# EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CIVIL/CRIMINAL DIVISION :I CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Lį

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 0177394

VS.

KIRSTIN BLAISE LOBATO,

DEPT. NO. II

Defendant.

Transcripts of Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE VALORIE J. VEGA, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

## "ROUGH DRAFT"

JURY TRIAL - DAY 19
VOLUME XIX

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2006

COURT RECORDER: TRANSCRIPTION BY:

LISA LIZOTTE NW TRANSCRIPTS, LLC.

District Court 1027 S. RAINBOW BLVD., #148 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89145-6232

(702) 373-7457

nwtranscripts@msn.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

40/5/06

APPEARANCES: LAS VEGAS, NEVADA THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2006 PROCEEDINGS 2 PROCEEDINGS BEGAN AT 11:08:40 A.M.□ 3 (Jurors are not present) 4 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: **BILL KEPHART** Chief Deputy District Attorney 200 South Third Street THE COURT: The record shall reflect that we're 5 convened outside the presence of the jury in State versus 6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-3482 Lobato, under C177394. That Mr, Kephart is present for the 7 State and that all three defendant's counsel are present, 8 SANDRA K. DIGIACOMO MR. SCHIECK: We'd ask that you waive the Deputy District Attorney 9 200 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 defendant's presence for the settling of instructions, Your 10 (702) 455-6450 11 Honor. 12 THE COURT: Granted. And it looks like I've got a new set. I had placed a phone call to Mr. Schieck and Ms, 13 DiGiacomo this morning about a couple of typos that were in 14 FOR THE DEFENDANT: DAVID M. SCHIECK Special Public Defender 333 South Third Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 (702) 455-6265 the draft set from yesterday and it appears that those have been revised. 16 MR, KEPHART: Appears there may be another typo 17 and another one that Mr. Schieck found. 18 SHARI L. GREENBERGER, ESQ. SARA ZALI<IN, ESQ. 19 (Pause in the proceedings) 506 Broadway MR. KEPHART: Your Honor, also with the packet 20 San Franciscó, California 94133 21 that you have and the old packet, there was two additional ones that we put on the back, 22 23 THE COURT: Right MR. KEPHART: And I didn't include them in that 24 XD(-2 XIX-4 INDEX packet, so if you have the old ones it'd be — THE COURT: I do. 2 3 MR, KEPHART: Okay. NAME DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS 4 THE COURT: Those were the ones to -- one of them **DEFENDANT'S WITNESS** would be given if the defendant requested it,, 5 6 MR. KEPHART: Correct. **Douglas Twining** 29 53 78 82 7 THE COURT: It's the Fifth Amendment ones, Okay. Did you find a typo, Mr, Schieck? MR. SCHIECK: Yes, in the deadly weapon 9 instruction that's towards the -10 MR. KEPHART; Right in the middle? 11 **EXHIBITS** 12 MR,, SCHIECK: — more than halfway through, I don't 13 ADMITTED **DESCRIPTION:** THE COURT: The State is not required to recover 14 the deadly -- or the one that defines a deadly weapon? 15 DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS 16 MR, KEPHART: Yeah, it starts out deadly weapon in Cel!phone records 37 quotes, 17 **BBBB** Time sheet of father - Twining 45 THE COURT: Probably be the one right before that 18 then. Deadly weapon means? 19 MR. SCHIECK: It's just about halfway in, second 20 line, do you have it, Your Honor? 21 JURY INSTRUCTIONS 94 THE COURT: Yes. 22 CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENDANT REBUTTAL ARGUMENT BY THE STATE 115 MR. SCHIECK: Or is like to cause, I think that's 23 150 185 24 suppose to be or is likely to cause, xIX-3 XIX-5

<u>NV V. LOBATO</u> 10/5/06

MR. KEPHART: Likely to cause. THE COURT: Likely to cause.

MR. SCHIECK: And the rest -- I'm not sure this is — THE COURT: Let me see if it's right in the other set

or if —

7 set,

MR. SCHIECK: No, it's not. I'm looking at the other

THE COURT: The other one is wrong too? Okay.

MR. SCHIECK: I was gonna ask you to look at the statute on that instruction also, Your Honor. And I just know the number of the statute,

THE COURT: I think that's actually case law.

MR, KEPHART: Well, part of it is, because after the <u>&rabic</u> [phonetic] case, there was a lot of issues as to the use of a weapon or in the manner in which it's used. And, so if you look at this instruction there's two different concepts they're talking about. They're talking about one that is designed, the -- the design is contemplated for the use to cause substantial bodily harm or death. And then the other one is device instrument material or substance under the circumstances in which it's used, attempted to use or threaten to use is readily [sic] capable of substantial bodily harm or death. That's contemplating -- there's both statute and case law on that.

XIX-6

MR. SCHIECK: The case law that was superceded by the statute, which was designed to alleviate the design issue that came up in *Zombic* and I think that the -- starting on line 4 language with any weapon is actually the language of the statute. Deadly weapon means any instrument which if — any weapon, device, instrument, material and continuing to the end.

THE COURT: Do you have — you have the cite?

MR, SCHIECK: I sure don't, Your Honor, I'm sorry.

I don't have it off the top of my head.

