on the cartridge case, either during the feeding or extracting

process, or during the expansion process when the cartridge is fired, and they're imparted all around this area here.

Here, there are two different areas of chamber marks. You see each one of them has a line right down the middle. It's a photo that I took -- thank you -- with the test fire from item 4, letter designator G on the lefthand side. On both of these photos, two different areas of chamber marks, and item 16 is depicted on the right hand side.

Q And again, the "Ext" that we're looking at, what mark is that?

A And that's the extractor mark. Again, that's the hook that goes underneath the rim that extracts that cartridge case from the chamber. And you see a line right down the middle from the photo. And test fire 4, letter designator I is depicted on the left, and item 16, the extractor mark, is on the right hand side.

Q So, again, if I cover this, this is the pristine known example that you fired, and this is the submitted evidence?

A Yes, that's correct.

1.2

Q Okay. And you were able to make the conclusion that all of the 9 millimeter Luger cartridge casings that were submitted to you were fired by the Smith and Wesson 9 millimeter firearm that was submitted to you for testing?

A Yes, ma'am, that is correct.

Q Now, with regard to the bullet fragments or metal fragments that were submitted to you, in total, there were 16. We talked about ones that you were able to identify having been fired from the .40 caliber pistol that was submitted. Showing you what's been admitted as State's 201. Let me zoom back out. Are these the additional fragments that were submitted to you for analysis?

A Those are the photos of the additional bullets and fragments that were submitted to me for analysis, yes.

Q Thank you, Ms. Lester. We are not looking at the actual items, we are looking at photographs of the items. With regard to these, walk through or tell the members of the jury the process you use to make either -- any conclusions with regard to these metal fragments or bullets that were submitted.

A Same process that I described before with the Glock. I took the known test fires from the Smith and Wesson pistol that I actually fired into the water tank, put those together on my comparison microscope to compare them to each other to determine if there was enough microscopic information and enough repeatability in that information for me to be able to compare it to the evidence.

I determined when I was doing that that my test fires from the Smith and Wesson pistol, that they did not have a lot of microscopic information on them. I was able to index

them, which means I could match up the correct land impression and the correct groove impression, but overall, there wasn't a lot of markings. So, that's kind of a red flag to me that I might not be able to come to a conclusion on my comparison.

So, I looked at the test fires to each other, and then I went ahead and -- same as before, with a test fire on the left and a test fire on the right. I would take off the test fire from the right and put each piece of evidence on the right hand side to go ahead and do the comparison. And I did that with those first five items there, 28, 32, 34, 35, and 36.

Q With regard to those items, were you able to make any conclusions or identifications?

A I was able to make a conclusion of inconclusive. I determined that I was unable to be able to identify or eliminate those particular items from that Smith and Wesson pistol.

Q Now, with regard -- does that have to do -- we look at some of these and there are some damages to the item. Is that partly because of that?

A Yes. Due to the damage and the lack of microscopic information, I was unable to draw a conclusion as to one way or the other.

Q With regard to -- and was that for all of these items? You talked about the first five. What about item 24,

25 and 26, those items?

1.2

A For -- yes. For the first five, I did say that they were inconclusive. And for the bottom three depicted there, 24, 25 and 26, I determined that those were not suitable for comparison due to lack of microscopic marks.

Q Now, the last three you couldn't even compare, fair to say?

A That's correct.

Q With regard to item 28, 32, 34, 35 and 36, was there any general riffling impressions that -- anything that could be drawn, or conclusion could be drawn about that?

A Remember how when I talked about the riffling and I talked about how those grooves are cut in the barrel, and on the Glock barrel, particularly, there were six grooves and they twisted to the left. On the Smith and Wesson on the test fires, the test fires showed five grooves, and those actually twisted to the right. So, those were in a counterclockwise motion.

So, I was able to determine that these five did have those same matching class characteristics as the Smith and Wesson. They did show five land and groove impressions and a right-handed twist. And also, the widths of those land and groove impressions was consistent visually with the widths of the land and groove impressions from the test fires from that Smith and Wesson pistol.

```
But it's fair to say you couldn't make a conclusive
1
   identification, even though, generally speaking, they had the
   land and groove impressions twisting to the right that were
3
   consistent at least with the 9 millimeter?
                      They had matching class characteristics, but
        Α
5
   insufficient amount of matching individual microscopic detail
   for me to be able to draw a conclusion of identification or
7
   elimination.
8
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Ms. Lester. I'd pass
9
   the witness, Judge.
10
                                  Cross-examination?
              THE COURT:
                          Okav.
11
                         Yes, Your Honor.
              MR. OTTO:
12
                           CROSS-EXAMINATION
13
    BY MR. OTTO:
14
              Good afternoon, Ms. Lester.
15
              Good afternoon.
16
              My name is David Otto. I represent Mr. Washington
17
    in this case. You have -- you've testified in this judicial
18
    district before?
19
              Yes, sir, I have.
20
               How many times, approximately?
21
               Five times.
22
               Five times. Were some of the fragments you tested
23
    full metal jacket, or hollow point?
24
               If I may look at my notes for one moment.
 25
                 Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890
```

There were some that were full metal jacket, some that were jacketed hollow point, and some which I said were either 2 jacketed hollow point or soft point, that I was not able to tell. And they were fragments of the bullets or Q. projectiles, is that correct? Some of what I received were actual complete bullets, and I did also receive some fragments. 8 You mentioned a -- that you then -- you testified to a theory of identification. 10 Um-hum. 11 Could you explain to us what the -- what a theory of 12 identification is? 13 Sure. Like I said, it's the theory that we as 14 firearms examiners countrywide, nationwide, worldwide use to 15 determine whether or not we can identify, eliminate, or make 16 inconclusive decision. 17 And it's a theory? They're not established facts, 18 is that correct? 19 It's based on scientific research and scientific 20 studies that have been done, but the last part of the 21 conclusion is an opinion of identification that is made by me 22 as the examiner. 23 Your examination and comparison of these cases and 24 the projectiles, it's not able to tell you what bullet hit, if

anyone, in this case, is that true? No, I did not do any exam as towards what bullet hit 2 who or what. 3 You also talked about general categories of marks on all -- that all guns leave on projectiles and cases. So, is it fair to say that these marks are very -- are similar to 6 each other, one Glock .40 would leave a similar mark to 7 another Glock .40? 8 That's fair to say. Α 9 Now, you talked about a firing pin making an 10 impression. And I'm showing you -- and I'm going to blow this 11 up if I can get it right. I'm showing you State's Exhibit 12 194. And at the top, two primer ends of a cartridge case, 13 correct? 14 That's correct. 15 Α And they look a little like soda cans almost, don't 16 they, in that picture? 17 You could say so. 18 The left is your exemplar, the one you fired into 19 the water tank? 20 Yes, that's correct. Α 21 And the right is one that was provided to you by the 22 CSA's or evidence technicians in this case, correct? 23 Yes. It was submitted to me, and I retrieved it Α 24

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ◆ 303-798-0890

from an evidence technician.

25

Fair to say those primer strike marks are somewhat different? 2 I do expect them to be somewhat different. All 3 these marks are made during motion. It's a very dynamic process, which is why when I make my identification, I'm not looking for 100 percent agreement in all those marks. As I testified, I'm just looking for sufficient agreement for me to make an opinion of identification. 8 Your opinion of identification? 9 That's correct. 10 Α MR. OTTO: All right. I have nothing further. 11. THE COURT: Redirect? 12 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA: 15 Ms. Lester, let me ask you this so -- the 16 edification for our jurors. What happens after you make your 17 conclusions with regard to your work? Does it just get 18 submitted to me, or what happens next? 19 After I make a microscopic identification, when I 20 say, this piece of evidence, I've ID'ed it to this particular firearm, I make that conclusion, and then that conclusion has 22 to be verified by a second independent examiner. 23 So, I go ahead and I submit that to another examiner 24 in our laboratory, and they put those two actual pieces of

evidence on their microscope and do a microscopic examination, and determine what their conclusion would be and whether or not they agree with me as an -- that it's an identification.

2.2

So, before I can actually report out that this is an identification, a second examiner physically looks at the same evidence that I look at.

In addition to that, once I've completed those identifications -- and in this case, I had three different identifications, two sets of cartridge cases, one set of bullets. Once I've completed those and those have been verified by another examiner, then the entire case file goes through a technical review.

That is a review that's done by another qualified firearms examiner, and they check the entire case to make sure that all of our policies and procedures have been followed correctly, and that basically, the conclusions that I've drawn are supported by the data which is in my case file.

Once that technical review is completed, before the case and the report can be released, the entire case file goes through one final review. It's an administrative review. Those reviews are currently done by our manager. He is the person who is technically responsible for all of the work that comes out of our unit. He does one final administrative review. That is basically to check for misspellings, numberings, that you didn't transpose something. But he is a

technically qualified person, as well, and he's reviewing the case as a third time.

So, once he finally okays it, that is when the case can finally get released, and the report can finally be released to the requester.

- Q Is the lab that you work for, Metro's lab, an accredited lab?
  - A Yes, it is.

Q And does it have to have certain qualifications in order for you to continue make analyses under that accreditation?

A Yes. Like we talked about earlier, I do have to continually take a proficiency exam on an annual basis in the field of firearms and in the field of toolmarks in order for me to be allowed to continue to go ahead and perform independent casework analysis.

Q With regard to Mr. Otto asking a question about, generally, does a Glock have similar characteristics of an item being fired from it -- or a cartridge being fired from it as another Glock would, and you said, yes, generally speaking, that's correct, is that right?

A Yeah, similar. We talked about class characteristics and individual class characteristics. The firing pin aperture that the firing pin goes through on a Glock slide, Glock, the manufacturer, makes that in a

rectangular shape. So, I expect to see that on another Glock .40.

The firing pin on a Glock is also kind of elongated. It's an oval shape and cross-section, so I expect to see that on another Glock. I don't expect to see a round firing pin impression or a round firing pin aperture. I expect to see those same general shapes. Again, those are class characteristics. Those are put there by the manufacturer, so I do expect to see them from one, to the other, to the other.

But I don't make an identification based on those characteristics. Those are just kind of the class characteristics. It's kind of like when you're looking for your car in a parking lot, you think, okay, I'm looking for all red cars. You know, there's 100 cars here and there's only 30 red cars, I know my car is in this group.

Those are things that can restrict it and allow you to narrow it down, but you don't make the identification until you look at those microscopic marks that are put there by that manufacturing process accidentally like I talked about. When those tools are making those marks, those are the marks that I actually use to make the identification.

Q So, when Mr. Otto showed you State's 194 and he just looked at the primer -- the overall primer area, that's one area that you use as part of an identification, is that fair to say?

A Yeah, it's just a class characteristic look. You can see it sort of has this rectangular shape here. So, in general, those shapes are the same, but I'm not using that overall shape. Again, I'm using those microscopic marks to make that identification.

Q So, for example, if we look at the actual chamber marks here as depicted, are those some of the things that you look at, as well as all the others that are depicted on this exhibit?

A Yes. And again, I'm not making marks just off that one area -- or making an identification just off that one area. I have several different areas on that cartridge case where there is agreement in the microscopic marks on those cartridge cases.

Q And when you talk about -- just for purposes of our jury, showing 194, as well as 198, 194 shows the overall class primer area of the Glock that's depicted here, and I want to show -- let me zoom-out -- for example, below it, 198, which is the 9 millimeter. Are you -- when you were talking about some that had, for example, circular verus square or rectangular, is that depicted in these?

A Yes. You can see on the top, those are primers -primer areas from the Glock firing pin impressions. And you
can see how the overall shape is more rectangular, and down
lower, on the ones from the Smith and Wesson 9 millimeter,

those have a round impression. 1 So, those are the things that are just class 2 characteristics, and that's why I say that, you know, in 3 general, firearms of the same manufacturer make/model might 4 have similar overall appearance. 5 Showing you, Ms. Lester, what's been previously 6 admitted as State's 84, do you recognize your signature on the 7 bottom there? Α Yes, I do. 9 And did you put the evidence tape on this? 10 Yes, I did. 11 And what -- let me zoom-in. What item of evidence 12 are we looking at in State's 84, at least the outside 13 14 packaging? That's impound item 16, which is said there to 15 contain one bullet. Okay. And did it come from the autopsy in this 17 case? 18 According to the package, it did come from the 19 autopsy. 20 Okay. So, item 16, you indicated that you had 21 renumbered what had been submitted to you as item 16. Do you 22 know what item number item 16 is when you renumbered it for 23 your analysis? 24

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

Yes.

25

It was impound item 16, laboratory item 23.

```
MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Court's indulgence.
1
             THE COURT: Um-hum.
2
   BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
3
             Lab -- so item 16 was laboratory item number 23, is
4
   that right?
5
             Yes, that's correct.
        Α
6
              THE COURT: And what --
7
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Were you --
8
              THE COURT: What exhibit number are we on now?
 9
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And I'm sorry, Judge.
10
    Exhibit number 196, depicting item 23.
11
    BY MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
1.2
              Is that depicting item 23, along with other items?
13
              Yes, ma'am.
14
              And that is what was in State's 84?
15
              Yes, that's correct.
16
              What if any conclusion were you able to draw with
17
    regard to item 23?
18
              Lab item 23, the bullet, I identified it as having
19
    been fired by the submitted Glock pistol.
20
               Okay. So, you don't know what bullet shot whom, but
21
          Q
    the evidence, if there is correlation, can be shown?
 22
          Α
               Yes.
 23
               MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Nothing further, Judge.
 24
               THE COURT: Recross?
 25
```

1	MR. OTTO: Ms. Lester, you excuse me.	
2	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Sorry, sorry.	I
3	RECROSS-EXAMINATION	ĺ
4	BY MR. OTTO:	
5	Q You mentioned that you fired both these pistols into	
6	a water barrel, and also downrange, correct?	
7	A Yes, that's correct.	
8	Q When you fired them, were you wearing gloves?	
9	A No, I was not.	
10	Q Barehanded?	
	A Yes.	
11	Q Did you get gunshot residue on your hands?	
12	A I may or may not have. I didn't specifically look	
13	for that.	
14	Q It's common to get gunshot residue on your hand	
15	handown correct?	
16	7	
17	Thank VOII	
18	TWO STEWERS. You're welcome.	
19	Nothing further, Your Honor.	
20	Thank you. You may step down. May this	
21		
22	GOUTENIACOUA: Yes, Your Honor,	
23	Vos Your Honor.	
2,4	Thank you, ma'am.	
25		
	Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890	

1 You're excused. 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you. THE COURT: Does the State have another witness? 3 MS. PIEPER: Judge, we just want to make sure that all of the evidence has been admitted, except for State's 89. 5 6 THE COURT: Correct? 7 THE CLERK: Yes. THE COURT: Apparently, everything but 89 has been 8 9 admitted. MS. PIEPER: And with that, the State will rest. 10 THE COURT: All right. The State rests its case in 11 chief. 12 Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take a recess. 13 you're on this recess, I'll ask you to repeat to one another 14 from memory the following -- I'm kidding. 15 16 But I will ask you to observe this admonishment. Please do not talk or converse among yourselves, or with 17 anyone else on any subject or any person connected with this 18 trial. Don't read, watch, or listen to any news report or 19 commentary on the trial. Please do not form or express any 20 21 opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you. 22 We'll take a ten-minute recess. 23 THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury. 24 THE COURT RECORDER: Off the record, Your Honor? 25

THE COURT: Off the record.

(Court recessed at 2:59 P.M. until 3:27 P.M.)

(Outside the presence of the jury)

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for reporting what happened with one of the -- I guess several of the juror members. Who was the family member who was with them in the elevator? Ma'am, are you the -- you're related to the defendant, Mr. Washington?

MS. HINES: Yes, I'm his mother.

THE MARSHAL: Ma'am, stand up, please.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am, for reporting that. We -- it's important to us, as you've heard me give instructions all the way through here to the jury not to talk to anybody, and it's important to us to know if any of the jury members are doing it.

It's also important to us to know if we have -- we have a situation develop where, even just getting in elevators, where we're just too close so that it's almost -- it's kind of uncomfortable to stand on an elevator with somebody and not say anything.

So, here's what I would like to ask. First of all, the -- apparently, all it was was a comment about a -- or not a butterfly. A bee? A bumblebee? What was it, ma'am?

 $$\operatorname{MS}$.$  HINES: It was this. I was walking and she was standing by the stairwell. And I -- I use a walker sometimes,

so I need to walk and hold the rail. So, I said, excuse me.

I said -- I know we're not supposed to talk to each other, so

I said excuse me so I could hold the silver thing.

And a bee was going into your stairwell as you walk down the long stairs. And something else. She said -- she said -- they thought it was a bee, and I said, oh, no, it was a wasp. And then I said, have a nice weekend.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. HINES: And that was it.

THE COURT: All right. Well, it -- even though it seems like an innocuous, you know, conversation about a bee or a wasp, it's too close. We don't want a situation where we're getting any need to have any kind of conversation between any defendant or defendant's family and any of the jury members, anymore than we would if it was a witness for the State out there. We just don't -- we don't want any talking amongst them.

So, what I'm going to ask you folks to do is -- I don't want to reach a point where I have to wind up arresting a family member, and I don't want to reach a point where I wind up having to exclude family members from being able to watch this trial. So, I'm going to ask you all to use very good sense and caution. And any time the jury goes out of the courtroom, let them exit first. I think we've been doing that, have we not?

THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let them exit, and give them time and space. Do not get even close to the jury members. That way, we won't have an accidental conversation that will get somebody in trouble, or worse yet from my standpoint and the taxpayers' standpoint, wind up having a mistrial and having to start over.

It doesn't take a lot of contact in order for the Court to decide we're going to have to start over here, just because we -- we're cautious and we don't want there to be any chance of there being any conversation.

So, could I ask you all to please -- and don't even -- I mean, they'll know you're not being rude if you don't talk to them. Don't even talk about the time of day or about anything, because, you know, as much as we didn't want the jury members to say anything to you, we also didn't want you to say anything to them. Fair enough?

MS. HINES: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Do you all understand?

MS. HINES: I do.

THE COURT: Everybody -- any questions about what I want you to do?