MR, KEPHART: I don't know it either. I know there was some cases after <u>ambit-</u>, 'cause they were -- that was the cause of the statute change, but I don't -- I don't know it,

MR, SCHIECK: I can check the statute during the break, Your Honor,

THE COURT: Okay. So we need to get that typo corrected. III have the JEA type it up. Get that corrected and then there's one in the old packet that starts, "the fact that a witness has been convicted of a felony".

MR. KEPHART: Mm-hmm. That should be in this one as well. Yeah, it is. It's about 2/3rd of the way in the packet. The reason we offered that, Your Honor, is because Mr. Pyszkowski is felon and he testified that he's a felon.

THE COURT: Okay. That's right.

MR. KEPHART: I mean it was offered last time because of Katrina Martin, but -- and there was no other felons at the time, but Steve is now, so,

THE COURT: Okay. Are there any of the State's proposed instructions that the defense is objecting to?

MR, SCHIECK: Your Honor, there's an instruction that's towards the back that indicates -- it talks about not being here to determine the guilt or innocense of anyone other' than the defendant. And its out position that there's no evidence of anyone else involved that's been presented by the State and therefore it would improper to give that instruction implying that there was. It starts with "You are here to determine the guilt or innocense of the defendant". It's pretty close to the end.

MR. KEPHART: It's about eight -- eight from the end,

THE COURT: Okay. Five, 6, 7, 8. I've got the evidence which you are to consider.

MR. KEPHART: Go one more.

THE COURT: Okay, There we are.

(Pause in the proceedings)

MR. KEPHART: Well, Your Honor, first of all the defendant's own expert had testified that this -- this case involved multiple assailants in his —

XIX-8

THE COURT: Mr. Turvey.

MR. KEPHART: Mr. Turvey did, Second, the jury had asked the question that was objected to as to being outside the scope of rebuttal on Detective Thowsen's about Doug's car being searched. And also there was a question asked by the jury as to Jeremy Davis, whether or not his place was searched. So there is some questioning about whether or not there was anybody else involved here and they're specifically instructed with this instruction they're not to consider that for purposes of guilt and innocense in this case. And it's a stock instruction that we always give because there's always that chance that a jury may thing other people are involved. Even if there isn't any evidence to support that, there's always that chance that they're thinking that, hey, they, you know, he could have done it with someone else or is there somebody else involved here. That's not what we're here for, we're here to determine the guilt or innocense of Ms. Lobato, not anyone else. So they're not to determine that,

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, I think his argument pretty much concedes there is no evidence. There may have been a couple of inquiries from the jury that they're curious about why certain things weren't done in the investigation of this case. That certainly neither one of those question, which aren't evidence in the case, indicated anything about the guilt

NV V. Lk...nif-' 10/5/06

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of either Mr. Twining or Mr. Davis, In fact they want to know about Mr. Davis' house because of the testimony that the car was left there, according to Blaise's statement and according to Mr. Davis it was left there over Memorial Day weekend. Not because he was involved in anything that happened on July 8<sup>th</sup>. Quite a quantum leap of reasoning that because the car was at his house on May -- or Memorial Day in May that he was involved in something on July 8th. Likewise, with Mr. Twining there's absolutely no evidence of his involvement in anything having to do with the death of Duran Bailey. Mr. Turvey said one or more people could have been involved. He didn't say it was definitely more than one, he said one or more. So I would ask that the Court not give this instruction. It just invites the jury to speculate as to things that there's no evidence of.

5

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

3

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

MR, KEPHART: Well, this -- this tells 'em not to do that, so,

MR. SCHIKK: But it's like telling somebody, you know, whatever you do don't look over there, you know, it's like the first thing you want to do is look over there.

THE COURT: The questions that Mr. Kephart referenced that came out from the jury came out because of various facts and circumstances that have been put before the jury and I do recall that testimony from Brent Turvey as well,

2 motive is not an element of the act of sexual penetration of 3 dead human body and leave it at that. Of course we've 4 already got the instruction that tells that motive is not an 5 element of murder, (Pause in the proceedings) 6 7 8 9

THE COURT: Motive is not an element of the crime of sexual penetration of a dead human body?

ask that it be changed or amended to just merely indicate that

MR. SCHIECK: Yes.

THE COURT: Does the state agree to that substitution?

MR, KEPHART: I'm trying to -- I remember when we discussed this last time. I'm trying to remember what it —

MR, SCHIECK: I think last time there was a huge Objection to the entire statute being vague and ambiguous. There was a lot of discussion of it.

MR. KEPHART: Well, there was in this area, because, see the -- it's almost like a strict liability type of thing and -- and so, I mean you don't have to prove what her reasons for it were. All you have to do is prove that the -- that it occurred and -- and that's the purpose of the statute, is you're punishing the act versus the reason for it. And so, I mean we argued was the plain meaning of it is to punish the penetration of a dead human body, regardless of what you

XIX-12

XIX-10

so the Court overrules the objection. The instruction is appropriate to be given in this case.

The deadly weapon instruction has been retyped. You know what, the spacing on it is different, MR. KEPHART: I can -- I can have it redone, Judge, on our font,

THE COURT: Richard, it looks like she's got it like triple spaced instead of double spaced. See how it —

THE COURT: Any other one?

MR, <sup>g</sup>CHIECK: Just double checking, Your Honor. I had a guestion about the language on the sexual penetration of the human body instruction, there's two of them. One of which gives the definition of sexual penetration and that's somewhere in the middle.

MR. KEPHART: It's about four —

THE COURT: It's right after the self-defense,

MR. SCHIECK: The one after the definition, it starts out with "Plain meaning of the relevant statute. I don't recognize that as being any jury instruction language to begin with. If the intent is to inform the jury that motive is not an element of sexual penetration of a human body -- of dead human body, I think we can phase it in such a way without starting with "Plain meaning of relevant statute", there's no reference to what statute they're talking about. So I would

XIX-11

believe caused her to do it or caused him to do it. And I think that's cleaner than just motive is not an element. I know -- I mean, we don't have to prove motive into anything, you know, it's just -- it's just a -- I thought it was more -- it's understood better by the way it reads now,

MR. SCHIECK: I don't think there's any plain meaning to the statute,

MR. KEPHART: Well, that's exactly the meaning of the statute.

MR. SCHIECK: Maybe that's the objection I've got.

MR. KEPHART: Yeah. But that is the --

MR. SCHIECK: I agree there's no motive requirement,

THE COURT: The purpose of the statute?

MR. KEPHART: Yeah, that -- that's —

MR, SCHIECK: For purposes of the statute I don't think -- I don't think motive is an element of the crime. I think they're right on that. It's a general intent crime,

MR, KEPHART: So if you reads the purpose of the statute is to punish the act of sexual penetration to a dead human regardless of motive says the same thing. I mean, I don't -- I can't remember what Phil and Gloria, and we were arguing about with this, but I remember that there was some --- quite discussion on that and I'm thinking that we were -- we

10/5/06 \11/ v. LOBATO

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

agreed on the plain meaning of the statute, but I think it reads the same if you say the purpose of the statute is to punish the act of the sexual penetration,

THE COURT: Do you like that language better? MR, SCHIECK: Well, I -- I -- I don't think the purpose of any statute is to punish. The purpose of statute is set for our laws to be followed.

MR. KEPHART: Well, that's kinda what the argument --

MR. SCHIECK: I think it's up to the — whatever body is in charge of doling out punishment. I mean if you're convicted of a crime, it's the Court's determination of what's punishment is going to be

> THE COURT: The purpose of the statute is to deter? MR, SCHIECK: That would -- that's better than

MR. KEPHART: That -- okay, plain meaning or the purpose or howeverlou want to say it, that's -- that's -- I guess that's fine.

(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: And motive is not an element of that

crime?

punish,

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

place.

MR. SCHIECK: That's fine.

(Pause in the proceedings)

XIX-14

this is what you'd be telling the jury is that there is evidence. They're making an argument that this is evidence and explains to the jury why -- I mean it tells the jury that this is evidence 4 that, yeah, that they gave to you that you have to determine whether or not the defendant was here or not. In the case that we -- I mean in the instruction we give to you, we just basically alibi. We're not going so far as to saying that they have given you evidence or we haven't given you any evidence. I believe it's argument. You could certainly argue that later, but it's not something that you want to be presenting in the jury instruction. Their second sentence they talk about essential elements of the offense, he says including the presence or involvement of the defendant, the second portion of that is wrong as a statement of law. Identity is not an element of the offense. So by making them put that in here like this it is -- it's not the correct statement of the law, so that's incorrect there as well. And I looked at the instruction --I mean in the cases that they have cited and they've cited the *United States v. Roves* [phonetic), saving approved instruction statute same form [sic]. That was instruction that the court rejected and then used a form of their own where they talked -- well, he talks about alibi, But -- and then the Nester V. "State was a when they were concluding the two differences between reasonable doubt and the instruction involving the

XIX-16

THE COURT: Okay, We'll have that one typed up. Any others?

MR., SCHIECK: Other than the alibi, we had offered an alternative to their alibi instruction. Does the court want to hear argument on that at this time?

> THE COURT: Do you have that typed up for me? MR. SCHIECK: Yes. With the change as to time and

THE COURT: Okay. That was a typo we discussed on the phone. Let me just -- I know she typed it up for me,

(Pause in the proceedings)

MR. KEPHART: Okay, Thanks.

MR. SCHIECK: It just changed right there.

(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: and you want this one put in place of the one that the State's got that starts "A, quote, "alibi" unquote, "amounts to",

MR. SCHIECK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the State have any opposition?

MR. KEPHART: We do, Your Honor. The first sentence in their instruction I believe is argument to the point

where they're telling the jury that -- that what they have produced or what they're -- what they have given, because

XIX-15

alibi. I think the alibi in our instruction is clearly the statement of the law, defining what alibi is and it doesn't give any kind of insinuation that any type of evidence was presented by -- I mean supported by the Court's reading of the statement to the jury,

MR. SCHIECK: If I might, Your Honor? This instruction is very similar to the instruction that we give in selfdefense cases where the jury is told that there's been evidence of self-defense proffered by the defendant, which shifts the burden to the state to prove that it was not an act of selfdefense. Alibi is the same type of offense. Once a defendant presents any evidence of alibi, the burden is on the state to disprove that there was an alibi. The burden remains with them and that's what this instruction makes clear. It's not intended to change or modify. It's the law in the state of Nevada that this made clear what that burden is. In fact there was -- there was time not too long ago, within the last 30 to 40 years where the burden was on the defendant to prove the alibi by a preponderance of the evidence in order to gain an acquittal. And obviously the Supreme Court said you can't do that, you can't put that burden on the defendant, because an alibi negates elements of the defense and that is the person who committed the crime. So, yes, identity is an element of the crime of first degree murder. You can prove that there

W v. LOBATO 1 0/5/06

was a first degree murder, but you have to prove the identity of the perpetrator. That is an element of convicting someone of first degree murder\_ So to say identity is not an element it's totally erroneous. And once it's been raise, and I don't care if they say you can't believe a single person that lives within 20 miles of the State of -- or the city of Panaca, there has been evidence offered of an alibi and the burden is now on them to prove that in fact the alibi is not true and the jury is entitled to be instructed to that and I would submit it.