MS. HINES: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I shouldn't be having any reason from here on to find out that you guys have ever even

```
been close enough to a jury member for there to be any kind of
1
                  Am I --
   conversation.
             MS. HINES:
                         No.
3
             THE COURT: Are we clear?
4
             MS. HINES: Yes.
5
                           Judge, did this conversation happen
             MS. PIEPER:
6
   today, or did this conversation happen on Friday?
7
                          That was Friday when we were leaving.
             MS. HINES:
8
                          Friday?
              THE COURT:
9
              MS. HINES: Friday when we were leaving.
10
              THE COURT: When we were leaving? Okay.
11
    where's this handrail?
12
              MS. HINES: You know, downstairs.
13
                          So, is it outside?
              THE COURT:
14
                          Yeah.
              MS. HINES:
15
                           Outside, going on that ramp that goes
              THE COURT:
16
    down to the --
17
                                  You know, right where --
                           Yeah.
              MS. HINES:
18
                           -- to the sidewalk?
               THE COURT:
19
                           Yeah. Not where the handicapped ramp is
               MS. HINES:
20
    at, because I don't park right there.
 21
               THE COURT:
                           Oh.
 22
               MS. HINES: I park right in the front because I have
 23
     a handicap placard.
 24
               THE COURT: Okay, I see.
 25
```

1	MS. PIEPER: Which juror was it?
2	THE COURT: Do you know which juror it was?
3	MS. HINES: It was that lady who has asthma, and
4	that lady who has a purse. Because everyone else was gone,
5	but I guess they don't have a car. I don't know. Those two
6	were standing there. Just those two.
7	THE COURT: And the lady with the asthma, can do
8	you know which seat she sits in normally?
9	MS. HINES: That's the one who sits back here. And
10	the other one, I don't know where she sits at. She sits
11	somewhere else, like on this front row.
12	THE COURT: Well, when you say "sits back here," do
1.3	you mean clear down at this end over here
14	UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: It's in the middle
15	THE COURT: or down at that end?
1.6	UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: like right here. The
17	fourth seat, maybe.
18	MS. HINES: That one who has black hair.
19	THE COURT: 1, 2, 3
20	MS. HINES: She sits right here.
21	THE COURT: The fourth seat in?
22	MS. HINES: I don't I don't know.
23	THE COURT: So, that would be Patricia Dowell? I
24	mean, the fourth seat
25	MS. HINES: I don't know her name. She was
	·

```
coughing. That's why I know --
1
             THE COURT: -- because we're missing --
2
             MS. HINES: -- she's the one with the asthma.
             THE COURT: Okay. And I think the one with the
4
   asthma -- is that the one with the asthma?
5
            MS. PIEPER: I don't know, Judge. We can bring the
6
   panel in and ask them.
7
             THE COURT: All right. And the other lady, which
9
   one was it?
             MS. HINES: Yeah, she had a Coach purse. I remember
10
   that.
11
             UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Backpack, actually. Duffel
12
13
   baq.
              THE COURT: She had a?
14
             MS. HINES: Coach purse.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. That won't help me. All right.
16
   We're going to --
17
              MS. HINES: My daughter says --
18
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: What did she say --
19
              MS. HINES: -- she has it today.
20
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- about the Coach purse?
21
              THE COURT: We're now going to pull the jury in and
22
    ask them, and admonish them again about this, because it's
    that important that we not have even passing the time of day
    between the family of a defendant and any jury member. Okay?
25
```

Everybody understand?

MS. HINES: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, Marshal, just before you go out, understand, folks, that I am deadly serious about this. And if there is any further kind of interaction between a family member and the jury, you need to understand that it's not impossible for a Judge to arrest a family member and put them in jail until the end of a trial.

I mean, we take this very seriously. And while I understand that an innocent conversation may seem to be just, so what, it's a big deal. So, I trust that nobody's going to push me to that point, okay? Thank you all. Now, let's bring our jury and I'm going to ask them.

MS. PIEPER: Are we going to canvass the jury in front of the family? Is that what -- did you say you were going to --

THE COURT: Is that -- I was going to.

MS. PIEPER: No, Judge. I'm going to ask that if --

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yeah.

MS. PIEPER: -- you talk to the members of the jury that the family is not in the courtroom.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's wait and see. Is he bringing them in?

THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Not yet. He hasn't come through the door yet.

THE COURT: All right. Folks, would you excuse us 1 just a few minutes, and we'll have the marshal come get you 2 and tell you when it's time to come in. 3 MS. PIEPER: And Judge, just for the record, you 4 speaking to the defendant's family was done outside the 5 presence of the jury. 6 THE COURT: Yes, thank you. Yeah, our record should 7 reflect that. 8 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 (Pause in the proceedings) 10 THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury. 11 (Jury reconvened at 3:35 p.m.) 12 THE COURT: Will counsel stipulate to the presence 13 of the jury? 14 MS. PIEPER: Yes, Your Honor. 15 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yes, Your Honor. 16 MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ladies and 18 gentlemen. You have heard me, ladies and gentlemen, 19 throughout this trial give you this constant admonition not to 20 talk to people about the case or about the trial, and -- or 21 about anyone connected with the trial. 22 We had an exchange. What probably will come as a 23 surprise to any of you that may have been a part of it, but it 24 causes us to need to ask some questions. And that was

apparently last Friday after we were finished, some of the 1 family members were leaving the building, and they may have 2 had a very brief exchange with some of the jury members, 3 specifically, with two of the female jury members who were probably it sounds like amongst the last to leave the 5 building. 6 Did anyone have a brief conversation -- not even 7 conversation, but exchange of pleasantries with a family 8 member? Yes, is this Ms. Dowell? Yes, ma'am. And Ms. Lucas? 9 JUROR NO. 7: Yes. 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Judge, if we may approach. 12 MS. PIEPER: Approach. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 (Off-record bench conference) 1.5 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Did anyone else 16 -- anyone else involved in any exchange of pleasantries or 17 anything with the family members? All right. I'm going to 18 ask all of you, except Ms. Dowell, to step outside the 19 courtroom. And in a minute, I'll have you come in, Ms. Lucas, 20 but we'll talk just to Ms. Dowell for a moment. Will everyone 21 else please leave the courtroom? 22 THE MARSHAL: All rise. 23 (Pause in the proceedings) 24 THE COURT: Ms. Dowell, will you stay with us, 25 Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

```
please -
1
             JUROR NO. 5: Oh.
2
             THE COURT: -- for a moment?
3
             JUROR NO. 5.: Okay.
4
             THE COURT: Yeah, um-hum.
5
                     (Jury recessed at 3:39 p.m.)
6
                   (In the presence of Juror No. 5)
7
             THE COURT: Do you want to just have a seat here,
8
   Ms. Dowell, in any one of the seats where the microphone is
   there? Do you see the microphone -- right there in the front
10
   row. Right there is a microphone. Just sit down right where
11
    you are.
12
              JUROR NO. 5: Oh, this one?
13
              THE COURT: Yeah.
14
              JUROR NO. 5: Yes.
15
              THE COURT: That way, we can pick up what you're
16
    saying. Would you tell us please, Ms. Dowell, what was this
1.7
    exchange of pleasantries or conversation?
18
              JUROR NO. 5: Oh, yes. We were, you know, where you
19
    come out of the entrance.
20
               THE COURT: Um-hum.
21
               JUROR NO. 5: She and I were standing in the step.
 22
    And I guess one other lady -- oh, we were in her way. And she
 23
     -- you know, we moved. And she was saying, oh, yes, I have
 24
     COPD, you know, and like, oh, yeah, I have asthma. And after
```

```
that, I just said, have a good weekend. That was it.
              THE COURT: Okay. Was this -- when you say at the
 2
   -- was it at a ramp, or where was this handrail?
 3
              JUROR NO. 5: It's outside when you come out of the
   door, you know, where the exit is.
 5
              THE COURT: Is it -- are you talking about out the
 6
   north exit, the one you normally come in --
 7
              JUROR NO. 5: Yeah, where the parking lot is --
 8
              THE COURT: -- and out at?
 9
              JUROR NO. 5: -- before you go down the step.
10
              THE COURT: Yeah, uh-huh. All right.
11
              JUROR NO. 5: Because I Have to wait for my husband
12
    to pick me up, because --
              THE COURT: I see.
14
              JUROR NO. 5: -- you know, because I have a hard
15
    time with my asthma by the time we finish --
16
              THE COURT: Yeah.
17
              JUROR NO. 5: -- our session, so --
18
              THE COURT: Okay.
19
              JUROR NO. 5: -- he'd rather pick me up.
20
              THE COURT: All right. And how are you doing with
21
    the asthma and our sessions?
              JUROR NO. 5: Oh, I'm fine.
23
              THE COURT: Doing all right?
24
              JUROR NO. 5: It was just that first day, you know,
25
```

I was just having a hard time. 1 THE COURT: Today? You're having some trouble 2 today? . 3 JUROR NO. 5: Oh, no. 4 THE COURT: Oh. 5 JUROR NO. 5: No. I just act up like this all the -- you know, it's spring and summer. 7 THE COURT: I see. Okay. Was that the extent of 8 the exchange between you? 9 JUROR NO. 5: Oh, yes, that was all the 10 conversation. And I told the other lady -- I go, don't talk 11 anymore, you know. 12 THE COURT: Which other lady? Ms. Lucas? 13 JUROR NO. 5: Yes. 14 THE COURT: The other juror member? 15 JUROR NO. 5: Yes, uh-huh. 16 THE COURT: Okay, well that was good advice. 17 was good advice. 18 JUROR NO. 5: It's just that we were -- like I said, 19 we were in her way because she was going down the stairs. 20 THE COURT: Yeah. Well, these things can happen, 21 and I will advise -- I will be advising all of the jury 22 members that I have told the family members that they must 23 stay completely away from all of you. So, we don't want any 24 juror member to have that close of contact with any of you --25

```
family members that are on either side, I mean, of a dispute.
1
   Okay?
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And Judge, if I may.
3
             THE COURT: Are there any questions from counsel?
4
                                 I do.
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
5
             THE COURT: Okay.
6
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Ms. Dowell, where were you
   positioned in regard to Ms. Lucas? Where was she positioned?
8
             JUROR NO. 5: Who's Mrs. Lucas?
9
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: The other juror member.
10
              JUROR NO. 5: Oh, that's her last name.
11
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay, sorry.
12
              JUROR NO. 5: I think she was to the left.
13
    on the right.
14
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. Had you moved out of the
15
    family member's way, the woman that spoke with you?
16
              JUROR NO. 5: Oh, yes. Uh-huh.
1.7
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. When you moved out of her
18
    way, she expressed to you that she had COPD, is that your
19
    understanding?
20
              JUROR NO. 5: Oh, that was the beginning of the
21
    conversation. You know, like she was going down the step.
22
    [Indiscernible] she -- like coming back toward me, and that's
23
    when she mentioned it.
24
               MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.
 25
```

JUROR NO. 5: Because we were just moving out so we 1 wouldn't be on, you know, her way. 2 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. And when she mentioned 3 that, what else did she say to you? You said it was the beginning of the conversation. 5 JUROR NO. 5: Beginning of the conversation. 6 was it until she was almost halfway down the step, and you 7 know, she said, have a nice -- you know, have a good weekend. I go, you have the same, you know, have a nice weekend. MS. SCHIFALACQUA: You said to the other juror, 10 don't talk anymore. Was there any other exchanges that you 11 observed? 12 Wait, wait. You said -- I -- did you THE COURT: 13 say that you said to the other juror, don't talk anymore, or 14 did she --15 JUROR NO. 5: Yeah. 16 THE COURT: -- say it to you? 17 JUROR NO. 5: I said it to her, you know, because --18 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 19 JUROR NO. 5: -- we're not supposed to talk. 20 THE COURT: I misunderstood. 21 JUROR NO. 5: We're not supposed to talk to anyone. 22 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: When you directed her not to talk 23 anymore, had she said anything, or had this woman said 24 anything else to you or to the other juror that you remember? 25

JUROR NO, 5: No. MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. And was it your 2 understanding that she spoke with you about her COPD because 3 you have expressed in open court that you have asthma? 4 JUROR NO. 5: Yeah. It's probably that day, you 5 know, I was having a hard time, that first day. 6 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. 7 JUROR NO. 5: She probably noticed that. 8 THE COURT: Is that why you use that handrail? 9 mean, is it related to your asthma at all, or is it just --10 JUROR NO. 5: Oh, no. I'm just --11 THE COURT: -- a handrail you would normally use? 12 JUROR NO. 5: I'm just a clumsy person, you know. 13 don't want to trip. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Ms. Dowell, is there anything 16 about that exchange that causes you pause to be able to sit on 17 this jury or make you uncomfortable? Is there anything about 18 it that you need to express to us that we should be concerned 19 about? 20 JUROR NO. 5: Oh, no. Not at all. 21 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: You understood not to talk to 24 Did -- you did not initiate an exchange with her, 25

```
correct?
1
             JUROR NO. 5: Oh, no way.
2
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. She initiated the exchange
3
   with you?
4
                           Yes.
             JUROR NO. 5:
5
                                This was after you had moved out
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
6
   of her way?
7
             JUROR NO. 5: Yes.
8
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Was there anything about a bee?
9
             JUROR NO. 5: A bee?
10
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: A bee, like a bee that buzzes and
11
    flies in the air. An insect.
12
              JUROR NO. 5: Oh, yeah. The other juror, when we
13
    were standing there before they even go down, and she goes,
14
    oh, what was that? Or something like that. And I go, it's
1.5
    probably a bee, because that day, I had bright clothes. It
16
    probably was attracted to the color of what I had on.
17
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.
1.8
              JUROR NO. 5: So, that's why we also moved.
19
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Did this woman say anything with
20
    regard to the insect to you at all?
21
               JUROR NO. 5: Not that I can remember, because
22
    really, nothing's important to me about stuff like that.
 23
     shouldn't have been even, you know, exchanging words.
               MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. So, from your
 25
```

```
understanding, she may have been present for this conversation
   about the bee, as well as her comment about COPD?
2
             JUROR NO. 5: I think so. Um-hum.
3
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.
4
             THE COURT: All right.
5
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: I have nothing further, Judge.
6
   Thank you, Ms. Dowell.
7
             THE COURT: Mr. Otto, any questions?
8
             MR. OTTO: Nothing about the case was mentioned?
9
              JUROR NO. 5: Oh, no way.
10
             MR. OTTO: There's nothing about this incident that
11
    would keep you from -- that would cause you to have a less
12
    open mind than as we discussed at the beginning --
13
              JUROR NO. 5: Oh, no.
14
              MR. OTTO: -- of the trial? I have --
15
              JUROR NO. 5: Not at all.
16
              MR. OTTO: -- nothing further.
17
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Dowell.
18
    We'll have you go out in the hall again for a minute, and --
19
              JUROR NO. 5: Okay.
20
               THE COURT: -- we'll bring in Ms. Lucero.
 21
               JUROR NO. 5: You're welcome.
 22
               MS. SCHIFALACQUA: I thought it was Ms. Lucas.
 23
               THE COURT: I'm sorry. Wait a minute, I've got it
 24
             Lucas. Ms. Lucas.
     wrong.
 25
```

THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor. 1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 (Outside the presence of Juror No. 5) 3 (In the presence of Juror No. 7) 4 THE COURT: Come in, Ms. Lucas, would you? Just 5 have a seat on the front row, if you would, Ms. Lucas, in 6 front of the microphone there in the middle. You see that --7 or that one. Either one. That's fine, yeah. Thank you. Have a seat there, Ms. Lucas. Ms. Lucas, could you relate to us what you saw or 10 heard on Friday? 11 JUROR NO. 7: I was standing by the rail walkway on 12 this side of the courthouse, waiting for my husband. And one 13 of the -- one of the -- one of them --14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 JUROR NO. 7: -- kind of like said, excuse me to me, 16 so I walk away. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Was it -- did it have something 18 to do with the handrail? JUROR NO. 7: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 JUROR NO. 7: She said she couldn't -- she wants 22 that railway so she won't fall. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And did you say anything to her, 24 or did she say anything to you? 25

JUROR NO. 7: She tried, yes. 1. THE COURT: What did she say to you? 2 JUROR NO. 7: She said that, I know I'm not supposed 3 to talk to you, and I was with the other lady. THE COURT: Uh-huh. 5 JUROR NO. 7: She said, I know, I have asthma, too, 6 or something like that, but I didn't listen to their 7 conversation. THE COURT: Okay. Was there any other conversation going on, or are you saying you didn't listen to their 10 conversation? Those are the words that you heard, but was 11 there other conversation that you couldn't make out, or was 12 that just all that was said? 13 JUROR NO. 7: That's the only one that I paid 14 attention to. After that --15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 JUROR NO. 7: Because I was talking -- you know, I 17 was texting with my husband. THE COURT: Okay, so you were --19 JUROR NO. 7: I was waiting for him. 20 THE COURT: -- on your phone, texting? 21 JUROR NO. 7: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Okay. And so, if I'm understanding, 23 this other woman said, excuse me, she -- and she wanted the 24 handrail --25

```
JUROR NO. 7: She needed the handrail.
1
             THE COURT: -- that you were standing by?
2
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
 3
             THE COURT: Okay. When that happened, where was Ms.
   Dowell to you? You know, was --
              JUROR NO. 7: She was next to me.
              THE COURT: Hm?
              JUROR NO. 7: She was next to me, but away --
 8
              THE COURT: Next to you?
 9
              JUROR NO. 7: -- from the rail.
10
              THE COURT: Okay.
11
              JUROR NO. 7: I was the one closer to the rail.
12
              THE COURT: So, you were the one that needed to move
13
    then?
14
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Dowell was to your left, or
16
   your right, or behind you, or --
17
              JUROR NO. 7: To my left.
18
              THE COURT: Your left?
19
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. And so, the words that you heard
21
    were -- I'm sorry, relate those again if you would, please.
22
              JUROR NO. 7: She said -- I'm not really particular
23
    on how she said, but I know --
24
              THE COURT: Yeah.
25
```

```
JUROR NO. 7: -- she said, I need -- I'm sorry,
1.
   excuse me, I need the railing --
2
             THE COURT: Okay.
             JUROR NO. 7: -- because I have asthma and I don't
   want to fall.
             THE COURT: Okay. And then, did somebody say
6
   something about not supposed to talk to you?
7
             JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
8
             THE COURT: Who said that?
9
             JUROR NO. 7: The other lady.
10
              THE COURT: The -- are you talking about Ms.
11
    Dowell --
12
              JUROR NO. 7: No.
13
              THE COURT: -- the juror, or the other lady?
14
              JUROR NO. 7: The other lady.
15
              THE COURT: She said she's not supposed to talk to
16
    you?
17
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
18
              THE COURT: Okay. Did you or Ms. Dowell say
19
    anything in response to that? Did you say anything back to
20
    her when she said that?
21
               JUROR NO. 7: No.
22
               THE COURT: Okay.
23
               JUROR NO. 7: I didn't.
24
               THE COURT: All right. And was that it?
25
```

```
JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
1
             THE COURT: Was there any conversation that you
2
   heard about a bee?
3
           JUROR NO. 7: No, that was after the fact, because
   there's like bee all around us.
             THE COURT: Okay. And who said something about a
6
   bee?
             JUROR NO. 7: I think Ms. Dowell.
8
             THE COURT: Okay. Do you know what she said?
 9
              JUROR NO. 7: No, I said, there's a bee.
10
    it's a bee.
11
              THE COURT: Okay.
12
              JUROR NO. 7: So, I step away again.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. And did anybody say anything more
14
    about that afterwards?
15
              JUROR NO. 7: No.
16
              THE COURT: That was it?
17
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
18
              THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Lucas. Does that
19
    prompt any other questions from counsel?
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you. Ms. Lucas, with
21
    regard to this Friday, was it the persons that were out kind
22
    of observing, were they the ones who initiated speaking with
 23
    you and the other juror?
 24
               JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
 25
```