MR. KEPHART: Your Honor, in the instruction that we've offered, that specifically says that. If after a consideration of all the evidence you have reasonable doubt as to whether the defendant was present, the time and place the crime was committed, she is entitled to a verdict of not guilty. There's nothing shifting burdens there. We're telling them, basically this is what an alibi is, and if you believe, after considering all the evidence, you have a doubt as to whether or not the defendant was present at the time and place of the crime, she's entitled to a verdict of not guilty. And that's specifically saying that, But when they go into their position basically they're saying, there is evidence, you'd be saying that. And submit it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: [Sneezing]. MR, KEPHART: Bless you.

XIX-18

THE COURT: Thank you, I think the -- the last sentence of both of 'ern is essentially the same. I do agree that the first sentence of the defendant's proposal is more akin to argument than to language that should be in an instruction. But it sounds like the middle sentence, "it's the state's burden to establish beyond a reasonable doubt each of the essential elements of the offense," that if we took out the word "including" and put the word "and" instead -- and the presence of it -- and involvement of the defendant, I think that would be a more accurate statement of the law. And we could put that sentence in the middle of the State's proposed one. Kind of cut and paste 'ern.

So I'm gonna step down and have the JEA type that up.

MR. SCHIECK: So the second sentence is gonna be inserted into the middle of the State's instruction?

THE COURT: Right, I think the last sentence is the same on both, isn't it?

MR. SCHIECK: I think our says you must find the defendant not guilty and theirs is slightly different.

THE COURT: It says she is entitled to a verdict of not guilty,

MR. SCHIECK: Right. A slight difference. THE COURT: They're both correct

XIX-19

MR, SCHIECK: That's true,

THE COURT: It's the not guilty part that's the important part.

[Laughter]

MR. SCHIECK: No, as we like that "must" though. That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, we can — we can do that. I don't like your first sentence is my main problem for the argument reason, so I like the State's first sentence. It reads more consistent with language of instructions.

Do you care on the "you must find" or "she is entitled to"?

MR. SCHIECK: Either one is fine with the defense, Your Honor,

MR. KEPHART: Whatever you want to do, Judge. That's fine. We've always given she's entitled -- I mean they're entitled to a verdict of not guilty, it's like you're not ordering them to do something it's just that they're making that determination based on an entitlement of the law, so,

THE COURT: Since Mr, Schieck doesn't care we'll leave it that way then.

Go off the record,

(Court recessed at 11:39:04 a.m. until 11:43:38 a.m.) (Jurors are not present)

XIX-20

THE COURT: Okay. I had the 3EA retype the alibi in accordance with our discussions. Does anybody have any opposition to this one being given?

MR, KEPHART: Let's see.

MR, SCHIECK: No, Your Honor, I think that addresses the concern we had the burden of proof, so that's fine with us.

MR. KEPHART: That's fine, Judge. We've -- I've already addressed our objection to their instruction, but I understand you're giving this one, so.

THE COURT: Okay, Do you want yours marked as State's offered, not given?

MR. KEPHART: Yes, Your Honor,

THE COURT: All right, And here's the one on the statute. Here's the one on the deadly weapon.

(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: Any opposition to the purpose of the statute?

MR, SCHIECK: No, Your Honor.

MR. KEPHART: I don't have any opposition to the — that either, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KEPHART: I -- I'm just kinda wondering, I mean we're looking at the different types here and they still