Okay. You didn't go out and MS. SCHIFALACQUA: 1 speak to them first --2 JUROR NO. 7: No. 3 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- is that right? Okay. you indicated that you said it was the other lady that said, I 5 know I'm not supposed to talk to you, was that the same lady that said, excuse me, I need the -- you know, the rail? 7 JUROR NO. 7: Yes. 8 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. So, it was just one woman 9 that spoke with you --10 JUROR NO. 7: Yes. 11 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- is that fair? Is it the --12 and that's the same woman? When she indicated, I know I'm not 13 supposed to talk to you, she actually told you that, is that 14 right? 15 JUROR NO. 7: I heard her, but I was starting to 16 walk, you know, walk around, walk away. 17 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Sure. So, you kind of exited 18 yourself from the -- her initiation? 19 JUROR NO. 7: Yes. 20 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And when she said that, you were 21 about to say something else when Judge was asking you questions. What else happened? 23 JUROR NO. 7: When --24 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: When she said, I know I'm not 25 Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

supposed to talk to you, or something about that. 1 JUROR NO. 7: I said -- I was walking away. 2 turned around. I turned around with Ms. Dowell. MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. 4 JUROR NO. 7: I turned on her side, and facing that 5 6 way. MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. When she made this 7 contact, initiated this contact with you, were there any other 8 persons that you've seen in the courtroom by her when she was 9 talking to you, or was it just her? 10 JUROR NO. 7: There were a few of them, but they've 11 already --12 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Kind of walking? 13 JUROR NO. 7: -- went ahead. 14 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. Is there anything about 15 her talking to you that has had any impact on you being able 16 to continue to sit on this panel? 17 JUROR NO. 7: No, but can I say something though? 18 THE COURT: Yes. 19 JUROR NO. 7: With the line of the job I have, I am 20 scared now that I'm realizing that I'm dealing with a lot of 21 people every single day on my job. And --22 THE COURT: Remind me if you would what job you 23 have. 24 I'm working as lead player's club at JUROR NO. 7: 25 Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

```
1
    Eastside Cannery.
              THE COURT: All right. And what is your position
 2
 3
    there?
              JUROR NO. 7: Lead player's club rep --
    representative.
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. And who -- I don't -- I don't
 6
 7
    know -- I don't recall what the conversation was that you may
    have told us at the beginning. Who do you deal with in that
    position?
              JUROR NO. 7: A lot of people. Guests that comes in
10
11
    to the casino.
12
              THE COURT: Guests come in? Okay.
              JUROR NO. 7: We gave away the player's club.
13
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And so, you see regular public --
14
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
15
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- kind of coming in to gamble,
16
17
    is that fair to say --
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
18
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- Ms. Lucas?
19
              THE COURT: Well, when you say you're concerned, you
20
    mean -- what is it you're concerned about, ma'am?
21
              JUROR NO. 7: I'm just -- because every day now --
22
    now, especially today, there's like a lot more people coming
23
    in the courthouse -- the courtroom.
24
              THE COURT: More people coming in the courtroom?
25
```

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	JUROR NO. 7: Um-hum.
2	THE COURT: And does that concern you?
3	JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Are you saying you find that
5	intimidating?
6	JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
. 7	THE COURT: In what way, ma'am?
8	JUROR NO. 7: It doesn't intimidate me. It's just,
9	I think it's when we make the decision and stuff like that,
10	it might affect my decision, because like I said, I deal with
11	people every single day, and what if I saw one of them that
12	comes to my work?
13	THE COURT: Uh-huh. When you say
14	JUROR NO. 7: Not saying that I see them now, you
15	know, I've seen them before.
16	THE COURT: Uh-huh. When you say it might affect
17	your decision, how would it affect your decision?
18	JUROR NO. 7: It might not be coming from what, like
19	you said, you know, look at the evidence
20	THE COURT: Right.
21	JUROR NO. 7: and all that stuff before you make
22	a decision.
23	THE COURT: Um-hum.
24	JUROR NO. 7: It's just
25	THE COURT: Are you saying that you would be afraid
	Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

```
to vote to find the defendant guilty of these charges out of
1
   fear?
2
             JUROR NO. 7: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay. Have you expressed that to any of
   the other juror members --
5
             JUROR NO. 7: No.
6
             THE COURT: -- or to anyone else?
7
              JUROR NO. 7: No.
8
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Otto, any questions?
9
              MR. OTTO: No, Your Honor.
10
                          Okay.
              THE COURT:
11.
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Judge, if I may follow up.
12
    you indicated that you're afraid to do -- I mean, we haven't
13
   gotten to the close of, you know, the case yet. Obviously,
14
    you would have to follow the law, but you indicated that you'd
15
    be afraid to make a finding of guilt because of fear for the
16
    family members that you've seen in court?
17
              JUROR NO. 7: Maybe, yes.
18
              THE COURT: All right.
19
              MS. PIEPER: We want you to be completely honest
20
    with us, so I think I'm trying to, and I think the Judge is,
21
    as well as defense counsel, trying to understand sort of what
22
    you're saying. So, can you just kind of be explicit and tell
23
     us? Because --
24
                             Since now I'm -- I want to be here.
               JUROR NO. 7:
25
```

Don't get me wrong. I was -- when I got my citizenship, I'm 1 sworn to do this duty. I am not trying to get away from it. 2 THE COURT: Understood. 3 JUROR NO. 7: However, the line of job that I have, dealing with every -- different people every single day, I 5 don't know -- I'm not saying that I'm not going to see them or may not -- may see them, but under that circumstances, what if 7 one of them comes to my work --8 MS. PIEPER: So, let me --9 JUROR NO. 7: -- and recognized me? 10 MS. PIEPER: Okay. Let me ask you this. 11 afraid -- and correct me if I'm wrong in any of my statements 12 -- are you afraid that if you find the defendant guilty, that 13 the family members you have seen in the courtroom may try to 14 find you at where you work? 15 JUROR NO. 7: Yes. 16 And why are you afraid that they Okay. MS. PIEPER: 17 might try and find you at where you work if you've only had 18 sort of one contact with them? Why are you afraid that that's 19 going to happen? 20 JUROR NO. 7: Because, like I said, I -- it's my 21 conscience. 22 It's your -- I'm sorry, it's your what? THE COURT: 23 JUROR NO. 7: My conscience. 24 Your conscience? THE COURT: 25

```
JUROR NO. 7: And my -- maybe I'm just being
1
   paranoid now.
2
             THE COURT: Okay.
3
             JUROR NO. 7: Only until today.
             THE COURT: Have you -- have you been to work since
   this trial started?
6
             JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
             THE COURT: Okay.
8
             JUROR NO. 7: I have been working since the first
   day.
10
                          And has this feeling built up while you
              THE COURT:
11
   -- you know, since the beginning of the trial? In other
12
   words, you find this --
13
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes. After five days, I kind of --
14
    but today, especially, now that there's more people --
15
              MS. PIEPER: Okay, so you're --
16
              JUROR NO. 7: -- coming in.
17
              MS. PIEPER: Okay.
1.8
              THE COURT: All right.
19
              MS. PIEPER: Are you afraid because the amount of
20
    people has grown from last week?
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
22
              MS. PIEPER: Okay. And because the amount of people
23
    has grown from last week, you're concerned that you will not
24
    base your decision based on the evidence in this case?
```

JUROR NO. 7: Yes.

2

3

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

MS. PIEPER: Okay. I guess I'm kind of confused maybe why the number of people would cause you that concern if you've never really had any contact with them.

JUROR NO. 7: Not contact, but they -- people come into my work.

MS. PIEPER: Okay.

JUROR NO. 7: And we get into the point to where we know them, I know their faces.

MS. PIEPER: Okay. But I guess what I'm trying to understand, and I -- please don't -- I'm not trying to offend you.

JUROR NO. 7: That's okay.

MS. PIEPER: I'm trying to figure out how the number of people sitting back here in the courtroom has suddenly caused you -- have you seen them doing something in the hallway? Have you heard them talking? Have you seen the way they act outside? What is it about more people sitting in the courtroom that causes you concern that as a juror now you're not sure you can follow through with the obligations that the Court has, you know, sort of given to you so far?

JUROR NO. 7: When we go out, especially.

MS. PIEPER: Okay.

JUROR NO. 7: Leaving the courthouse. Now sometimes I have my husband pick me up. I'll be standing outside.

```
know, there is no way -- yeah, maybe sometimes that we -- I
1
   don't want to see them.
2
             MS. PIEPER: Okay. The family -- are you saying
3
   that the family members --
4
             JUROR NO. 7:
                           Yes.
5
             MS. PIEPER: -- scare you?
 6
             JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
             MS. PIEPER: Okay. And they scare you because of
8
   what? I guess that's what the Court's trying to get to and
 9
   I'm trying to get to.
10
             JUROR NO. 7: How the case is going. I mean, I
1.1
   understand it is, you know, a homicide.
12
              THE COURT: I -- counsel, I'm going to excuse her
13
    for a minute. But why don't you do this. Would you just use
14
    out little anteroom right there? Would you show her where the
15
    anteroom is?
16
             THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor.
1.7
              THE COURT: And we'll talk, and we may ask you to
18
    come back. Thank you -- thank you, Ms. Lucas --
19
              MS. PIEPER: Thank you.
20
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Ms. Lucas.
21
              THE COURT: -- for coming in and speaking to us.
22
              MS. PIEPER: Judge, do you want us to approach, or
23
    go in the back, or?
24
             THE COURT: I'm sorry, do we want to what?
25
```

MS. PIEPER: Nothing. 1 (Outside the presence of Juror No. 7) 2 THE COURT: All right. I don't think there's much 3 question but we're going to need to excuse this juror. Any --4 any -- Mr. Otto, do you disagree? 5 MR. OTTO: I don't. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: The bigger problem, Judge, is 8 obviously the family. You know, the idea that -- and I'm 9 sorry, but even the other juror, the idea that she's 10 approaching them, I have COPD too, talking about her asthma, 11 letting them know that they're watching what these jurors are 12 saying and doing, Judge. It's unbelievable. 13 I think you're reading a little too much THE COURT: 14 into that --15 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: I don't --16 THE COURT: -- Ms. Schifalacqua. 17 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: We have a woman here that's 18 almost crying, Judge, before you, indicating her fear because 19 of this family. I don't think I'm reading too much, with all 20 due respect, Judge. I really don't. THE COURT: Well, here's what I -- here's what I 22 think. You have someone who has had this eat at her for the 23 last week when she goes to work and she realizes how 24 unprotected she is, and how the fact is that she might -- some 25

of these people might come into where she works. I mean, that's what I heard her expressing, and I think that's ample reason to excuse her. But what I hear you saying is that it's all the family members' fault, and --

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Well, no, Judge -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: -- all they've done is attend.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: I --

1.0

THE COURT: All they've done is attend, other than that one exchange on Friday.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Sure. And Judge, I'm sorry. I don't want the record to reflect that I'm saying it's all of their fault. I'm saying that I've --

THE COURT: All right.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- watched them walk out after our jurors. I've made, you know, obviously a record of that. It is very close. I've watched them approach and be the persons that initiate -- say the words, I know I'm not supposed to talk to you, violating this order of this Court. And so, my concern isn't that -- you know, with regard to Ms. Lucas, obviously she has things building that she might see, you know, family members in her line of work.

But that they are, you know, initiating contact is of great concern of the State, that they are watching and paying attention to what -- the things that the jurors are saying so that when they contact them they talk about personal

things, i.e., asthma and otherwise, and that they're making the initiation even when they outwardly can express that they know they're not supposed to. I guess that's my concern.

And watching them day after day walk out closely next to our jurors, et cetera, all of those things made my concern raise, Judge. So, I don't want it to reflect that Ms. Lucas -- she clearly has that on top of her own concerns, and I think she made that record clear.

But I absolutely -- you know, it's not all of the family's fault, but they know exactly what they're doing, Judge. They're outwardly expressing that they're defying a court order. I know I'm not supposed to talk to you, by the way, I'm going to talk to you about particular things to your own health. It's of concern for the State, Judge.

whole lot into the brief exchange on Friday. It's very unfortunate, and it's true that she did make a comment that she knew she wasn't supposed to talk to her, but I mean, as far -- from what I've heard, that was it, and I don't think that that is a reason to do anything other than make sure that it doesn't happen again.

Mr. Otto, I hope that you will convey to the family members when you get a chance, that we are now losing a juror because of that -- in fact, bring the family in again --

THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor.

-- will you? THE COURT: 1 (Pause in the proceedings) 2 THE COURT: Thank you for returning, ladies and 3 gentlemen. 4 I want to be sure that you understand clearly what 5 has happened, and why I am going to caution you all again. 6 We're going to lose one of the members of this jury now partly over that brief exchange on Friday. We're going to have to 8 excuse one of these jury members. It doesn't help that it's 9 reported to me that one of you -- and I assume you were the 10 only one that spoke to her, right? Were you the only one that 1.1 spoke to her --12 MS. HINES: I'm the one who --13 THE COURT: -- ma'am? 14 MS. HINES: -- said, excuse me. 15 Yes, I'm sorry. I don't know your name, THE COURT: 16 ma'am, or I would call you by name. You were the only one 17 that spoke to the jury member? 18 I'm the one who said, excuse me. MS. HINES: 19 Yeah. THE COURT: 20 MS. HINES: Yes. 21 Well, it's reported you also said, I THE COURT: 22 know I'm not supposed to talk to you. Yes. MS. HINES: 24 THE COURT: Now, that seems so innocent to you, but 25 Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

what it tells us is that you're violating the Court's order even by saying that. So, what I want you all to understand is, if I have to, I'll bar you from this courthouse for the remainder of this trial.

I hope you can tell I'm trying to bend over backwards not to do that. I understand that you are family, that you care about the defendant. But I'm not going to lose this jury in order to preserve to you the ability to come and watch this trial. I'm not going to do it. And unfortunately for you, I have to put the burden on you to make sure that there cannot be any circumstance where any question could be raised about communication of any sort.

So, I must caution you all again, stay very far clear of any jury member. I've raised a bunch of kids, and sometimes I like to say to other people the same thing I say to my kids. What would you do different next time? Hopefully, it would be to go use a different stair rail, go find a different place to wait until those people are gone.

Don't get anywhere near them, because -- because of your connection to the defendant. Again, it's the same as if it were one of our testifying police officers out there. If they approached one of these jury members, you can bet we'd be in here having this same conversation. Do not get anywhere near this jury.

MS. PIEPER: Judge, for the record, can we have the

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

```
defendant's mom or mother figure's name for the record?
             THE COURT:
                         Yeah.
2
                         It's Yolanda Hines. Your Honor, I have
             MS. HINES:
3
   a question for you.
4
                         Yeah, hang on one second. Did you get
             THE COURT:
5
        Yolanda? Is it Yolanda?
б
                         Hines. Yolanda Hines.
             MS, HINES:
7
             THE COURT: Hines? Okay.
8
             THE CLERK: Can you spell that for us?
9
             MS. HINES: First and last?
10
             THE CLERK: Just the last name.
11
              MS. HINES: H-i-n-e-s.
12
              THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Hines.
13
                          Yes. When you release your jury and we
              MS. HINES:
14
    wait, and we let them go in the first elevator, and we wait
15
    behind. And then they leave, and then we go in the next
16
    elevator, and then we wait, and we walk out. And then, when I
17
    go out -- because you guys have cameras here.
18
              THE COURT: I'm sorry?
19
              MS. HINES: You guys have cameras here.
20
              THE COURT: Okay.
21
              MS. HINES: And then we leave and we go out, and
22
    they're lagging behind. And I don't know what they were
23
    doing, but they were still here.
24
              THE COURT: I understand that, and they told us
25
```

that. 1 MS. HINES: And then --2 THE COURT: One lady said that she was waiting for 3 her husband because she has asthma. She doesn't -- she 4 doesn't walk very far. 5 MS. HINES: Yeah, and that's why I wasn't in court Friday morning, because I was at the doctor. And I'm very 7 sick myself, so I come here to support my son. 8 Okay. THE COURT: 9 And that's why I have to park so close, MS. HINES: 10 and that's the nearest stairwell for me to park by. 11 Okay. THE COURT: 12 MS. HINES: When I have to park far away -- that's 13 why they ride with me, so I can have the car to be pulled up 14 if we have to park far. That's really inconvenient for me. 15 THE COURT: Yes, it is. 16 So, I didn't know they were going to be MS. HINES: 17 there. 18 Well, I understand that's it's --THE COURT: 19 And I said, I know I'm not supposed --MS. HINES: 20 Here's what I want you to understand --THE COURT: 21 -- to speak to you, but excuse me. MS. HINES: 22 -- though, Ms. Hines. Here's what I THE COURT: 23 want you to understand. Your inconvenience is not going to 24 cause me to throw this jury out and start this trial over. 25

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

· 医克里克氏 医克克氏 医克克斯氏试验检尿病 医皮肤 医皮肤 医皮肤 (1)

Your inconvenience must give way to the inconvenience or the problems that some of our juror members have in getting their own transportation and dealing with their own medical problems.

That's the way it has to be in any trial. You cannot have the -- you cannot have contact and communication because it would be too inconvenient for a family member to go do something else. If it's going to be inconvenient, then I'm going to have to ask you not to come.

MS. HINES: Oh, I understand that now.

THE COURT: Okay. So, that's what I want you to understand. It's all on you guys to make sure we don't have anything more like this happen, or I will indeed order you all not to appear, and I don't want to do that. All right. Counsel, anything else?

MS. PIEPER: Not by the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

1.

2

3

5

10

11.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. OTTO: Not by defense, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, folks. Now, counsel, I'm inclined to simply bring Ms. Lucero -- Lucas in and excuse her, bring the rest of the jury and admonish them.

MS. PIEPER: Okay.

and and in a second regard and the first recognitive production and the first recognition of the second second

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. OTTO: After you excuse this juror, I would just like to approach briefly in terms of timing.

THE COURT: All right. Do you want to do it now? 1 MR. OTTO: Yeah, we can do it now. 2 THE COURT: Yeah, let's approach. 3 (Off-record bench conference) 4 THE COURT: Ms. Lucas? 5 THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor. 6 (Pause in the proceedings) (In the presence of Juror No. 7) 8 THE COURT: Ms. Lucas, thank you for rejoining us. 9 We are going to excuse you with our thanks at this time. 10 appreciate the time and effort you have put into this. I hope 11 that you will get the opportunity soon to be able to serve on 12 another jury. 13 Now, what we'd like to ask you to do is, after you 14 turn in your badge and all that sort of stuff, and pick up 15 your personal things, if you would exit through this door, our 16 -- my law clerk will escort you down the back hall and release 17 you out that door. 18 JUROR NO. 7: Thank you, Judge, for the support to 19 20 me. THE COURT: Oh. You will -- I'm sorry, you will 21 need to go back to Jury Services also on the third floor. 22 JUROR NO. 7: Third floor? 23 THE COURT: Yeah. Thank you again, Ms. Lucas --24 JUROR NO. 7: Thank you. 25

```
THE COURT: -- for the time you've spent.
                (Outside the presence of Juror No. 7)
 2
              THE COURT: All right. We're ready to bring our
 3
   jury?
 4
              THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor.
 5
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
              MR. OTTO: We were going to do that first?
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: After they're excused for the
 8
 9
    day.
              THE COURT: I was going to bring the jury --
10
              MR. OTTO: Oh, I -- yes, yes, I'm sorry. My
11
    apologies.
              THE COURT: Here's the thing. I'll bring the jury.
13
    I will admonish them.
14
              MR. OTTO: I understand.
15
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Actually --
16
              THE COURT: Then I will turn to you --
17
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yeah.
18
              MR. OTTO: I understand.
19
              THE COURT: And you -- yeah, go ahead. We'll bring
20
    the jury.
21
              MS. PIEPER: And then you're going to rest.
22
              THE COURT: And --
23
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Mr. Otto will rest.
24
              THE COURT: After I -- after I send the jury home --
25
```

MR. OTTO: I have to rest. 1 2 THE COURT: -- we'll make the record of your motion. 3 (Pause in the proceedings) THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury. 4 5 (Jury reconvened at 4:13 p.m.) THE COURT: Counsel, stipulate to the presence of 6 7 the jury? 8 THE MARSHAL: You may be seated. 9 MS. PIEPER: Yes, Your Honor. MS. OHLINGER-JOHNSON: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. 11 12 will notice that we are one more jury member short. I have admonished the -- anyone who is family of the defendant not to 1.3 14 be -- not to be anywhere close to you. While I understand 15 that it was a seemingly innocuous conversation that took place, it has caused us to lose another juror member. 16 17 Please make sure that you do not have any conversations, not only with anyone about the case or about 18 19 someone in the case, but have any conversations with anyone 20 who may be related to anyone in the case. The same would be 21 true if a police officer were to approach you, you know, about the case, someone who testified. 22 23 You're not supposed to talk to anybody that has any connection with the case, even remote connection, you should 24

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ◆ 303-798-0890

not be talking to them. Does everybody understand that? Any

25

questions? All right. Thank you.

We're ready now to proceed ahead. The State has rested. The defense may call your first witness.

MR. OTTO: The defense rests, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The defense rests. Ladies and gentlemen, you've now heard the evidence portion of the trial. It remains for me to instruct you on the law and for you to hear the closing arguments of the attorneys. We will do that tomorrow, so I'm going to send you home today after a brief day.

While you're on this overnight recess -- first of all, counsel, is 1:00 o'clock -- do we want to start at 1:00 or 1:30?

MS. PIEPER: 1:30 is fine.

THE COURT: 1:30 work for you? Let's make it 1:30 tomorrow then, ladies and gentlemen.

While you're on this overnight recess, please recall the Court's admonition not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial, or on any person connected with the trial. Please do not read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any medium of information whatsoever.

Please don't do any internet research of facts or of law. Please do not visit any of the places that are made mention of during the trial. Please do not form or express

any opinion on any of the subjects that are connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you and you're able to deliberate amongst yourselves on the verdict.

We will begin at 1:30 tomorrow. The jury will be excused. Court will remain in session. Thank you.

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury. Guys, just go ahead and leave your notebooks on your chairs. I'll collect them.

(Jury recessed at 4:16 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. The record will reflect the absence of the jury. Mr. Otto, you have a motion?

MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor. I have a motion to make for an advisory verdict of not guilty. Under — it is my belief that under NRS 175.381, paren (1), close paren provides, "If at any time after the evidence on either side is closed the Court deems the evidence insufficient to warrant a conviction, it may advise the jury to acquit the defendant, but the jury is not bound by such advice."

That statute is supported in case law by the case of <a href="State\_v.combs">State\_v.combs</a>, C-o-m-b-s. That's at 116 Nevada, Advance Opinion No. 124. That's in the Nevada in the year 2000. It is also supported by an earlier case called <a href="State v.Wilson">State v.Wilson</a>, W-i-l-s-o-n, and that can be found at 104 Nevada 405, 760 P.2d 129. That's a Nevada Supreme Court case in 1988.

25 //

Both the State and the defense have rested. my position that there is insufficient evidence to find Mr. Washington guilty of any of the crimes charged in the 3 Information. And for that reason, I would ask the Court to advise the jury of that fact in -- as pursuant to NRS 175.381(1), and the case law cited. 6

1

2

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I disagree with THE COURT: All right, thank you. the statement that there's any lack of sufficient evidence for this case to go to the jury as to all of the charges, and accordingly, the motion is denied.

> Thank you, Your Honor. MR. OTTO:

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Judge, the other thing I needed to make a record of, when we talked about the second portion of the trial, we talked about, depending on if the jurors come back with a first, that we would do a penalty, and then the ex-felon in possession of a firearm.

However, it would actually have to be reversed. would have to do, no matter what the verdict is, the possession of firearm by an ex-felon, because that is also a guilt phase portion of the trial before they could ever hear any of the -- you know, any of the evidence with regard to penalty.

THE COURT: The penalty phase?

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Right.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: So, I just wanted to say that, even though we do still have a potential of both, I mean, it depends on what the jurors do, outstanding, no matter what, we would have to do the possession of firearm by ex-felon first --

THE COURT: All right.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- prior to any penalty information being brought before the jury.

THE COURT: Okay.

1.1

MR. OTTO: As I understand it, the State proposes correctly, that when and if the jury returns a verdict -- whatever verdict --

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yeah, it doesn't matter.

MR. OTTO: -- the jury returns, guilty or not guilty on any charge, or all of the charges, the State will then before -- if there is a penalty phase under the murder in the first degree, the State will present further evidence on an Amended Information which will at this time contain ex-felon in possession of a firearm, which was not yet put in front of the jury because that would prejudice the guilt phase of this trial.

THE COURT: All right. Let's assume then that we have a verdict -- we never know, but if we were to for some reason have a verdict by the end of tomorrow, then we have a full day Wednesday. How long would you anticipate the

additional evidence would take? MS. PIEPER: Judge, the ex-felon in possession of a 2 firearm, essentially, we could -- I could probably do it or 3 Ms. Schifalacqua. We stand up and we say, ladies and gentlemen, this is opening statements. Here are certified --5 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: She reads the Information. MS. PIEPER: -- Judgment of Convictions, the defendant has been convicted of these prior felony convictions, here is the law in regard to ex-felon in 9 possession of a firearm, here's my closing arguments. 10 Otto then gets up and makes his arguments, and then we do 11 rebuttal. One person can probably do it in probably two 12 13 hours. MS. SCHIFALACQUA: I wouldn't even say that long. 14 MS. PIEPER: Right. 15 Two hours? MR. OTTO: 16 Okay. THE COURT: 17 MS. PIEPER: Well, I mean, I don't know what you're 18 19 going to say. MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yeah. By the time you read the 20 Information --21 THE COURT: She's allowing for a long argument by 22 the defense on it. 23 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Well, she's --24 MS. PIEPER: You got to read the --25

```
MS. SCHIFALACQUA: You know, by the time you read
1
   the Information --
2
             MS. PIEPER: -- information.
 3
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- we stand up and say, you
4
   didn't know there was a second portion of the trial, we move
5
    our certified Judgements of Conviction into evidence, we then
    close.
 7
              THE COURT: Right.
 8
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: We have to read the instructions
 9
    again, but --
10
              THE COURT: Right.
11
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- instead, the --
12
              MS. PIEPER: Right.
13
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- ex-felon in possession
14
    instructions --
15
              THE COURT: Right.
16
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- thereby we do a brief
17
    argument. If Mr. Otto wants to argue, we do -- I mean, I
18
    don't even think --
19
              THE COURT: So --
20
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- it's two hours.
21
              THE COURT: So, what I'm trying to avoid is a day in
22
    which we only spend, you know, an hour, two hours, send them
23
    out, they come back with a verdict on that, and we are not --
24
    we can't accomplish anything beyond that point.
25
```

```
MS. PIEPER: We'll be ready to move -- well, the
  2
     only glitch is --
  3
               THE COURT: If we get a verdict back -- so that's
     all we need to all be aware of.
               MS. PIEPER: Yeah.
  6
               THE COURT: If we get a verdict back on that second
  7
     phase, on the felon -- ex-felon in possession, Wednesday
  8
     afternoon, we need to be prepared to move straight forward --
  9
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA:
                                 Sure.
 10
              MS. PIEPER: Sure.
              THE COURT: -- on the penalty phase.
11
12
              MS. PIEPER: Yes.
13
              MR. OTTO: If that's what we get back.
14
              THE COURT:
                         Yeah. And if that were the case --
    well, let's see, we still -- we have plenty of time in hand,
15
16
    it would appear.
17
              MS. PIEPER: Yes.
                                 Yes.
18
              THE COURT: Even if we didn't get started on the
19
    penalty phase itself until Friday morning.
20
              MS. PIEPER: Not this Friday.
21
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Not this Friday. It's Good
22
    Friday.
23
              THE COURT: Oh, I -- oh, yeah. That puts us into
   Monday, and we've got Monday, Tuesday, and -- so we do need to
24
25
   be prepared to go forward Wednesday on the penalty phase if --
```

1.	MR. OTTO: If we have a verdict.
2	THE COURT: If we yeah, if these things you
3	know, the domino effect happens.
4	MS. PIEPER: We'll have the instructions and
5	everything pulled for the ex-felon. We'll have the
6	Information, we'll have one ready to be filed. We'll also
7	have instructions ready on the ex-felon in possession
8	THE COURT: All right.
9	MS. PIEPER: of a firearm.
10	THE COURT: All right. Do we need anything else on
11	the record before we settle instructions? I have received
12	instructions from the State and from the defense, and I'm
1.3	prepared to spend the rest of the afternoon with counsel. Is
14	there anything else for the record before we
15	MR. OTTO: No, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: break for the day?
17	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: No, Judge.
1.8	THE COURT: All right, we're off the record. We
19	will begin again tomorrow 1:30 on our instructions and final
20	argument. Okay?
21	(Court recessed at 4:23 p.m., until Tuesday,
2 <u>2</u>	April 15, 2014, at 2:02 p.m.)
23	* * * *
24	

## CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

## **AFFIRMATION**

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

> Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC Englewood, CO 80110 (303) 798-0890

JULIE LORD

Alun to Chum

TRAN

CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CASE NO. C-294695-1

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

DEPT. NO. I

Plaintiff,

vs.

MATTHEW WASHINGTON,

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Defendant.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH CORY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

JURY TRIAL - DAY 7

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 2014

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE:

DANIELLE K. PIEPER, ESQ.

BARBARA F. SCHIFALACQUA

Chief Deputy District Attorneys

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

DAVID J. OTTO, ESQ.

ROBERTA OHLINGER-JOHNSON, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

BEVERLY SIGURNIK
District Court

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Englewood, CO 80110

(303) 798-0890

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

and the same of the section production of the section of the secti

## INDEX

STATE'S	CLOSING A	ARGUMENT	BY MS.	SCHI	FALAC	QUA .	٠		•	•	•	11
DEFENDAN	T'S CLOSI	ING ARGUN	ENT BY	MR.	OTTO							30
STATE'S	REBUTTAL	CLOSING	ARGUMEN	IT BY	MS.	PIEPER						37

1	LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 2014, 2:02 P.M.
2	(Outside the presence of the jury)
3	THE COURT: We're not pulling our jury in yet
4	though, right?
5	THE MARSHAL: No, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: All right, please be seated. Let's go
7	on the record to settle instructions. Okay. Counsel are
8	aware of the instructions which the Court intends to give. On
9	behalf of the State, are there objections to any of the
10	instructions?
11	MS. PIEPER: No, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Any additional instructions which the
13	State proposes?
14	MS. PIEPER: No, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: On behalf of the defense, are there
16	objection to any of the instructions?
17	MR. OTTO: No, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Are there any additional instructions
19	which the defense wishes to propose?
20	MR. OTTO: Yes, there are, Your Honor, two.
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. OTTO: And
23	THE COURT: We've discussed those in chambers?
24	MR. OTTO: We have discussed those in chambers.
25	THE COURT: Any additional record you wish to make?
- 1	

MR. OTTO: No. I just wish to file my proposed 1 instructions and the citations along with them with the Court. 2 THE COURT: Very good. If you'll file those in open 3 As I've indicated to counsel, you will have a separate 4 copies of numbered instructions on which we'll have shortly. 5 We're making the copies now. Once we have those, is there 6 anything else that needs to be brought before the Court before we bring our jury in and I instruction the jury? MS. PIEPER: Judge, I think the only thing is that 9 Mr. Otto wanted to make a record in regard to his jury 10 instructions and obviously the State will respond to that 11 record for the record -- for the record. 12 THE COURT: He just did. 13 MS. PIEPER: Oh, he doesn't --14 THE COURT: He just submitted the instructions. 15 MS. PIEPER: You don't want to argue? 16 THE COURT: Did you wish to make any further record 17 in relation to those? 18 MR. OTTO: Except to say that I propose them, I 19 believe that they are a correct statement of the law. 20 State has objected to them and the Court has ruled and 21 excluded them from the instructions. 22 THE COURT: That's correct. 23 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for the State's 24 purposes, obviously, the one with regard to motive, we have

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ◆ 303-798-0890

25

submitted a motive instruction that we think is an accurate statement of the law and gives Mr. Otto the opportunity to argue motive, but does not weigh in with regard to reasonable doubt which, for our position, obviously by statute, there is only one reasonable doubt instruction to be given.

And with regard to the battery with use of a deadly weapon being a lessor included offense of attempt murder, we've provided this Court and counsel obviously with the current case law that says it is certainly not, that they are separate offenses that have particular elements and therefore that's why we objected to those, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else? Any further record before we bring our jury and do the instructions and then closing argument?

MS. PIEPER: Not by the State.

THE COURT: How long does State anticipate your opening argument to be? Or your closing argument, whatever you want to call it.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Forty-five minutes to an hour, Judge.

THE COURT: And your final?

MS. PIEPER: That will all depend on Mr. Otto.

THE COURT: Uh-huh, Mr. Otto?

MR. OTTO: I did want to add to the record, Your 1 Honor, that earlier and not too much earlier, I made a motion 2 for -- for an advisory verdict of not guilty. I did that at 3 the close of the State's evidence and just to keep the record 5 clear, that's also -- -That's been made, that's correct. THE COURT: 6 MR. OTTO: You -- you denied that motion. 7 THE COURT: And I've denied the motion, that's 8 correct. 9 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: How long are you going to be in 10 closing? 11 MR. OTTO: My closing, 30 minutes, 40 minutes. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MS. PIEPER: And I will probably be 30 minutes or 40 14 We'll finish today, Judge. 15 minutes. THE COURT: I am not intending to keep this jury 16 As you know, we are pinching pennies everywhere. 17 my -- my assumption is that when we are finished with 18 argument, generally speaking, they usually like to stay long 19 enough to elect a foreman and then go home. 20 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. 21 THE COURT: And I'll have them come back at 9:00 22 o'clock tomorrow. Even though I'll be doing other things, 23 they can deliberate and then we would be prepared to -- oh, 24 wait, tomorrow --25

1	correct?
2	MS. PIEPER: Correct.
3	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Correct.
4	THE COURT: And I will further advise them not to
5	open any of the package which remain unopened.
6	THE CLERK: You mean the ammunition that's in with
7	the guns?
8	MS. PIEPER: Yes.
9	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Correct.
10	THE CLERK: (Inaudible).
11	MS. PIEPER: Yes.
12	THE COURT: And they're responsible to pull out
13	you know, to tell us which ones not to give them.
14	MS. PIEPER: I spoke to Michele already.
15	THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
16	MS. PIEPER: Not by the State, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: All right then, let's bring the jury.
18	(Jury reconvened at 2:15 p.m.)
19	THE COURT: Will counsel stipulate to the presence
20	
21	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yes, Your Honor.
22	MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.
24	Thank you once again for joining us. Has anyone have any
25	problem with anyone inquiring into your official duties?

Okay. Go ahead.

(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: As I indicated yesterday, ladies and gentlemen, you have heard all of the evidence in this case. It now remains for me to instruct you on the law and for you to hear the closing arguments of counsel.

I'm about to instruct you upon the laws that applies in this case. I would like to instruct you orally without reading to you, however, these instructions are of such importance that it is necessary for me to read to you these carefully prepared, written instructions.

If the instructions are long, and some are quite complicated, if they are not especially clear when I read them to you, please keep in mind that when you go to the jury room, you will be able to take these carefully prepared, written instructions with you so that you can read them and consider them carefully.

(Jury instructions read; not transcribed)

We will take a 10 minute recess during which you will, once again, please, recall and live by the Court's admonition which is that you are not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial or on any person connected with the trail, do not form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

We will take a 10 minute recess and when you are 1 finished, please line up outside and the Bailiff will bring 2 3 you in. (Jury recessed at 3:17 p.m.) 4 THE COURT: The record will reflect the absence of 5 the jury. Let me -- because we have some new people here who 6 are viewing, may I repeat my admonition of yesterday. No one 7 who is a spectator to this trial should go anywhere near the 8 There should be no communication with anyone in the jury, nor should anyone who is a spectator or any of us, 10 obviously, the attorneys, the Court included, should any of us 11 be anywhere near the jury. 12 Now, in a courthouse where there are not -- there's 13 only a few restrooms and there's only a certain number of 14 elevators, that may be a challenge. I expect everyone who's a 15 spectator here to comply with that order. 16 So counsel, anything else? 17 MS. PIEPER: No, Your Honor. 18 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: No, Your Honor. 19

MR. OTTO: No, Your Honor.

20

21.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Take a 10 minute recess.

(Court recessed at 3:18 p.m. until 3:37 p.m.)

(Outside the presence of the jury)

THE COURT: All right. Counsel ready?

MS. PIEPER: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yes, Your Honor. 1 2 MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Please be seated, we'll bring our jury. 3 4 Well, be seated for a minute anyway. 5 (Jury reconvened at 3:37 p.m.) THE COURT: Will counsel stipulate to the presence 6 7 of the jury? MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yes, Your Honor. 8 9 MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. All right, we'll be pleased to hear the closing argument on behalf of the State. 11 Schifalacqua. 12 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT 14 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Ladies and gentlemen, over this 15 last week or so you've heard the evidence proving the crimes 16 that the defendant committed in this case, and they are 17 conspiracy to commit murder, murder with use of a deadly 18 weapon, attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon, battery 1.9 with use of a deadly weapon, and discharging a firearm at or 20 into a structure. 21 Now, on November 5th of 2013, that defendant, along 22 with Martell Moten, took the life of Nathan Rawls and then 23 tried to take the lives of Marque Hill, Laroy Thomas and 24

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

Ashley Scott. It is on that day, on November 5th of 2013,

25

that the defendant, along with Martell Moten, began a coordinated series of acts to effectuate their specific intent to kill. And, ladies and gentlemen, they were, in part, successful.