<u>UV v. LOBATO</u> 10/5/06

appear differently. I mean does -- I don't know, Do you have MR. KEPHART: No, I don't have any objection to 1 2 a concern with that at all, Your Honor? 2 that. 3 3 THE COURT: No, THE COURT: Okay, And take us off the record MR. KEPHART: Okav. 4 %I we get that typed up. 4 5 THE COURT: I think they're close enough. 5 (Court recessed at 11:49:52 a.m., until 11:50:35 arm,) MR, SCHIECK: I don't think it matters when they 6 6 (Jurors are not present) 7 read the instructions. 7 THE COURT: We're gonna now number the 8 THE COURT: And then the deadly weapon with the 8 instructions. 9 9 typo corrected. Deadly weapon means. Will or is likely to. Number 1, It is now my duty as Judge, 10 Any opposition to that one? 10 Number 2, If, in these instructions. 11 MR. KEPHART: No, not by the state, no. /1 Number 3. An information is. MR. SCHIECK: No, Your Honor, 12 12 Number 4, In this case the defendant is accused in THE COURT: Okay. Any others? 13 13 an Information. MR, SCHIECK: No, Your Honor, not from the 14 Number 5, Murder is. 14 15 defense. 15 Number 6, Malice aforethought means. MR. KEPHART: Not by the state. 16 Number 7, Express malice is. 16 THE COURT: Okay. We've got the two at the back -17 17 Number 8, The prosecution is not required, 18 18 Number 9, Murder of the first degree. MR, SCHIECK: We wanted the second of the two, 19 19 10, The law does not undertake to measure in units Your Honor. 20 of time. 20 THE COURT: The longer one? 21 21 Number 11, The crime of first degree murder. MR. SCHIECK: Yes. 22 22 Instruction Number 12, Murder of the first degree 23 THE COURT: "It's the constitutional right of a 23 includes murder which. defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compelled to 24 Number 13, Manslaughter is. XIX-22 X1X-24 testify. Thus the decision as to whether he should testify is 1 MR. KEPHART: Your Honor, could you -- probably left to the defendant on the advice and counsel of his attorney. 2 not have -- hold on. On Number 12, we had -- I think it's 12, 2 You must not draw any inference of guilt from the fact that he 3 3 is it 12, Dave? 4 does not testify, nor should this fact be discussed by you or 4 MR. SCHIECK: I think so. 5 enter into your deliberations in any way." 5 MR. KEPHART: Number 12 we had deleted a MR. SCHIECK: Yes. Your Honor. 6 6 portion of that from the original packet that I gave you THE COURT: Should we change "he" to "she"? 7 involving involuntary manslaughter. Does it -- it doesn't say 8 MR. KEPHART: You can if you wanted to. 8 anything on there about involuntary manslaughter, does it, on 9 MR. 5CHIECK: I think to be consistent we probably 9 the one you have? should. 10 10 THE COURT: The Number 12 that I have says 11 THE COURT: Okay. From "his" to "her". While 11 "Murder of the first degree includes murder which is any kind that's getting typed up, we have one form of verdict, any of willful, deliberate and premeditated killing. 12 12 opposition to the form of verdict? 13 13 MR. KEPHART: Okay, MR. SCHIECK: No, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All murder which is not Murder of the 14 THE COURT: That will given backed by the Court — 15 15 First Degree is Murder of the Second Degree,. Murder of the 16 by the court clerk. And then where did you want me to put Second Degree is murder with malice aforethought, but 16 the -- the Fifth Amendment. 17 without the admixture of premeditation and deliberation, 17 MR. SCHIECK: Somewhere around the reasonable 18 MR, KEPHART: Okay. That's it then. 18 doubt instruction would be fine. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 19 20 (Pause in the proceedings) 20 So, Number 13, Manslaughter is. THE COURT: You want it right after reasonable Number 14, The heat of passion. 21 21 22 22 doubt? Number 15, The crime of murder may include, MR. SCHIECK: That's good, Your Honor. 23 Number 16, You are instructed that. 23 THE COURT: Any opposition? 24 Number 17, Deadly weapon means. 24 X1X-25 XIX-23

'N v. OBATO 10/5/06

Number 18, The State is not required to have that his father has concerning dates and times of a trip to recovered the deadly weapon. 2 2 Idaho. 3 Number 19, The killing or attempted killing. 3 MR. KEPHART: That's correct, Your Honor. 4 Number 20, The right of self-defense. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything further that 5 21, Actual danger. we need to do with regard to the instructions or the form of 6 22, If evidence of self-defense is present 6 verdict? 7 23. If a person kills another in self-defense, 7 MR. KEPHART: I -- the State doesn't have anything 8 24, A person who commits a sexual penetration. further. 8 9 25, The purpose of the statute is to deter the act of 9 MR. SCHIECK: No, Your Honor. 10 sexual penetration of dead human body. 10 THE COURT: Okay. I'm gonna make copies of the 11 Number 26, The flight of a person. 11 instructions to hand out to the jury and we've got 14 of them, 12 27, No act committed by a person while in a state of 12 right? And you guys have your copies, right? 13 voluntary intoxication. That's 27. 13 MR. KEPHART: Yes. 14 28. The fact that a witness has been convicted of a 14 THE COURT: And defendant's counsel nodding their felony, 15 15 head up and down, so I'm gonna make 15. 16 29, An, quote, "alibi", unquote, amounts to. 16 And well see everybody at 1 o'clock unless there's 17 Number 30, To constitute the crime charged. 17 something further. 18 31, The defendant is presumed innocent until the 18 MS, GREENBERGER: Thank you, Your Honor, 19 contrary is proved. 19 MR, SCHIECK: Thank you, 20 32 will be the right to remain silent, one that the 20 MS. GREENBERGER: Have a nice lunch, defense requested. 21 THE COURT: Thanks, You too. 22 33, You are here to determine the guilt or 22 (Court recessed at 11:58:01 a.m., until 1:21:22 p.m.)□ 23 innocense. 23 (Jurors are present) 24 34, The evidence which you are to consider. 24 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Let the record reflect XD<-26 X1X-28 TWINING - DIRECT 35, The credibility of believability. that resuming trial in State versus Lobato, under C177394, in 2 36. A witness who. the presence of the defendant, together with her three 3 37, Although you are to consider only the evidence. counsel. The two prosecuting attorneys are present. And the 4 38, In arriving at a verdict in this case, ladies and gentlemen of the jury are present as well. 5 39, If, in your deliberation, you should desire to be 5 We are proceeding forward in the case. We had further informed. 6 taken a couple of State's rebuttal witnesses out of order, but 6 7 Number 40, When you retire to consider your we are returning now to the defendant's case in chief and 8 verdict. defendant may call their next witness. 8 9 41, Now you'll listen to arguments of counsel, 9 MR. SCHIECK: We would call Douglas Twining, Your 10 (Pause in the proceedings) 10 Honor. 11 THE COURT: 32, we now have is, It is the 11 THE CLERK: Please come all the way forward. constitutional right of a defendant in a criminal trial. 12 12 Remain standing and raise your right hand, 13 (Pause in the proceedings) 13 **DOUGLAS TWINING, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS SWORN** 14 THE COURT: Mr. Schieck had advised the Court at 14 THE CLERK: Thank you, please be seated. State 15 the end of the day yesterday at sidebar that Doug Twining 15 your name and spell it for the record, please. 16 would be the defendant's last witness. 16 THE WITNESS: My name is Douglas Howell 17 MR. SCHIECK: Correct 17 Twining, D-o-u-g-l-a-s H-o-w-e-l-1 T-w-i-n-i-n-g. 18 THE COURT: So I assumed from that, that the 18 THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Schieck. 19 defendant will be taking the Fifth and so that it why it would 19 MR, SCHIECK: Thank you, Your Honor, 20 be appropriate to include this instruction. 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION MR. SCHIECK: That's correct, Your Honor. 21 BY MR, SCHIECK: 22 THE COURT: Okay, 22 Q Mr. Twining, where did you reside in July of 2001? 23 MR. SCHIECK: And with respect to Douglas, they 23 A At my parents' house at 3899 Monte!' Avenue, just stipulated that he can testify as to some documentation 24 Q Is that here in Las Vegas?