On that date, as you know, they went to 2655
Sherwood Street. Now, this apartment complex was in a residential area. It sat in -- apartment complex next to apartment complex and the walkway to get in was narrow. If you remember the testimony, you couldn't drive through, it was gated. And you had to walk through that gate to get to where apartment 18 was.

As well as, when they walked through, the area itself that made up the courtyard, was because it wasn't a full apartment complex. Apartment 18 was on the lower level and the apartment above it mirrored the exact same design. As well as, across the way, there was another apartment complex that mirrored the apartment complex of 2655. That made up, as you see, the courtyard in the middle which accessible only by foot and not by vehicle.

At approximately 4:30 in the morning, the defendant and Martell Moten shot up, multiple times, apartment 18. And this is the outline of not only the strikes, but where Nathan Rawls took his last breaths.

Now, Marque Hill, as you heard, along with Laroy Thomas, saw their friend take those last breaths. But before

that, at 4:34 in the morning, Marque Hill tried to save his friend's life and he called 911. And you heard his call and you have his call. At 4:34 in the morning is when he calls for help and the defendant, along with Martell Moten, have already shot up apartment 18.

Around that same time, not far from the apartment complex here, only a couple of apartment complexes over, the DeSotos were doing what presumably every single person in that entire complex was doing, sleeping. The DeSotos were also sleeping.

You heard from Lorraine, as well as Darrin, that they were awoke by gunfire. It's at that time that they testified they looked out their window and saw a vehicle driving down an alleyway, because as they described in every one of these complexes, this is gated, this is gated, this is gated and it's not accessible via driving. And that alleyway is where the defendant, along with Martell Moten, drove that silver Dodge Magnum.

Both Darrin and Lorraine DeSoto described the Silver Dodge Magnum. It had the limo tint, no chrome, low profile, and it drove down that alleyway. It is at, ladies and gentlemen, only 4:35 in the morning when Lorraine DeSoto makes her call to 911 and describes the car that the defendant is caught in. She gives that description.

And you heard testimony that Officer Parquette,

Officer Christian Parquette, working as a patrol officer in the Downtown Area Command hears the call in the South Central Area Command that borders the command that he works in. And he is made aware of, obviously, the descriptions that the DeSotos had given 911 operators.

б

He assigns himself to that call at 4:37, mere minutes after the call is placed. And he, driving in the area, spots the defendant and Mr. Moten in their vehicle at approximately 4:39. He first sees them, as he testified before all of you, that at four -- by 4:39 in the morning, he already had, at Eastern and St. Louis, the suspect vehicle, as well as the plate of 142LFP. And at 4:40 in the morning, it is at Eastern and Ogden that Officer Parquette pulls over the defendant and Martell Moten in that felony car stop.

The defendant is driving that silver Dodge Magnum, plate 142LFP. He is exited from that vehicle and, as you are well aware, Martell Moten's in the back seat.

Now, who is the registered owner of that vehicle?

It is, and you have in evidence, the defendant's girlfriend.

Dean Raetz talked you on the stand, he testified that it is the defendant's girlfriend that is the registered owner of that vehicle that he was driving on the date in question, oh, so early in the morning hours.

But what else do we know that ties him besides physically being in that vehicle? A latent print analysis.

David Johnson talked to you about the prints that were submitted by CSA Cromwell as well as CSA Taylor. They lifted prints from the vehicle after it was processed back at the lab.

And with regard to those prints, the exterior side surface of the front driver door was identified to the left middle finger of the defendants. The exterior surface of the rear driver side door window was identified to the left palm of the defendant, as well as the exterior window of the trunk door was identified to the right palm of the defendant.

In that vehicle, in that rear passenger seat, not only did Officer Parquette, but Detective Rogers who had then got on scene, once that they -- once they communicated that this was no longer just a shooting, but in fact, the defendant and Mr. Moten were successful in their intent to kill and took Nathan -- Nathan Rawls' life that the homicide detectives were on scene. And in that rear passenger seat, what was observable more readily than the photographs that were shown to you in court, was the butt of a firearm. Martell Moten had the best access to that 9 millimeter firearm, semiautomatic firearm that was collected and impounded in evidence.

What else do we know about that 9 millimeter firearm that was collected into evidence? It was sitting on top of blue gloves. And those gloves ultimately were tested and swabbed for DNA.

Beata Vida testified that the profile obtained from what she referred to as the outside of the gloves, though admittedly didn't know if Mr. Moten had frankly pulled the gloves off and turned them inside out or vice versa, but that the outside swabbing of that had a mixture profile. However, she was able to identify the major contributor as being Martell Moten.

The car obviously was transported and thereafter searched back at the lab. Ultimately, what was found hidden under the steering column where defendant was seated was another firearm. And you saw -- you heard Detective Rogers, as well as CSA Cromwell and Taylor, talk about where they found that firearm, right under where the defendant was seated. They pulled it down and found the firearm. Defendant is the person that had the best access to that firearm, the 40 caliber semiautomatic Glock, if you recall, with a laser on it.

Now, the firearms that were collected in this case, as the Judge explained by the law, didn't have to be, but they were, and it's significant for a number of reasons, because it links the defendant and his co-conspirator to this crime. But let's first talk about some of the elements of a crime and one of them, very easily, is a deadly weapon.

In this case, the law instructs you a deadly weapon is any instrument which, if made by its design, can cause

substantial bodily harm or injury or death. And obviously, a firearm not only would meet that requirement, but by law, firearms are deadly weapons. So in this case, when asked if any of the crimes were committed with use of a deadly weapon, it is so very clear that the answer to that is, yes.

Now, using a deadly weapon, especially in an instance where somebody is working with another partner when they commit the crime, it doesn't mean that each person has to actually physically take that weapon and pull the trigger. But the law recognizes that when more than one person commits a crime and one uses a deadly weapon in the commission of the crime, each can be convicted of using the deadly weapon, even though they didn't personally pull the trigger. An unarmed offender uses the deadly weapon if they acknowledge of the use of the deadly weapon.

In this case, the Judge went on reading our Second Amended Information, and it's clear that obviously we've charged what we refer to as different theories of liability. And that includes directly committing a crime, aiding and abetting in the commission of a crime, or doing it pursuant to a conspiracy. And the law makes no distinction with regard to which theory is used to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed the crime. But let's talk about each one of those.

25 //

1.

7.

So what's a conspiracy? Well, really it's an agreement or mutual understanding between two or more people to commit a crime, but no formal contract is needed. And why? The law recognizes that it's not likely that you will know that someone met and had some sort of written agreement between each other to commit a crime, all right? We don't have to show that.

2.0

A conspiracy can be inferred from conduct. So what do you look to, ladies and gentlemen? You're going to look to the conduct of the defendant and Martell Moten before, during and after the commissions of a crime. And that conduct shows not only their intent, but whether or not they acted in a coordinated series of acts to show that conspiracy.

Who's liable under a conspiracy? Well it depends somewhat between a specific intent crime and a general intent crime. But the act of one co-conspirator is the act of all of the co-conspirators when it's done in furtherance of a conspiracy if, for a specific intent crime, the defendant specifically intends that crime to occur; and with regard to general intent crimes, that it follows as one of the probable and natural consequences of the object of the conspiracy.

Aiding and abetting is also charged. A person who knowingly and with criminal intent aids, promotes, encourages or instigates by act or advice, or act and advice the commission of such crime with the intention that a crime be

committed is aiding and abetting. But we don't have to prove which person actually aided and abetted and which person actually committed the offense with regard to being a principal.

And this makes sense, ladies and gentlemen. The law is wise. Why? Because when people get together to commit a crime, one, it's more likely to occur. Two, oftentimes different people play different roles when they want to effectuate a crime. And so the law recognizes that whether you're the getaway driver that knows somebody's going to get out of the car and shoot, whether or not you actually pull the trigger, or whether or not you spent and calculated the plan, you are -- each one is liable as a principal. And it makes sense, because when people act together, different people play different roles.

Now, in this case, we know that the defendant acted with Martell Moten because the evidence shows that. But we also know that he physically acted in shooting up apartment 18. He conspired with Moten. If you look at his conduct before, during and after to commit the crime of murder, he conspired with Moten to kill. And, in fact, they were successful.

But one thing about theories of liability is -- and is very clear under the law, is that you do not have to agree amongst yourselves on a theory of liability. The defendant

can be liable as when directly committing the offense, aiding and abetting or as a co-conspirator. As long as you agree that the evidence establishes the defendant's guilt of the offense, your verdict shall be guilty as to that offense even if you disagree on the theory of liability.

Nathan Rawls' life was taken on November 5th of 2013. He was sleeping. It was 4:30 in the morning. And Dr. Simms talked to you, the medical examiner, about the cause of his death, gunshot wounds to his body, and there were three.

Three gunshot wounds that Dr. Simms testified about. One, remember, entered that -- in his right upper back and that was lethal, it did damage to his aorta. It crossed his chest, it hit his lungs, and it exited the left upper chest. We refer to that as a through and through gunshot wound. That was a lethal injury.

The second entered the right side of Nathan Rawls.

It was also lethal; went into his lungs and that's the bullet that was recovered by Dr. Simms.

And the third gunshot, if you recall, was a through and through wound to -- that fractured Nathan Rawls' knee which was not lethal.

Now, two of those three were lethal wounds. One Dr. Simms talked about being more lethal, if you will, not able to save Nathan Rawls life at all, no matter the medical intervention.

The bullet recovered from Nathan Rawls' body. The crime scene analyst, Shayla Joseph, actually impounded that. That was recovered from Dr. Simms. And it was forensic analyst, Anya Lester, identified that that bullet was fired by the .40 caliber Glock that was found in the defendant's car right under his steering wheel.

But this, the recovery of this bullet, does not make a difference with regard to whether the through and through bullet was from the .40 caliber or not. See, the defendant and Martell Moten acted together with the specific intent to kill. So it makes no difference which bullet actually killed Nathan Rawls, because they both acted with the specific intent. And so whether it was the 9 millimeter -- in this case we know one of them was the 40 caliber -- but it makes no difference under the law.

Let's talk about murder. It is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought and you're instructed that there are two types, first and second degree.

Malice aforethought; it's an intentional doing of a wrongful act without legal cause or excuse or what the law considers as adequate provocation. There's express and implied malice. Express malice is a deliberate intention, unlawfully, to take away the life of a human being which is manifested by external circumstances capable of proof. And implied malice is when no considerable provocation appears or

when all the circumstances of the killing show an abandon and malignant heart. And here it is clear by the nature of this offense, the number of shots fired, that the killing was wrongful and had no legal cause or adequate provocation.

First degree murder has three different elements that the State has proven in this case. The killing has to be willful, deliberate, and premeditated. What do those mean? Let's talk about it.

Willfulness is the intent to kill. An intention to kill, what do we look at? People don't go around necessarily expressing verbally their intent when they act. But their actions, and the law recognizes that their actions themselves tell us what the intent is. So the law says, you look at the facts and circumstances of the killing. The use of a weapon calculated to produce death and the manner of its use.

And in this case, we had more than one weapon calculated to produce death that were shot multiple times. The intent that the defendant and Martell Moten had that early morning is clear, and it was to kill, each time they pulled that trigger of either firearm.

Deliberate -- and I'm sorry, you look at the attendant circumstances characterizing the act. Let's talk about what deliberate means. It's determining upon a course of action to kill. And it may be arrived at in a short period of time.

Premeditated is the either design or determination to kill and it can be as instantaneous as successive thoughts of the mind.

So what's required with regard to the length of time? The law recognizes that every situation is going to vary and there is no specific time frame in order to show some premeditation and deliberation. The true test is not the duration of time, but rather the extent of the reflection.

And a cold, calculated judgment and decision can be arrived at in a short period of time.

Did the defendant act willful, deliberate and premeditated? That's the question. Absolutely. The evidence proves that the answer is, yes. He, along with Martell Moten, committed the crime of first degree murder with use of a deadly weapon.

Defendant's deliberate actions. What were the course of action that he and his co-conspirator took? He coordinated with Martell Moten to go to a specific location. They had to procure a vehicle; firearms, multiple of them; ammunition; the evidence of gloves; the timing, 4:30 in the morning; as well as positioning themselves to get to the courtyard, walking in there.

What about his premeditated actions? Defendant's determination to kill was distinctly formed by the position, look at the position of the shooters; the number of shots

fired; there was no fight. This was cold and calculated action. The victims are unarmed, unaware, unable to escape. It was Marque Hill that said there was no other exit to that apartment and they were awoke to gunfire, having done nothing to provoke it.

We have charged, and as the Judge indicated, that first degree murder includes second degree murder. Well, what is that? That is murder with malice aforethought, but without the added mixture of premeditation and deliberation. And here, it is clear that the defendant committed the crime of first degree murder with the use of a deadly weapon.

Let's talk about the attempt murders. What's attempt murder? It's a performance of act or acts which tend, but fail, to kill a human being when such acts are done with express malice, namely, the deliberate intention unlawfully to kill.

And in this case, the defendant tried, but failed, to kill three other people. See, he was successful in killing Nathan Rawls, but he tried and failed to kill Marque Hill, Laroy Thomas, as well as Ashley Scott. And in this case, all of those persons were in that residence, but -- and there were multiple shots fired. The law recognizes what's called transferred intent, so let's talk about that.

Transferred intent means that it doesn't matter if the defendant had the specific intent to kill Nathan, Laroy,

Marque, Ashley and then -- or an unknown person frankly. The intention to kill transfers. So there are two things with regard to transferred intent that are important. If a person intends to kill another person, but accidentally kills a third or -- by accidentally, I mean their aim is off, but they intended to kill the first, the intent transfers. If they have the intent, it is formulated before the victim is hurt.

And there's another area that is very important in this case. It's that if it's in a group, a specific intent to kill can be at the group. It does not have to be at a named person because in this case, you heard that -- from Marque, from Ashley, from Laroy, there was no beef. They didn't know the defendant. But his intent to kill, along with Martell Moten's specific intent to kill was at the group. And it transfers from the second that they pulled the trigger. Follow that bullet because that's where the intent went. It doesn't matter where it lands.

Instruction No. 4, when you get the packet from the Judge, talks about intent and not to confuse intent with motive, because intent is not motive. And motive is not an element of any offense ever. Let me say it again, motive's to an element of a crime. And don't confuse the one with the other, because the State does not have to prove motive.

Now, Mr. Otto may get up before you and talk about motive. It is common experience to want to know the why's.

Sometimes we don't know the answer to why's. Mr. Otto may suggest that lack of motive has some sort of impact on the defendant's willful, deliberate and premeditated conduct.

But ask yourselves what it is and what inferences Mr. Otto may be asking you to draw and whether or not it really makes sense, because the State submits to you that lack of a motive actually further shows the defendant's specific, cold and calculated intent to kill.

Attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon. In this case, we have three different attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon crimes charged. Why? Well, you saw the trajectory, you heard from the crime scene analyst.

In this case, when the multiple bullets are flying through the apartment complex, in that apartment, it has killed or at least struck Nathan Rawls. And you know that Laroy as well as Ashley are seated on this loveseat. And their position is such that the bullets are literally flying overhead and that makes way into Marque Hill's bedroom. And they -- all of them, the defendant attempted, but failed to kill.

Marque Hill, he talked about and testified for you that he was laying asleep in his bed and frankly, quite luckily for him, he didn't have a traditional bed. He only had a box spring and a mattress. And he said if he would have, and I quote, had the rails on his bed, he would have

been dead, because he testified that when he woke up, the bullets were literally whizzing by his head when he crawled to the ground. As well as Laroy Thomas and Ashley Scott, that the loveseat that they were seated on had -- right above was riddled with the impacts of gunshots that the defendant and Martell Moten took on those early morning hours.

11.

Attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon for each one of these victims is the defendant and/or Martell Moten shooting with this specific intent to kill, which is separate and apart from battery, a general intent crime with use of a deadly weapon. And there are two counts of battery with use of a deadly weapon for Laroy Thomas, as well as Ashley Scott.

So what's a battery? It's any willful and unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another. And in this case, we know it was done with a deadly weapon. Why? Obviously, Ashley talked about being struck with one of the gunshots that flew through the apartment when she was asleep. And she went to Sunrise Hospital and they actually recovered a bullet from her body.

As well as for Laroy Thomas. He, too, was shot, battery, use of force or violence on the person of another, each one of them is a person of another. And was it done by a deadly weapon? Absolutely. Why? We know that they each had gunshot wounds, they testified to the same, they each went to Sunrise Hospital. Laroy to this day, in fact, you saw him on

crutches, after the bullet was removed, he's still going ongoing therapy for the injuries he sustained from this.

But attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon and battery with use of a deadly weapon are separate offenses. And the defendant is guilty of both. The attempt murder requires a specific intent to kill, but it does not require any unlawful use of force or violence.

And the best example of that is that Marque Hill was never actually struck with a bullet that night, but the defendant attempted to kill him as those bullets are whizzing by his face. And but for that rail, he would have, at least in his testimony, also been dead.

Battery with use of a deadly weapon doesn't require a specific intent to kill. It requires only the unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another. And the defendant, it is clear, is guilty of both types of offenses, three counts of the attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon and two counts of the battery with use of a deadly weapon.

Discharging a firearm at or into a structure. The law tells us that it is the willful -- willfully and maliciously -- a person who willfully and maliciously discharges a firearm at or into an occupied structure. And an occupied structure, under the law, although in this case it was physically occupied, it just means that it hasn't been abandoned.

And with this and with all of the charges, the State has obviously alleged defendant directly committed this crime, aiding and abetting in the commission of this crime, or via co-conspiracy with him and Martell Moten. And in this case, we know that obviously this structure, having not been abandoned, was shot up, riddled with bullets from both that 9 millimeter firearm as well as the Glock.

And part of why we know that is, Ms. Lester spent quite a long time on a very heady subject, but that is absolutely vital in this case, and that is, the guns that were taken from his car with Martell Moten, and the cartridge casings collected on scene at 2655 Sherwood were shown, and Ms. Lester testified, that there was microscopic evidence showing that the 9 millimeter cartridge casings were fired from that gun that was found in the backseat of the defendant's car where Martell Moten had the most access. And that the cartridge casings of the .40 caliber were fired from the gun that was underneath the defendant's steering wheel.

Ladies and gentlemen, you will go back and look at all of the evidence and we ask you to do so. There's a ton of it in. And when you look at all of the evidence, you can come to one conclusion and that's that the defendant is guilty of conspiracy to commit murder, first degree murder with use of a deadly weapon for willfully, deliberately, and with premeditation killing Nathan Rawls; for three counts of the

attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon for Ashley Scott, Laroy Thomas and Marque Hill; for two counts of battery with use of a deadly weapon for Laroy Thomas and Ashley Scott; and for ten counts of discharging a firearm at or into a structure because those are the crimes that that defendant committed on November 5th of 2013. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Now, we'll be pleased to hear the closing argument on behalf of the defendant. Mr. Otto.?

MR. OTTO: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And Court's indulgence. Madame Clerk, if we could have this switched back over.

## DEFENDANT'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. OTTO: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

We, the defense, by law are not required to prove anything. Mr. Washington is considered not guilty. No matter how many times the State points its finger at Mr. Washington, he is considered not guilty. The -- just because the State accuses and points a finger and argues does not make Mr. Washington guilty.

The State must prove its case with evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. I submit to you, the State has not done so. Matthew Washington did not commit any of the crimes charged. The State has stacked a lot of charges expecting that you'll be overwhelmed. There is no evidence that Matthew Washington

was at apartment 18 at 2655 Sherwood at anytime ever.

The State mentions its theories. These are really just asking you to speculate on the guilt of Mr. Washington. The law does not allow you to speculate that a crime was committed and that Mr. Washington committed it. You must find the evidence and there is none.

Let's ask some questions. Where is the unnamed co-conspirator mentioned throughout the charging documents? Where are the fingerprints, the gunshot residue, the DNA. We know they're not on the gun. We know they're not on the bullets. We know that Martell Moten's DNA is on the gloves.

Where is it on the dash -- the under-dash panel showing that Mr. Washington went in there. They didn't even test it. They could have tested for touch DNA which you've heard is a sensitive test. They could have and they didn't. We would have more answers to these unanswered questions in this case if the State and the police had tested that part of the car. Ask yourselves, why didn't they?

These unanswered questions must give you pause. Why no fingerprints, why no gunshot residue, why no DNA, why didn't the police even test the panel for those things?

At the beginning of this trial, during the voir dire, we spoke to you about your willingness and your agreement to follow the law and the instructions which the Court just read to you. And now it is your opportunity to

look at the evidence presented and match it to the instructions. You will have these instructions in the jury room with you and I invite you to study them carefully and match them to the evidence.

Look first at Instruction No. 4, consider it, that Mr. Washington did not commit the crimes charged. The State has shown no evidence of a joint operation of an act forbidden by law.

No motive has been shown. The State just argued about motive and said I'd mention it and I would. Now, motive is not an element of the crime, but motive tends to show why. That's an unanswered question, why? We don't have the answer. The State simply has not shown any evidence that Matthew Washington fired a gun at anybody or anything at anytime and especially not on November 5th.

The State certainly has shown no evidence of a willful, deliberate and premeditated intent to kill by Matthew Washington. The State asks you to find Matthew Washington guilty based on speculation, based on guess. Where is the third unnamed co-conspirator? Where is the physical evidence?

In order to find Mr. Washington guilty, you must find that the State has proven each and every element of each and every charge. And you must find that beyond a reasonable doubt. I call your attention to Instruction No. 6.

Calling your attention to Instruction No. 12, you

can consider only the evidence in the case in reaching your verdict. You can use your common experience and your common sense, but you may not make inferences based on speculation or guess. That is what the State asks you to do. The State says, guilty, guilty. Where's the evidence?

1.

There is no -- looking at the definition of conspiracy in Instruction 14, there is no evidence of an agreement that Matthew Washington made with anyone. Without an agreement, there can be no conspiracy. Matthew Washington did not agree with anyone to shoot, kill or injure any person. The State had presented -- has presented no evidence of such a conspiracy.

What proof of conspiracy has the State shown? What proof of an agreement? Instruction No. 17, persons alleged or proven to have been members of a conspiracy is not in itself sufficient to prove that such a person was a member of the alleged conspiracy. Where is the unnamed co-conspirator? People with other people who may have shot is not enough evidence to convict Mr. Washington beyond a reasonable doubt.

Has the State shown Matthew Washington was with the unnamed co-conspirator? No. Has the State shown that Matthew Washington touched that dashboard? It could have and it didn't show. It didn't even test. What evidence, calling -- calling your attention to Instruction No. 18, what evidence of advice or encouragement, what evidence that Matthew Washington

acted as a lookout? What evidence has the State shown that Matthew Washington committed the crimes charged?

1.5

Yes, they have him in the car. Yes, they have him in his girlfriend's car. Yes, they have the gun under the panel. No evidence he ever even knew that gun was under the panel, none.

Instruction No. 19, mere presence at the scene of a crime or knowledge that a crime is being committed is not sufficient to establish guilt. The State has proven presence, as I just said. At least during the stop, but not at 2655 Sherman (sic). The State has proven nothing more than presence at the stop.

Instruction No. 20, first degree murder. Requires

-- it is a specific intent crime. What specific intent has
the State shown you? What? What evidence of a conspiracy, of
an agreement? None. What specific evidence of Matthew
Washington's intent, premeditatedly, deliberately to kill has
the State shown? It has shown none, and I'm sorry we sat here
for a week.

Murder I is a specific intent time. Murder in the second degree is a general intent crime, that's Instruction No. 21.

Matthew Washington, as I've said many times, is not guilty of any offense. I can stand here and shout what evidence, what evidence all afternoon, but I'll

call your attention to Instruction No. 23, second degree murder and first degree murder. The State must show competent, credible evidence and they cannot. You are not allowed to base your decision on speculation, conjecture or a theory that the State puts forth.

Motive, the victims in this case who testified, stated they did not know Mr. Washington. What motive? The victims in this case who testified, testified that there were no beefs, no disagreements, no reason at all, they knew that Mr. Washington would shoot through their window, through a curtain that night.

Ask yourselves when you go back there, is there any evidence of Matthew Washington shooting a gun? No. No gunshot residue, no fingerprints, no DNA, no -- none of those things on the dash panel.

Instruction No. 27, read this very carefully please. First degree murder is perpetrated by means of any kind of willful, deliberate and premeditated killing. All three elements; willfulness, deliberation, premeditation, must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt before an accused can be convicted of first degree murder, and I submit to you, there is no evidence Matthew Washington shot a gun or agreed with anybody to commit a crime. Certainly, not willful, deliberate and premeditated murder in the first degree.

-//

1.2

Talked about the potentials of shooting into a group. Nobody could see into that apartment. The State concedes everybody in the apartment complex was asleep, or supposedly. The victims in this case testified that they were asleep. What evidence that Matthew Washington knew there was a group of people in there? What evidence that Matthew Washington picked up a gun and shot it? None. There is no evidence of willful, deliberation or malice aforethought.

The State has the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt for each and every element of all 17 charges in this Information, and after a week, we have conjecture, we have speculation. They ask you to make a leap and in your mind's eye, to see Matthew Washington there. There's no evidence of it, none. You must not based your decision, excuse me, on speculation or guess. The State has not proven its case.

Now, I'm going to sit down and I won't get a chance to speak to you again. The State will now have a chance to get up and finish its closing argument. As you listen to the State, ask yourself, what would I say if I got a chance to stand again? I would say, no matter how many times they point their finger, there is no evidence that Matthew Washington shot anybody or knew anyone was going to be shot. Thank you so much for listening. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Now, we'll hear

the final argument on behalf of the State. Ms. Pieper.

MS. PIEPER: Thank you. We need to switch over,
please.

2.4

## STATE'S REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT

MS. PIEPER: Mr. Otto just said to you don't be overwhelmed. Ladies and gentlemen, I don't want you to be overwhelmed at all. I don't want you to be overwhelmed by the evidence that we have. So what we're going to do is we're going to have an opportunity to talk to you about what happened at 2655 Sherwood.

He told you the State has no evidence in regard to the defendant being there. He asked you to speculate and I'm going to tell you we do not want you to speculate. The State of Nevada does to want you to speculate. We have evidence, it's not all direct, and we are going to ask you to infer.

One of the things that he did talk about was reasonable doubt and so I want you to know this is the reasonable doubt instruction. One of the things that I highlighted is that doubt to be reasonable must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation. That is the reasonable doubt instruction.

One of the things that the State of Nevada has to do is show two things. We have to show that the crimes are committed and that's what Ms. Schifalacqua did, she went to the crimes and the law. And that this defendant committed

those crimes. That's what we have to do, and that's what we have done.

1.9

2.4

Gunshot residue. We just heard Mr. Otto talk about gunshot residue. What did Detective Bob Rogers tell us?

Detective Rogers got up here and he testified. One of the things he told you is that once somebody is put in handcuffs, they don't do gunshot residue tests. Why not? Because of contamination and they get false positives. Why is that?

Because handcuffs are around guns all day. The handcuffs on the officers' belt are right next to the guns. So they don't do gunshot residue tests. And the State of Nevada doesn't want to have false positives. We don't want to have contamination. We want you to based your decision on the evidence in this case and not speculate.

The defendant committed these crimes. If you look at the timing, you'll see it. Don't speculate, we want you to infer.

Earlier in jury selection, you heard me talk about direct versus circumstantial. You heard me talk about the -- you come into the courtroom and it's cold outside and it's gray skies and, you know, everybody a little bit cold, you have hot chocolate.

We're in court all day and you leave and as you leave, you can see rain droplets on the ground, you can see water rushing. And one of the jurors said, you have to have

direct evidence in order for me to convict. And some of you kind of looked like, what?

1.7

This is a circumstantial evidence case, and we are not afraid of that. We are not afraid of that. But if you look at the evidence, it will lead to you where you need to go. Look at the timing. Marque Hill calls 911 at 4:34 a.m., and you heard that call. At 4:35, Lorraine DeSoto calls, and she describes the vehicle that she sees outside of her bedroom window. She says, silver Dodge Magnum, limo tint, leaving the scene slowly.

At 4:37 a.m., Officer Parquette logs onto the call. At 4:39, he sees the car at Eastern and St. Louis. And by 4:40, he has stopped the car. Six minutes after Marque Hill has called, the car is stopped. You can wait in the Regional Justice Center for an elevator for longer than six minutes. From the time of the call to the time these defendants were pulled over.

What else do we know? The location of where the car is stopped and then where it was originally seen. You heard from Darrin DeSoto. Darrin DeSoto got in that chair and he told you, originally, he looked out his bedroom window, but then he couldn't really see, so he moved. He sort of went to the kitchen/livingroom area. And when he looked out, he told you that he could see a car where the lights were kind of coming around the corner. And what did both of the witnesses

say, the DeSotos? They saw the car slowly drive by, not fast, not going to draw attention, slowly and methodically drive by.

What else do we know? We know the location and the timings of when things happened. Marque Hill calls. Lorraine DeSoto calls at 4:35. By Eastern and St. Louis, Officer Parquette has already seen the vehicle and is following them.

You heard the testimony of all of the officers, or the officers that came, that told you they sort of had a plan, they were talking amongst each other. Behind the silver Dodge Magnum was Officer Parquette and other officers were sort of fanned out. You heard from Eric Sokolowski, he was at the area of Eastern and Stewart and he had stopped traffic in case there was a chase.

By 4:40, the car is stopped. So it's not -- we're not asking you to speculate. We're asking you to use your inference. Shots ring out and within minutes, there's a 911 call, and then within minutes an officer sees it, and then within minutes a car is stopped.

But it's not just that. That's not the only thing that we have. We have guns inside of the vehicles. One of the things that was interesting that you heard is that when the car was stopped at Eastern and Ogden, Officer Parquette asked the defendant for consent to search, but he also said, is there anything illegal in the car. And what did the defendant say? There's nothing illegal in the car, it ain't

mine, it's his, and he points to his co-defendant, to his co-conspirator. Why? Because he didn't think we were going to find the gun under the panel.

You heard that they did one search of the car and when they were searching that car, they were sort of looking in areas where the plastic may have been pulled up and they didn't find it. It took a second search of the car to find the defendant's gun. He knew there was a gun in the car. That's why he said, oh, if there's anything illegal, it's his.

The defendant even places himself near the crime scene. He says, oh, I picked up my friend at the Stratosphere. What did the officers testify to? That the Stratosphere area was sort of near this crime scene. You don't have to go through the alleyway of the DeSotos in order to leave for the Stratosphere. The defendant places himself at the crime scene. Do not speculate, ladies and gentlemen, but use your ability to see the inferences.

You heard from defense counsel that potentially nobody knew that people were living at 2655 Sherwood. Does that look like an abandoned apartment building? We have landscape and greenery, we have trees.

Granted, maybe they're not as taken care of as our homes might be. We have a barbeque out there, we have bikes on the side. And the defendants were standing right there as they were shooting. It's not like they didn't see these

things. Does that look like an abandoned apartment? There's bikes. Do you see any sort of boarding up the walls, there's lights everywhere.

This wasn't abandoned. They knew what they were doing and they executed it. They had a plan and they executed it. They went there together, they stood outside and shot, and then they left together.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is a conspiracy. That is aiding and abetting, when you help someone. That is directly committing the crime when you stand there and you shoot time after time after time after time.

We have shown you that not only do we have three theories, but we also have shown you that defendant is guilty under each one of those three theories. But again, like the jury instructions tell you, you don't have to agree on it. Some of you may say it's a conspiracy. Some of you may say aiding and abetting. And others of you may say he directly committed it.

Intent to kill. Officer Weber testified that when he got to the scene, he could see that the window had bullet holes in it. And then, of course, after the crime analysts come, we find out that actually in that window area, there are ten discharges.

The intent to kill goes from outside in that courtyard, through the window to inside, through the curtains,

and then through this wall. And then you also heard testimony from Marque Hill that it sort of was whizzing past him as he was sleeping.

But what did we also hear from the crime scene analyst? That they actually recovered a bullet that went from the courtyard, all the way through the livingroom, all the way through the bedroom, all the way through the closet, into the back defect of the beginning of the apartment complex. That's how far these bullet travels.

To even suggest that this is abandoned is ridiculous because there's cars everywhere, there's people there. Maybe they're not up at 4:30 in the morning, but you can use your ability to use inferences.

First degree murder versus second degree murder.

First degree murder has three additional elements;

willfulness, deliberation and premeditation. Willfulness is
the intent to kill. What I usually kind of explain to people
in regard to this case is willfulness sometimes is the number
of shots that we see.

Deliberation, I explain this way. You kind of have to think about, you know, weighing the consequences, and people usually go what does that mean? We're lawyers, we use all these big words sometimes we can't define. This is how I explain deliberation. You're driving to the courthouse this morning. You're driving in your car, you see a light coming

up maybe 50, 40, 30 feet. As you're driving, you see that the light turned yellow. Now, you got to make a choice. Most people in Nevada already know what choice they're going to make, but you got to make a choice. It's a yellow light and you know it's going to turn red.

So as you approach the intersection, you look around. Are there pedestrians on the side of the road that may walk in front of your car? Are there cars any other way that are going to drive in front of you? Usually if there aren't, you drive through the light and then you hit part of the yellow, maybe you hit part of the red.

But that's what deliberation is, it's sort of weighing things. It happens quickly because in that case, you're driving, you see a yellow light, you don't see people, you don't see cars, you go through the intersection. It's that deliberation. It's the weighing process. That is what deliberation is.

Premeditation. And the phrase I like to use out of this is, it may be as instantaneous as successive thoughts of the mind. Normally what we think of as premeditation is something maybe we -- has been thought out for maybe two weeks, three weeks, four weeks, five weeks. But premeditation can be quick.

It's similar to deliberation. You make a decision and you follow through with it. And what do we know in this

case? We know that they shot and then they left together. And the way that they left tells us something. They didn't rush, they didn't speed out of there, they didn't make a lot of noise. You heard the DeSotos say that although no cars can drive through, that there was no (inaudible). They made sure that they were quiet. They made sure that they needed to do what they intended to do.

You also heard a lot from Mr. Otto in regard to the unnamed co-conspirator. One of the things is the State looks at all the evidence in the case and sometimes we think maybe there was a third person. Why? Well, there's two guys in the car, right? Both in the driver's side. It's kind of odd. Normally, you think somebody might be in the passenger side. That's why we charged (inaudible). But you don't find the defendant not guilty because we haven't brought in evidence of a third unnamed co-conspirator.

Mr. Otto also said that the State has to show every element beyond a reasonable doubt. I would ask you to read that instruction. What it says is that we have to show every material element beyond a reasonable doubt. And I would submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that we have in this case.

He also said a whole bunch of things about, you know, the unnamed co-conspirator and things to that event. You are asked to determine the guilt or innocence of this

defendant sitting in the courtroom. This is the person that you're asked to judge; not Martell Moten at this point, not somebody else, this defendant. Other people will have their days in court.

2.

1.4

I am often asked sometimes how do you show willfulness, deliberation and premeditation? And we often hear the phrase, you know, a photo says a thousand words. In regard to this case, here's how we show it. That is the front door of apartment number 18. That is the window of apartment number 18. These defendants shot that many times. That's the amount of shots they shot into that apartment.

Ladies and gentlemen, based on the evidence in the case, based on all that you have heard, we are going to ask you to find this defendant guilty of first degree murder with use of a deadly weapon, three counts of attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon, two counts of battery with use of a deadly weapon and ten counts of discharging a firearm. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, you've heard the arguments of counsel. You will not retire to deliberate upon your verdict.

When you retire to deliberate upon your verdict, you will have all of the evidence that was admitted into evidence except we will not be sending any of the bullets or shells or magazines that were made mention of.

Additionally, ladies and gentlemen, I must advise you that, as you saw, several of the packages of evidence were admitted and testimony was elicited about the writing on the packages. Do not open any of the packaged evidence that was admitted. So those are the instructions of the Court on that.

Now, it is -- we will now swear the court officer to take charge of the jury. The jury in this case will consist of all of you except Ms. Perez in seat number 15. We hope that Ms. -- is it Ms. Perez?

JUROR NO. 15: Perez, yes.

THE COURT: Perez, thank you. We don't want anyone
-- our alternate juror to feel left out, but it is necessary
that we have alternate jurors in order to make sure that we
have the requisite number for the verdict in the case.

In the event that one of the main jurors in this case were to fall ill or some such thing and not be able to complete, then the alternate juror would yet be called forward to deliberate with the jury in this matter. For that reason, we'll ask that our alternate juror please remain under the Court's admonition not to discuss anything about the case or any of the people connected with the case with anyone unless and until you know that the entire jury has been discharged.