21

1

21

XIX-29

VV v. LOBATO 10/5/06 TWINING - DIRECT rWINING - DIRECT Α Yes, sir. I believe she -- she probably spent the night a 2 Q And how long had you been living there in -- as of 2 couple times, you know, during the couple months I hung 3 July 2001? 3 around with her. 4 Approximately -- since 1996. 4 Q During — when did she first spend a couple of nights 5 Q So about five years? 5 at your house, that you recall? 6 Α 6 Probably like in May, June, 7 Q Are you acquainted with an individual by the name 7 Q Now you'd indicated that you — you met her of Kirstin Blaise Lobato? 8 approximately in June of 2001 and you just say -- said that she' 9 Α Yes, sir. may have stayed at your house in May. Are you sure exactly 10 Q Do you see her here in court today? when you met her? 11 A Yes, sir. A No, it could have been the end of -- the end of -- it 11 12 Q And where is she seated and what is she wearing? was either the middle to the end of May, or April, right around 12 13 A She's wearing a light colored dress behind that 13 in there some where. I can't recall exactly. monitor right there at the defendant's table. 14 14 You're not sure of the exact date? 15 Q Between the two other young ladles? 15 A No. 16 Α Yes, sir, 16 Okay. Now did there come a point in time where 17 MR, SCHIECK: Okay, Could the record reflect the 17 Blaise started staying at your house more regular? identification of the defendant, Your Honor, 18 18 A She stayed — yeah, there was. 19 THE COURT: The record shall so reflect. 19 Q When was that? 20 BY MR. SCHIECK: 20 A That would be the end of -- probably the end of 21 Q Do you recall when you first met Blaise? 21 June, 22 A Yes, sir, 22 Q 2001? 23 Q When was that? 23 A Yeah. 24 A It was approximately May to June -- early June, I 24 Q Okay, How long did she stay there during the end XIX-30 XIX-32 TWINING - DIRECT TWINING - DIRECT believe in 2001. of June at your house? At your parents' house? 2 And do you recall where you met her? 2 Probably a couple few days at a time and I think 3 I believe I met her at Steve's -- a guy named Steve's A 3 actually she stayed there for approximately a week in July. 4 house, 4 Let's stick with June for right now. 5 Q Do you know Steve's last name? 5 A Okay. 6 I believe it's like Pyszkowski or actually no, I don't 6 Q We'll get to July. Okay. Did -- and who was living in 7 recall. It's like a Polish sounding kinda name. your house — in your parents' house, besides yourself at that 8 Does Pyszkowski sound familiar? 8 period of time? 9 Yeah that -- that could be. Α 9 A My mother, my father was in and out on business 10 Q And you were still living at MonteII at that time? 10 and myself. Correct, sir. 11 A 11 Q And your mother's name? 12 Q And how well did you get to know Blaise at that 12 Violet Marie Twining. 13 ti me? 13 Q And your father's name? 14 A We had, you know, seen each other and hung out 14 A Thomas Howell Twining. for awhile. 15 15 Q Did there ever come a time, after Blaise had stayed 16 Q There -- did there --16 with you at the June that she went somewhere else? 17 A Got to know -17 A She had went to Panaca to her parents' house, I 18 Q I'm sorry, go ahead, believe. 18 19 Α -- got to know each other. You know, friends. 19 Q Do you recall when she left to go to Panaca? 20 Q Did there ever come a time where she stayed at She had -- I think maybe July 2, I think sticks out. 20 your house? Q Are you sure of the date or is that just — 21 22 A Yes, sir, 22 No, I'm not sure of the date at all. 23 And I want to break that down. Were there any 23 Q Did you take her to Panaca? times that she would stay for a day or two, for instance? 24 I took her to Panaca -- no, I did not.