We will swear the court officer then,

COURT OFFICER SWORN

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Ladies and

gentlemen, if you will retire with our court officer through this door. 2 THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury. THE COURT: Ms. Perez, if you'll just wait a moment, 4 then we'll have you exit and you'll be met outside so that we 5 can excuse you from the courthouse. 6 (Jury retired to deliberate at 4:45 p.m.) THE COURT: All right. Ms. Perez, if you will now 8 follow through, you'll be met and excused from there. 10 you. The Court will be in recess and awaiting the verdict 11 of the -- of the jury. We've still got a door open there, so. 12 THE CLERK: It's closed between us. 13 THE COURT: Yeah. Anything else before we go off 14 the record? 15 MS. PIEPER: No, Judge. Just one thing. Typically 16 we give our laptops so that they can listen to the 911's, but 17 our PowerPoint's on it. So we're going to go back to the 18 office, clean it up, and then bring it back, like, maybe 20 tomorrow. THE COURT: All right. It will be a clean laptop 21 with nothing but the 911 on it? 22 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Well, they have it. 23 MS. PIEPER: They have it, but they can play it in 24 25 here.

```
THE COURT: So they just play the CD. So the laptop
 1
    itself is clean?
 2
              MS. PIEPER: Will not --
 3
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: We have to get one.
              THE COURT: All right.
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: So what time tomorrow will they
    come back so we can make sure that we drop --
 7
              THE COURT: Nine o'clock.
 8
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay. So we ensure we'll drop
 9
    off the laptop.
10
              THE COURT: Yeah.
11
              MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.
12
              THE COURT: So if counsel would be available from
13
    9:00 o'clock on, no more than a few minutes from the
14
    courthouse with your -- on your cell phones. And do we have
15
    your cell phones from all four?
16
              MR. OTTO: I hope so. I don't know.
17
              MS. OHLINGER:
                             I believe so.
18
              THE CLERK: We'll get them right now.
19
              THE COURT: Will you make sure you have all their
20
    cell phones?. Thank you.
21
            (Court recessed at 4:47 p.m., until Wednesday,
22
                    April 16, 2014, at 10:27 a.m.)
23
24
25
```

## CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

## AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC Englewood, CO 80110 (303) 798-0890

JULIE LORD, TRANSCRIBER

4-19-14

DATE

Alm & Chum

TRAN

CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CASE NO. C-294695-1

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

DEPT. NO. I

Plaintiff.

vs.

MATTHEW WASHINGTON,

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Defendant.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH CORY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

JURY TRIAL - DAY 8

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 2014

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE:

DANIELLE K. PIEPER, ESQ.

BARBARA F. SCHIFALACQUA

Chief Deputy District Attorneys

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

DAVID J. OTTO, ESQ.

ROBERTA OHLINGER-JOHNSON, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

BEVERLY SIGURNIK District Court VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC Englewood, CO 80110

(303) 798-0890

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

## LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 2014, 10:27 A.M. (Outside the presence of the jury) 2 THE COURT: -- having conferred with counsel, we 3 have -- I've indicated what responses I will give to questions 4 one and two, which essentially are simply to refer back to the 5 jury instructions, except that question two will also say, 6 specifically, Instruction 43, as well as jury instructions, generally. Any other record that needs to be made by either 8 side on this? 9 MS. PIEPER: Not by the State, Your Honor. 10 MR. OTTO: Not by the defense, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. The record will be 12 supplemented with a copy of both the original note, as well as 13 a copy of the typewritten question and answer, which is going. 14 back to the jury. 15 MS. PIEPER: Thank you. 16 MR. OTTO: Thanks. 1 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 MR. OTTO: Should we, like, wait here and see if 19 they have another one? 20 21 MS. PIEPER: No. THE COURT: Well, I would say this. Are we off the 22 23 record? (Court recessed at 10:28 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.) 24 (Outside the presence of the jury) 25

1	THE COURT: We have a verdict. We're on?
2	THE COURT RECORDER: We are now.
3	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: (Indiscernible). I don't believe
4	there's any objections to the jury instructions that we
5	provided to this Court, so they just need to be numbered so
6	that, obviously, after the Amended Information is read, we
7	will do a brief opening. We will basically submit the JOC's
8	and then we will be prepared to close.
9	So, we just wanted to make sure that the Court had
10	those and that on record, Mr. Otto didn't have any objection
11	to the jury instructions for the second portion of this case.
12	THE COURT: Is that a correct statement?
13	MR. OTTO: That is a correct statement, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Okay. I thought I had one question when
15	I went through.
16	MR. OTTO: Do you want to give me the JOC's so I can
17	look at them (inaudible)?
18	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: They're up there.
19	MR. OTTO: Oh.
20	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Oh, and I provided them, but go
21	ahead and look.
22	MR. OTTO: I know, I saw them.
23	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yeah, I know, I just want to make
24	sure.
25	(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: And as I understand it, the State's evidence is simply the --

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Right. They -- we'll talk to that, obviously, that all the other testimony is a part of this portion of the trial. We will move and admit, obviously, three certified Judgments of Convictions. I will say what they are and then we will rest, essentially, Judge, and move right into jury instructions and closing arguments.

THE COURT: Now, I do not know at this moment whether there will be any witness testimony; is that correct?

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: In regard to the ex-felon? I -- well, I don't know if -- I guess, the defendant could take the stand. At -- you know --

THE COURT: If --

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: -- at that point, we're not going to have any additional unless he takes the stand, I guess.

THE COURT: Therefore, if that turns out to be the case, I would not give, credibility/believability of a witness; would I?

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Well, they are still -- I -- if you don't want to give it, Judge, that's fine. But the entirety of the trial and why he's in possession is because of all of the witness testimony. So the credibility and believability, for example, or Officer Parquette, who saw the firearm --

1	
1	THE COURT: Right.
2	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: et cetera, is applicable.
3	THE COURT: You're right. You're right, okay. And
4	therefore, I would also give the expert instruction as well.
5	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Correct. Because we know it was
6	obviously tested. There were firearms that were
7	(Pause in the proceedings)
8	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Otto, without holding
9	you to it, do you know whether or not your client will be
10	taking the stand to testify?
11	MR. OTTO: Without holding me to it, I would say,
12	no.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Are counsel of the opinion that
14	on the chance that the defendant elects to take the stand, I
15	need to give the admonition once again?
16	MS. SCHIF'ALACQUA: I've
17	THE COURT: The same one that I gave previously?
18	Would you bring me my trial book? I left my criminal trial
19	book on my bench.
20	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, after we rest, I
21	think it would probably be prudent for you to canvass him
22	again, that at the second portion of this trial, if he doesn't
23	want to
24	MS. PIEPER: Or do you want to canvas him now?
25	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: or you can canvass him now,

frankly.

THE COURT: Yeah. If we -- if your evidence is going to consist of nothing but the --

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Correct.

THE COURT: -- certified copies of the previous convictions, I mean, we'll be to that point immediately.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Sure. Yes, Judge, we'd ask then that he be canvassed now.

THE COURT: I will -- I will do so. We're getting it right now. I left it in my chambers. Thank you.

Mr. Washington, you'll recall that during the last phase of the trial, I gave you, at one point, an admonition regarding your right to testify or not to testify during the trial. Do you recall that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to give you that -- thank you. I'm going to give you that admonition again.

Under the Constitution of the United States and under the Constitution of the State of Nevada, you cannot be compelled to testify in this case; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You may at your own request give up this right and take the witness stand and testify. If you do, you will be subject to cross-examination by the Deputy District Attorney, and anything that you may say, be it on direct or

cross-examination, will be the subject of fair comment when the Deputy District Attorney speaks to the jury in her final argument; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If you choose not to testify, the Court will not permit the Deputy District Attorney to make any comments to the jury because you have not testified; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If you elect not to testify, the Court will instruct the jury -- and I do not have another copy of that instruction -- the Court will instruct the jury, but only if your attorney specifically requests as follows; "The law does not compel a defendant in a criminal case to take the stand and testify and no presumption may be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the failure of a defendant to testify," the same thing that I advised them during the last phase of the trail.

Do you have any questions about any of these rights as I've explained them to you?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. You are further advised that if you have a felony conviction and more than ten years has not elapsed from the date that you were convicted or discharged from prison, parole or probation, whichever date is later, and

if the defense has not sought to preclude that from coming 1 before the jury, and if you elect to take the stand and testify, then the Deputy District Attorney, in the presence of the jury, will be permitted to ask you the following: (1) 4 have you ever been convicted of a felony; (2) what was the 5 felony; and (3) when did it happened, however, no details may б be gone into; you understand that? Ź

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Otto, do you know whether you would be requesting that instruction? On the chance that you are going to request that instruction again, it's the same one that I gave --

> MR. OTTO: Yes.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: -- in the last phase, I would need another -- another -- I don't have that one in this packet.

MR. OTTO: I would request it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Do we still have the last set of jury instructions? Get me a copy of those.

If it's all right with counsel, what I can do is I can use the copy from the last time, and before we send the original of the new set of instructions back --

MS. PIEPER: Judge?

THE COURT: -- we will insert the -- a new original.

MS. PIEPER: Judge, Ms. Schifalacqua and I have

1	copies of the jury instructions. We just have to see	
2	THE COURT: All right.	
3	MS. PIEPER: May I approach?	
4	THE COURT: You may.	
5	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Do you want me to white out the	
6	number? Court's indulgence.	
7	THE COURT: Yeah, we will need to do that. Thank	
8	you.	
9	(Pause in the proceedings)	
10	MS. PIEPER: May I approach?	
11	THE COURT: You may. Thank you. Does counsel need	
12	copies of the instructions that I'm going to give? If not,	
13	then I will simply number these while we are proceeding	
14	forward with this next phase and we can	
15	MR. OTTO: If we could take two minutes to make me a	
16	copy of them, I would appreciate it, Your Honor.	
17	THE COURT: All right. I suppose we could do that.	
18	(Pause in the proceedings)	
19	THE COURT: All right. I will number these while we	
20	are proceeding and I will get a copy a couple of copies	
21	made, one for each side.	
22	MS. PIEPER: Judge, can we approach just briefly?	
23	THE COURT: Sure.	
24	(Off-record bench conference)	
25	THE COURT: All right. Are we ready for the jury,	

1	then?
2	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yes, Your Honor.
3	MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: You may bring the jury.
5	(Pause in the proceedings)
6	(Jury reconvenes at 3:14 p.m.)
7	THE COURT: All right, please be seated. The record
8	will reflect the presence of the jury. Who is the jury
9	foreman? Or foreperson?
10	JUROR NO. 8: I am, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Roark?
12	JUROR NO. 8: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Has the jury arrived at a verdict?
14	JUROR NO. 8: Yes, we have.
15	THE COURT: Would you hand it to the Bailiff,
16	please?
17	(Pause in the proceedings)
18	THE COURT: All right. The Clerk will read the jury
19	(sic) and inquire of the read the verdict and inquire of
20	the jury.
21	THE CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada,
22	the State of Nevada, plaintiff, vs. Matthew Washington,
23	defendant, Case Number C-13-294695-1, Department I.
24	Verdict. We, the jury, in the above-entitled case,
25	find the defendant, Matthew Washington, as follows:

Count 1. Conspiracy to commit murder; guilty of 1 conspiracy to commit murder. 2 Count 2. Murder with the use of a deadly weapon, 3 victim, Nathan Rawls; guilty of first degree murder with use 4 of a deadly weapon. 5 Count 3. Attempt murder with the use of a deadly 6 weapon, victim Ashely Scott; guilty of attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon. 8 Count 4. Battery with use of a deadly weapon, 9 victim, Ashely Scott; guilty of battery with use of a deadly 10 weapon. 11 Count 5. Attempt murder with use of a deadly 12 weapon, victim, Laroy Thomas; guilty with attempt murder with 13 use of a deadly weapon. 14 County 6. Attempt murder with use of a deadly 15 weapon, victim, Marque Hill; guilty of attempt murder with use 16 of a deadly weapon. 17 Count 7. Battery with use of a deadly weapon, 18 victim, Laroy Thomas; guilty of battery with use of a deadly 19 20 weapon. Count 8. Discharging firearm at or into a 21 structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of 22 discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft 23 or watercraft. 24 Count 9. Discharging firearm at or into a

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

25

structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft.

G

Count 10. Discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft.

Count 11. Discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft.

Count 12, Discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft;

Count 13. Discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft.

Count 14. Discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft.

Count 15. Discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of

```
discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft
 2
    or watercraft.
              Count 16. Discharging firearm at or into a
 3
 4
    structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of
    discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft
 5
    or watercraft.
              Count 17. Discharging firearm at or into a
    structure, vehicle, aircraft or watercraft; guilty of
    discharging firearm at or into a structure, vehicle, aircraft
10
    or watercraft.
11
              Dated the 16th day of April, 2014, signed by
12
   Foreperson, Brian Roark.
              Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, are these your
13
   verdicts as read, so say you one, so say you all?
14
15
              THE JURY: Yes.
              THE COURT: All right. Before the verdict is
16
   recorded, does either side wish the jury to be polled?
17
              MS. PIEPER: Not by the State.
18
              MR. OTTO: The defense wishes to poll the jury, Your
19
20
   Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. The Clerk with poll the
21
22
   jury.
23
              THE CLERK: Ms. Lahav, is this your verdict as read,
    (indiscernible)?
24
              JUROR NO. 2: (Inaudible).
25
```

```
THE CLERK: Mr. Farley, are these your --
              THE COURT RECORDER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear a
 2
    response.
              THE COURT: Can you speak up, please, folks, when
    you answer?
              JUROR NO. 2: Yes.
              THE CLERK: Mr. Farley, are these verdicts as read?
 7
              JUROR NO. 3: Yes, ma'am.
              THE CLERK: Mr. Johns, is this your verdict --
   verdicts as read?
10
              JUROR NO. 4: Yes.
11
              THE CLERK: Ms. Dowell, are these your verdicts as
12
13
   read?
              JUROR NO. 5: Yes, ma'am.
14
              THE CLERK: Ms. Harakal, are these your verdicts as
15
16
   read?
17
              JUROR NO. 6: Yes.
              THE CLERK: Mr. Roark, are these your verdicts as
18
   read?
19
              JUROR NO. 8: Yes.
20
              THE CLERK: Ms. Morrison, are these your verdicts as
21
22
   read?
              JUROR NO. 9: Yes.
23
              THE CLERK: Ms. Lucero, are these your verdicts as
24
25
   read?
```

1	JUROR NO. 10: Yes.
2	THE CLERK: Ms. Yono, are these your verdicts as
3	read?
. 4	JUROR NO. 11: Yes.
5	THE CLERK: Mr. Eslinger, are these your verdicts as
6	read?
7	JUROR NO. 12: Yes.
8	THE CLERK: Mr. Andrews, are these your verdicts as
9	read?
10	ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.
11	THE CLERK: Ms. Lynch, are these your verdicts as
12	read?
13	ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.
14	THE CLERK: Thank you.
15	THE COURT: All right, thank you.
16	The verdicts will be recorded.
17	Ladies and gentlemen, in most of the trials that we
18	do, this would be the point at in time in which I would
19	thank you for your service and be discharging you. However,
20	as you have gleaned previously, this is a trial in which there
21	are stages and we will now proceed to the second stage of the
22	trial.
23	I will not be giving you, again, the all of the
24	instructions which I gave you at the beginning of the first
25	phase of the trial. However, all of those instructions are as

binding and are as good to recall throughout the second stage
as they were during the first. You will recall that I gave
you instructions that had to do with how the case was based,
on an Information. The purpose of the trial was to see
whether the State would meet its burden of proving the
defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, for this stage, it is necessary for you to know

Now, for this stage, it is necessary for you to know of an additional charge. I will now ask the prosecutors, and I don't know whether --

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Judge, I would just request the Clerk read the Second Amended Information for the second portion.

THE COURT: All right.

(Second Amended Information read; not transcribed)

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: To which the defendant?

THE COURT: To which the --

THE CLERK: To which the defendant has pled not

18 | guilty.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you. All right.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, this -- this case now is based on the Information which has been read to you by the Clerk. You should distinctly understand that the Information is simply a charge and it is not in any sense evidence of the allegations that it contains.

The defendant has pled not guilty to the

Information. The State, therefore, has the burden of proving each of the essential elements of the charge beyond a reasonable doubt. As the defendant sits there now, he is not guilty.

The purpose of the trial is to determine whether the State will meet its burden. It is your primary responsibility as jurors to find and determine the facts.

Under our system of criminal procedure, you are the sole judges of the facts. You are to determine the facts from the testimony and other evidence that will be presented to you as well as exhibits that are introduced in court. It is up to you to determine the inferences which you feel may be properly drawn from the evidence.

You must not be influenced in any degree by any personal feeling of sympathy for or prejudice against either the State or the defendant. Both sides are entitled to the same fair and impartial consideration.

Counsel, is counsel of the opinion that it's necessary for the record to contain the initial instructions, the same ones that were previously given?

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Judge, we're -- you will instruct them that everything of the first portion of the trial is applicable to this portion, so I would submit.

MR. OTTO: I'd submit, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. In other words, ladies and

gentlemen, all the same rules apply, the same instructions which I previously gave you are in effect for this portion of the trial as well.

In order for you to understand a little bit more about what this charge is -- counsel, I'm going to go a little bit outside the order that I normally do. I'm going to ask the State to indicate to you what the nature is of the offense, not the opening statement, but simply the nature of the offense which is charged.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, ladies and gentlemen, this portion of the trial, you will -- the State has alleged that on November 5th of 2013, that the defendant possessed a firearm and at that time, he was prohibited from doing so.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, this phase of the trial will proceed entirely the same as it did before. First, the Deputy District Attorney will make an opening statement, which is an outline to help you to understand what the State expects to prove. Next, the defendant's attorney may, but does not have to, make an opening statement.

The State will then present its evidence and counsel for the defendant may object. Following the State's case, the defense may present evidence. However, as I've said, the defendant is not obligated to present any evidence.

I //

1.6

1.7

1	And after all the evidence has been presented, I	
2	will instruct you on the law. After the instructions on the	
3	law have been read to you, each side has the opportunity to	
4	present oral argument. And as I've said before, what is said	
5	in closing argument is not evidence. The arguments are	
6	designed to summarize and interpret the evidence. After the	
7	arguments have been completed, you will retire to deliberate	
8	upon your verdict.	
9	MR. OTTO: Your Honor, we have a question.	
10	THE COURT: Does either side	
11	MR. OTTO: We have a question	
12	UNKNOWN FEMALE JUROR: There's some music out there.	
13	MS. PIEPER: Oh, the door.	
14	UNKNOWN FEMALE JUROR: Could we at least shut the	
15	door, please?	
16	THE MARSHAL: Yes, sorry about that.	
17	UNKNOWN FEMALE JUROR: Thank you.	
18	THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.	
19	Does either side invoke the exclusionary rule?	
20	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Not at this time, Judge.	
21	MR. OTTO: No, Your Honor.	
22	THE COURT: All right. We'll now be pleased to hear	
23	the opening statement	
24	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Your Honor.	
25	THE COURT: of the Deputy District Attorney, Ms.	
	Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890	

Schifalacqua.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Schifalacqua, (inaudible).

THE COURT: Schifalacqua, sorry.

## STATE'S OPENING STATEMENT

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Ladies and gentlemen, all of the evidence that you heard in the first portion of the trial, and as the Judge said, that we're going to do this in stages, there's actually one more stage after this. But all of that evidence that was presented, all of the witnesses that came before you, all of the 200 plus exhibits, those are all still in evidence for you to consider.

The one thing that the State will give you in this portion of the trial that you didn't know at the last portion of the trial was that, on November 5th of 2013, the defendant had been convicted of three prior felonies. And so he obviously committed one further crime that you didn't know about.