XIX-33

Vv. LOBATO 10/5/06 TWINING - DIRECT TWINING - DIRECT On July 2", I'm talking about? Q A **I** thought it was gonna be nicer than it was. It was 1 A 2 pretty dry, the desert air, you know, blowing in your eyes and 3 Q What was she driving? stuff, but -Α She was driving her -- okay, it was July 2nd and she 4 Q How long did was driving her red Fiero -- or I -- I think it's a Fiero, yeah. 5 -- it was evening, it wasn't too bad, 6 Mazda Miata or Fiero, 6 Q -- do you recall how long it took you to drive up Was it a big car? 7 there? 8 8 Α No, a little car, To the best of my recollection several hours. Like 9 Q Now you're how big? How tall are you? 9 about three hours, I think. Two and a half, three hOurs. I 10 Α I'm `6"6, 10 Q Did you ever ride in that car? 11 Q Had you ever been to Panaca before? 12 A No. 12 Α No, sir. 13 Q Why not? 13 Q During that period of time did you have a cell 14 A I don't think I'd fit in there, phone? 14 15 So did Blaise take her car, to your knowledge, to 0 15 Yes, sir. Actually, I'm sorry, it was my father's cell Panaca on July 2" when she went? 16 16 phone. 17 Α 17 Q Okay, Did you have a cell phone that you used? 18 She didn't leave it at your house? 18 19 Q And during the period of time while Blaise was in 19 20 Did you assist her packing to — 20 Panaca between the 2 and the 9 , were there any phone MS. DiGIACOMO: Objection, leading, 21 21 calls between you and her? 22 THE COURT: Sustained. 22 A Yeah, there was numerous phone calls. 23 BY MR. SCHIECK: 23 Q I'm gonna hand you what's been marked as You said that she left on July 2nd, can you tell us 24 24 Defendant's Exhibit EE. XIX-34 XIX-36 TWINING - DIRECT TWINING - DIRECT what happened prior to her leaving on July 2'? 1 MR, SCHIECK: May I approach, Your Honor. 2 2 A Prior -- in the moments prior to her leaving? THE COURT: You may. 3 Q 3 BY MR. SCHIECK: Α As I recall, I helped her load up some bags and said 4 Q I'm gonna show you what's been marked as goodbye. 5 Defendant's Proposed Exhibit EE and ask you to just look at 5 6 Q Do you recall how many bags? 6 that briefly and tell me if you recognize what it is? No, It wasn't' too many. It wasn't a very big car 7 It looks to be my father's cell phone bill from Verizon and, you know, there was maybe several 8 Wireless for July 2001, July 9th, 2001, this page, 8 9 When was the next time you saw Blaise after July 9 Q Have you looked at all the pages? 10 10 Oh, I'm sorry. Oh, it says billing date July 9. It 2nd? 11 A July 2' would be on the -- the 8th -- late the 8th, 11 looks to be the whole month of -- from July 1' to July 9th, 12 12 early gth. Q And you recognize that as your father's phone bill 13 And where was that? 13 that -- on the cell phone that you used? In Panaca, Α 14 275-9271, yes, 0 And how did you get to Panaca? 15 Q That was your number? 15 16 A I drove my white Mustang convertible. 16 Yes, sir,, Q And what happened when you got to Panaca? 17 MR. SCHIECK: And move to admit Defendant's EE, 17 I met with Blaise and her parents and said hello and 18 Your Honor, 18 -- her dad helped me put my top up on my convertible and we 19 MS, DIGIACOMO: No objection. 19 20 came back to Vegas. 20 THE COURT: Granted, Was your top down all the way from Las Vegas to 21 21 (Defendant's Exhibit EE, admitted) 22 22 Panaca? BY MR. SCHIECK: Mr. Twining, I'm going to illustrate this for you on a 23 23 Yes, sir. Q Was that comfortable? projection device here that you can actually see on the screen 24 XIX-35 XIX-37

'Vv. LOBATO 10/5/06

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

TWINING DIRECT

in front of you, okay, when I put it up here. Do you recall testifying at a prior proceeding?

A Yes, sir,

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q Do you recall during that proceeding that you had circled the number of phone calls that you had made to Panaca with your cell phone?

A Yes, sir,

Q And those were circled in red?

A I don't recall the -- I think I highlighted them, I don't recall if I highlighted them or circled them, but I did indicate numerous phone calls.

Q Well, let me show you portions of the phone bill you just identified. This is the document EE that you were just looking at?

A Okay.

Q Appears to be a phone call circled on July 2 at 9:00 p.m. to Panaca, is that correct?

A I — you'r3, talking about right in the center?

Q Yes, line 781. And I can zoom in if you need me to,

A I see Panaca, I don't see that it's incoming or outgoing. I don't know how they indicate that,

Q If I show you the top of the page, it says called from and called to, does that help you?

A Okay, yes,

XIX-38

## TWINING - DIRECT

Q Okay. So that would indicate a call to Panaca at 9:00 p.m. on the 2nd2  $\,$ 

A That's correct.

Q Okay. And do you recognize the phone number that was called from your cell phone?

A I don't -- I don't recall the number at all. I don't recall any of the phone numbers.

Q And can you read the phone number though?

A The phone number that's circled is 702-728-4589.