And what we will present to you in this very limited portion of the trial, in combination with all of the other evidence that you already got, is certified Judgments of Conviction showing that the defendant was, in 2010, convicted of grand larceny in case C-263408; that in 2011, he had been convicted of an attempt carry a concealed firearm or other deadly weapon in case C-269722; and that also in 2011, he was convicted of the felony of burglary out of case C-274118.

1	We will present certified Judgments of Conviction	
2	showing that he was a felon on November 5th of 2013, and in	
3	combination of all the other evidence that has been presented	
4	to you, we will prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he was	
5	prohibited, therefore, from having a firearm on November 5th	
6	of 2013. Thank you.	
7	THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Schifalacqua.	
8	Does the defense wish to make an opening statement?	
9	MR. OTTO: No, Your Honor.	
10	THE COURT: All right. State may call your first	
11	witness.	
12	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, we have marked	
13	Proposed Exhibits court's indulgence 202, 203 and 204,	
14	which have been shown to Mr. Otto and previously provided in	
15	discovery. They are certified Judgments of Conviction. We	
16	move for their admission at this time?	
17	THE COURT: Any objection?	
18	MR. OTTO: No, objection.	
19	THE COURT: Okay, 202, 203 and 204; is that correct?	
20	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: That is correct, Judge.	
21	THE COURT: Are admitted.	
22	(State's Exhibits 202, 203 and 204 are admitted)	
23	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, with that, the State	
24	would rest.	
25	THE COURT: All right. The State has rested. May I	
	Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890	

see counsel, please?

(Off-record bench conference)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to take a brief recess while I take up a matter with counsel.

While you're on this recess -- and I will ask the Bailiff to escort you back to the jury room or -- and you will see where there are also facilities there for you.

While you're on this recess now, it is important for you to recall the Court's admonitions which I have given before. This is now a new and different charge. Therefore, you are not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial or on any person connected with this trail. Please do not read, watch or listen to any commentary or report on the trial. Please do not form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is submitted to you.

We'll be in recess for ten minutes. The jury will be excused, court will remain in session.

(Pause in the proceedings)

(Jury recessed at 3:32 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right, thank you. The record will -- you may be seated, folks. The record will reflect the absence of the jury.

Counsel are aware of the instructions which the Court intends to give. Does the State object to any of its

own instructions? 1 2 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: No. MS. PIEPER: No, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Does the State have any additional 4 instructions to propose? 5 MS. PIEPER: No. 6 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: No. 7 THE COURT: Does the defense object to any of these 8 instructions? MR. OTTO: No, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Does the State have -- does the defense 11 have any additional instructions to propose? 12 MR. OTTO: No, Your Honor. 13 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, we did also have the 14 verdict form. I'm -- would just like --15 THE COURT: Yes. 16 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: I know Mr. Otto had seen it 17 previously, but I just want to make sure he sees it and makes 1.8 -- we make the record of the same. 19 MR. OTTO: I have seen this previously --20 THE COURT: Very good. 21 MR. OTTO: -- and have no objection. 22 THE COURT: I have that. Very good. We'll take the 23 rest of this ten minute recess. We'll come back and then it 24 will be time to for the defense case-in-chief. 25

(Court recessed at 3:33 p.m. until 3:46 p.m.) 1 2 (Outside the presence of the jury) 3 THE COURT: Do we need to make a record of anything before we bring our jury? 5 MR. OTTO: I think we're okay. THE COURT: All right. We'll bring our jury. 6 7 (Jury reconvened at 3:47 p.m.) 8 THE COURT: Will counsel stipulate to the presence 9 of the jury? MS. PIEPER: Yes, Your Honor. 10 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yes, Your Honor. 11 MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Thank you. All right, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, the 14 State has rested. The defense may call your first witness. 15 16 MR. OTTO: The defense rests, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, you've heard the evidence for this phase of the trial. It falls to 18 19 me then, again, to instruct you on the law which you are to 20 utilize in arriving at a verdict on this phase of the trial. Once again, I would tell you that I would like to 21 instruct you orally without reading to you. However, these 22 instructions are of such importance, it's necessary for me to 23 24 read to you these carefully prepared written instructions. These are not so long as the last ones. However, if they seem 25

complicated, please recall this; that when you retire to the jury room, you will be able to take these carefully prepared, written instructions with you.

It is my duty as Judge to instruct you in the law that applies to the 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 which is given in the instructions of the Court.

If in the instructions, any rule, direction or idea is repeated or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none should 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 these instructions is given has no significance as to their relative importance.

An Information is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of his guilt. In this case, it is charged in an Amended Information that on or about the 5th day of November, 2013, the defendant

committed the offense of possession of a firearm by an exfelon in the following manner, to wit: did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously own or have in his possession or under his control a weapon, to wit: a firearm, the said defendant being an ex-felon, having in 2010 been convicted of grand larceny in Case No. C-263408, in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, a felony under the laws of the State of Nevada; and/or having in 2011 been convicted of attempt to carry concealed firearm or other deadly weapon in Case No. C-269722-1, in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, a felony under the laws of the State of Nevada; and/or having in 2011 been convicted of burglary in Case No. C-274118, in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, a felony 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 defendant is guilty of the offense charged.

To constitute the crime charged, there must exist a union or joint operation of an act forbidden by the 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

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

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 until 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 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.

1.2

1.4

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 eye witness.

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 insinuation suggested by a question as to witness -- a witness's -- 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 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 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 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 opinion as to any matter in which he is skilled. You should consider such expert opinion and weigh the reasons, if any, given for it. You're 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.

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, unless he has received a pardon, and the pardon does not restrict his right to bear arms, shall not own or have in his possession or under his custody or control any firearm. Neither the concealment of the firearm, nor the carrying of the weapon are necessary elements of the offense. Firearm includes any firearm that is loaded, or unloaded, and operable or inoperable.

Proof of actual physical possession of a firearm is not required. A person is in possession of a firearm when it is under his dominion and control, and to his knowledge either is carried on his person or is in his presence and custody.

Or if not on his person or in his presence, the -- let me back up -- or if not on his person or in his presence, the possession is immediate, accessible and exclusive to him.

Two or more persons may have joint possession of a firearm if jointly and knowingly they have such dominion, control and exclusive possession.

A defendant's knowledge that the item he possessed was a firearm may be shown by direct evidence or by circumstantial evidence and reasonably draw an inference.

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.

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 every day 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 a 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 you or enter into your deliberations in any way.

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.

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.

Now, you will listen to the arguments of counsel who will endeavor to aid you to reach a proper verdict by refreshing in your minds the evidence and by showing the

application thereof to the law. But whatever counsel may say, you will bear in mind that it is your duty to be governed in your deliberation by the evidence as you understand it and remember it to be, and by the laws given to you in these instructions, with the sole, fixed and steadfast purpose of doing equal and exact justice between the defendant and the State of Nevada.

Now, we'll be pleased to hear the closing argument for the State, Ms. Schifalacqua.

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Your Honor.

# STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Ladies and gentlemen of our jury, you've heard, obviously, over this past week a number of items — have been shown, excuse me, a number of items of evidence and you've heard all the testimony. On November 5th, 2013, the State has proven this portion of the trial that you weren't aware which was the defendant was a felon at that time and he couldn't have a gun.

The elements of the crimes -- the crime charged for possession of a firearm by an ex-felon really have just three elements. The first is that the defendant, Matthew Washington, had to possess a gun. The second, that it has to be a firearm, loaded, unloaded; operable or inoperable. And the third is that he was a felon at the time, so he's prohibited and not allowed to do so.

Well, clearly, you have both guns in evidence. There was obviously the 9 millimeter as well as the :40 caliber that he was in possession, constructive possession and possession, on November 5th of 2013. Obviously, you know that they are firearms, they were test fired, and we know that obviously the other complete portion of the trial, the guns were used and they're firearms. So that element is met.

With regard to him being a felon, you have now his certified judgments of convictions. He was a felon on November 5th. Actually, he was a felon three times over for grand larceny, attempt carrying a concealed firearm or other deadly weapon, and burglary. So, that element is met.

And the third is possession. Now, possession goes to both, the -- when the defendant obviously was at 2655 shooting that firearm. And we charged different theories of liability, and we said you didn't have to agree, so possession also talks about when he was in that vehicle with Martell Moten and if -- the guns were found, one in the back seat and one in the front, and did he have possession over them?

Absolutely.

What the law recognizes and what the Judge read to you is, this is the gun, he doesn't have to have it on his person, right, to have possession. What he can have is, for example, constructive possession, meaning, he can have dominion and control over that item. Obviously, the item

that's beneath his steering wheel, apart from the fact that obviously we have evidence that he shot the gun, but also that he had dominion and control over the 9 millimeter, as well, because that was in the back. And even though he did not have it on his person, he still possessed one of the two guns.

1.1

Now, the other thing that you might be asking yourself is, well, Martell Moten was in the back. And we obviously presented evidence that each one of them had a separate firearm. But when he stopped in the vehicle, as when I put my pen between Ms. Pieper and (inaudible), the law recognizes that possession can be joint, and it can be constructive.

And in this case, even the mere stop, if you don't take in all of the other -- which you have all the other evidence before you about the actual shooting. But even if you were to not take that into consideration, the stop itself, when Officer Parquette stops he and Martell Moten, they are both in constructive possession of actually more than one firearm.

And so, the State has proved that the defendant committed the crime of possession of firearm by an ex-felon on November 5, 2013 and we ask that you find him guilty of that count. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Now, we'll be pleased to hear the closing argument on behalf of the

defendant.

MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor.

# DEFENDANT'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. OTTO: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. As the State has outlined, they have to prove that Mr. -- and the instructions have outlined, they have to prove that Mr. Washington was in -- knowingly had the power and the intention at a given time to exercise dominion and control over that firearm.

I call your attention to Instruction No. 13. And I would submit to you that there is no evidence in the case that Mr. Washington knew that that firearm was under the dashboard.

And for that reason, I would ask you to find him not guilty of this charge. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Final argument by the State?

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Your Honor. We're going to submit.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, you've heard the evidence and the instructions and the closing argument of the attorneys. It now rests for you to retire to the jury room and deliberate upon your verdict. You will have the written instructions and the evidence.

Counsel, well they have, again, all of the same exhibits?

1.	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Correct, sure.
2	THE COURT: All of the same exhibits, and the
3	additional exhibits that were admitted at this time. We will
4	await your verdict. Jury will be excused to deliberate.
5	(Jury retires to deliberate at 4:07 p.m.)
6	THE COURT: Okay. The record will reflect the
7	absence of the jury. Folks, I don't assume that we will need
8	to stray very far. It's one count and we'll see how long it
9	takes, but please do not go very far.
10	MS. PIEPER: Judge, if you don't mind, we're the
11	State's probably going to stay.
12	THE COURT: Stay here? That's fine.
13	MR. OTTO: I'm just going to speak to some potential
14	witnesses in the front room.
14 15	witnesses in the front room.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of
15	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of
15 16	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of tomorrow, we can start at 9:00 a.m.; is that right?
15 16 17	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of tomorrow, we can start at 9:00 a.m.; is that right?  THE COURT: Yes.
15 16 17 18	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of tomorrow, we can start at 9:00 a.m.; is that right?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: For the penalty?
15 16 17 18 19	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of tomorrow, we can start at 9:00 a.m.; is that right?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: For the penalty?  THE COURT: Yes.
15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of tomorrow, we can start at 9:00 a.m.; is that right?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: For the penalty?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of tomorrow, we can start at 9:00 a.m.; is that right?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: For the penalty?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.  THE COURT: We'll start at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of tomorrow, we can start at 9:00 a.m.; is that right?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: For the penalty?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.  THE COURT: We'll start at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: We just want to make sure we have
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And, Judge, for purposes of tomorrow, we can start at 9:00 a.m.; is that right?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: For the penalty?  THE COURT: Yes.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.  THE COURT: We'll start at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow.  MS. SCHIFALACQUA: We just want to make sure we have everyone here ready to go.

```
THE COURT: Yeah, 9:00 o'clock. All right, we'll be
 1
 2
    in recess.
            (Court recessed at 4:08 p.m. until 4:19 p.m.)
 3
                  (Outside the presence of the jury)
              THE COURT: It will be 9:00 o'clock tomorrow, then,
 5
   counsel that I'll have the jury come back and we'll start.
 6
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Okay.
 7
                    (Jury reconvenes at 4:20 p.m.)
 8
              THE COURT: Will counsel stipulate to the presence
 9
10
    of the jury?
              MS. PIEPER: Yes, Your Honor.
11
             MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Yes, Your Honor.
12
             MR. OTTO: Yes, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Please be seated. Mr. Roark, has the
14
   jury arrived at a verdict?
15
              JUROR NO. 8: Yes, we have, Your Honor.
16
              THE COURT: Would you hand it to the Marshal please.
17
              THE MARSHAL: Thank you, sir.
18
              THE COURT: The Clerk will read the verdict and
19
20
    inquire of the jury.
              THE CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada,
21
   the State of Nevada, plaintiff, vs. Matthew Washington,
22
   defendant, Case No. C-13-294695-1, Department I.
23
              Verdict. We, the jury, in the above-entitled case,
24
   find the defendant, Matthew Washington as follows:
25
```

1	Count 1. Possession of firearm by ex-felon; guilty	
2	of possession of firearm by ex-felon.	
3	Dated the 16th day of April, 2001 (sic), signed by	
4	Foreperson, Brian Roark.	
5	Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is this your	
6	verdicts as read, say one so say you one, so say you all?	
7	THE JURY: Yes.	
8	THE COURT: Thank you. Before the this verdict	
9	is recorded, does either side wish the jury to be polled?	
10	MS. PIEPER: Not by the State.	
11	MR. OTTO: Please, Your Honor.	
12	THE COURT: All right. The Clerk will poll the	
13	jury.	
14	THE CLERK: Ms. Lahav, is this your verdict as read?	
15	JUROR NO. 2: Yes.	
16	THE CLERK: Mr. Farley, is this your verdict as	
17	read?	
18	JUROR NO. 3: Yes, ma'am.	
19	THE CLERK: Mr. Johns, is this your verdict as read?	
20	JUROR NO. 4: Yes.	
21	THE CLERK: Ms. Dowell, is this your verdict as	
22	read?	
23	JUROR NO. 5: Yes.	
24	THE CLERK: Ms. Harakal, is this your verdict as	
25	read?	

		·
1		JUROR NO. 6: Yes.
2		THE CLERK: Mr. Roark, is this your verdict as read?
3		JUROR NO. 8: Yes.
4		THE CLERK: Ms. Morrison, is this your verdict as
5	read?	
6		JUROR NO. 9: Yes.
7		THE CLERK: Ms. Lucero, is this your verdict as
8	read?	
9	·	JUROR NO. 10: Yes.
10		THE CLERK: Ms. Yono, is this your verdict as read?
11		JUROR NO. 11: Yes.
12		THE CLERK: Ms. Eslinger, is this your Mr.
13	Eslinger,	is this your verdict as read?
14		JUROR NO. 12: Yes.
15		THE CLERK: Mr. Andrews, is this your verdict as
16	read?	
17		ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.
18		THE CLERK: Ms. Lynch, is this your verdict as read?
19		ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.
20		THE COURT: All right, thank you. Ladies and
21	gentlemen,	as you are already aware, we will begin another
22	phase of t	the trial tomorrow morning. If you will return,
23	please, o	itside of the courtroom at 9:00 a.m., we'll be able
24	to begin t	that phase of the trial.
25		It is important that you bear the Court's admonition
	-	

in mind now, particularly as you go home at this point after having put the time and effort into this case that you have. And that is that you're not to read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or on any person connected with this trial by any medium of information whatsoever, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet and radio.

Please do to conduct any factual or legal research in this case. Please recall the Court's admonition not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject or any person connected with this trial. And please do not form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial. Obviously, you already have it in the form of the verdicts that you have rendered, but please do not do —form or express any other opinions on any other subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

And please do not visit any of the places that have been made mention of during this trial. Please allow this to play out, as you have already, based upon the efforts of counsel to adduce witnesses and other evidence before you, and let your remaining verdict be based strictly and solely upon that.

Counsel, anything else before we adjourn for the evening?

MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Not by the State, Your Honor. 1 MR. OTTO: No, Your Honor. 2 3 THE COURT: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, you will be excused until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. 5 (Jury recessed at 4:24 p.m.) THE COURT: All right. 6 7 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: The door is still open, Judge. THE COURT: Door's open, okay. Counsel, for 8 tomorrow's purposes, what instruction? MS. PIEPER: I have the instructions, so I will send 1.0 the instructions to you tonight. They're -- there -- I think 11 there's only like seven instructions. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. MS. PIEPER: So we --14 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: And the verdict. 15 16 MS. PIEPER: Yeah. We, essentially -- you don't 17 have to read an Information. 1.8 THE COURT: Right. MS. PIEPER: We just get up and say, this is now 19 penalty. We do an opening, we call our witnesses, and then we 20 21 do a first close --MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Defense calls any --22 MS. PIEPER: Well, defense calls any witnesses -- we 23 24 call witnesses, rest. Defense calls witnesses, they rest. We do a first close, defense closes, and then we do a rebuttal. 25

THE COURT: Same as every other phase. 1 MS. PIEPER: Correct. 2 THE COURT: Okay. If there are any defense 3 instructions, I don't know if there will be, but if there are, 4 please get those to me by tomorrow morning if you would. 5 MS. OHLINGER: I will. 6 THE COURT: So that we'll be ready to proceed ahead. 7 Anything else, then? 8 MS. PIEPER: Not by the State, Your Honor. 9 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: No by the State, Judge. 10 MS. OHLINGER: Nothing by the defense. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 MS. SCHIFALACQUA: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 (Court recessed at 4:26 p.m., until Thursday, .14 April 17, 2014, at 9:34 a.m.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-798-0890

25

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

### **AFFIRMATION**

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY,

> Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC Englewood, CO 80110 (303) 798-0890

JULIE LQRD,

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA		
2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
3	MATTHEW WASHINGTON, ) No. 65998		
4	Appellant, $\left\langle \right\rangle$		
5	vi. {		
6	THE STATE OF NEVADA,		
7	Respondent.		
8	APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME IX PAGES 1731-1951		
9	PHILIP J. KOHN STEVE WOLFSON		
10 11	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610  Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155		
12	Attorney for Appellant CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO		
13	Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717		
14	(702) 687-3538		
15	Counsel for Respondent		
16	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
17	I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada		
18	Supreme Court on the day of 2014. Electronic Service of the		
19 20	foregoing document shall be made in adjordance with the Master Service List as follows:		
21	CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO HOWARD S. BROOKS SHARON DICKINSON		
22	I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and		
23	correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:		
24	MATTHEW WASHINGTON		
25	NDOC # 1061467 c/o High Desert State Prison		
26	PO Box 650 Indian Springs, NV 89070		
27	Employee Clark County Public Defender's Office		