Q And as you sit here today do you know whose phone number that was?

A Like I don't have -- I don't recall any of the phone numbers from back then.

Q And, again, there shows another phone call on the 2, 11:40 p.m, to Panaca?

A Line 789?

Q Yes.

A Yeah, 702-728-4589, yes,

Q Other than Blaise, did you know anyone else in Panaca?

A No.

Q And you'd indicated that you'd thought she'd gone to Panaca on July 2nd?

A Correct.

XIX-39

#### TWINING - DIRECT

Q Would you have called her when she got there?

A Yes

Q Do you recall doing so?

A I don't recall, but I'm sure I called her numerous times, so.,

Q Do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of your phone records?

A No.

Q We're just gonna continue over. Were you calling her a number of times while she was up there?

A Yesr

Q Did you call her almost every day?

A I believe so.

Q There appears to be two calls on July 3rd,
 MS. DiGIACOMO: Objection, leading.
 THE COURT: Sustained,

17 BY MR. SCHIECK:

Q How many calls are there on July 3 fd to Panaca?

A From what I can see on the screen there's two calls on there so far,

Q There's additional calls on the 3. We'll scan down. Do you see any further -- any other calls to Panaca?

A I don't see any other circled ones, And I don't see any other calls to Panaca, no,

## XIX-40

## TWINING - DIRECT

Q Okay. You were also — on this phone bill does it reflect calls that you received?

A Yeah, according to the bill.

Q Does it show the number of the person that called you though?

A Yeah, it looks like it does.

Q Or does it just show -- oh, on the -- I'll withdraw that question, Your Honor. Turning to the next page, do you recall whether or not you called Blaise on the 4 th of July?

A I believe I did.

Q Would the phone bill reflect that?

A I may have called her from my home phone, but the phone bill probably would reflect it if I called her from my cell phone. It should.

Q On July  $4^{th}$ , can you tell if there's any calls to Panaca?

A Looks like two. Yes, it looks like two that are circled.

Q Do you recall whether or not you called Blaise on the 5th of July?

A I don't recall offhand, but I probably did.

Q You had talked about your house phone. Was there a phone in your house also?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall whether you ever used that to call

10/5/06

IV v. LOBATO TWINING - DIRECT TWINING - DIRECT Blaise while she was in Panaca during that week? A It was before noon, I don't recall for sure, but it's quite possible that I Can you -- any closer estimate than that -- than did. That would be in the long distance records from that that, or is that the best you can do? A It was between 9:00 and noon, Q Okay, where -- I'm just gonna show you the 5<sup>th</sup> real 5 Q Okay. quickly. If you could just -- if I'm going to fast just let me Probably closer to like 10:00, know. Would it be fair to say you're not seeing any calls to Q And do you know where he was going? Panaca? He was going to Boise, Idaho, 9 Yeah, I don't see any on here. There's one there, Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as Q Okay, at 7:34 p.m.? 10 10 proposed BBBB,, Correct, line -- line 931 to Panaca. MR, SCHIECK: May I approach, Your Honor? 11 11 Do you recall whether you called Blaise in Panaca on 12 THE COURT: You may, 12 the 6<sup>th</sup> of July? 13 13 BY MR. SCHIECK: I don't recall offhand. I would assume I did, 14 Q This is BBBB, do you recognize what that document 14 Q I'm going to scan down the 6 th and at the very 15 15 is? bottom we've already gone to the 7 ", would it be fair to say 16 16 A A copy of my father's time sheet from July of 2001 you don't see any calls to Panaca on the 6th? 17 for HDR Construction Control Corporation, 17 18 Yeah, no cell phone calls. 18 Q And do you know, did your father bring that to Court Q What about the 7<sup>th</sup>, do you recall specifically on the 19 and provide it to us? 19 7th? Yes, I got it from his previous employer for her. 20 20 21 I don't recall offhand. I just saw two on the bill 21 Q And that reflects his first day of work in Idaho as 22 there. More than Mo. being on what day? 22 Were there any calls on the 7<sup>th</sup> or the 8<sup>th</sup> to Panaca? A July 9<sup>th</sup>-23 23 I see three on the 7 , one on the  $8111_{-}$ 24 MR. SCHIECK: Move to — XIX-42 XIX-44 TWINING - DIRECT MINING - DIRECT Q Now you'd indicated that you had traveled to Panaca THE WITNESS: -- 2001, to pick up Blaise on the night of the 8th, early morning on the 2 2 MR, SCHIECK: Move to admit BBBB. 3 3 MS. DiGIACOMO: No, objection.

9th,

Α Yes, sir.

Q Did you surprise her when you went up there?

4

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

To your knowledge did she know you were coming? Q

A Yes.

Q How would she know that?

A We had arranged, you know, me coming up there and picking her up.

Q Had you -- how had you arranged it?

A Over the phone.

Q During some of these phone calls?

A Yeah.

Q Is that a yes?

Yes, sir. Sorry.

Q Do you recall what you were doing on Sunday, July 8 , in Las Vegas?

Sunday the 8<sup>th</sup>? Early in the morning taking my dad to the airport for business and later that day doing a lot of running around preparing to go pick up Blaise.

Q Now you say taking your dad to the airport, do you recall what time you took him to the airport, approximately?

THE COURT: Granted,

(Defendant's Exhibit BBBB, admitted)

BY MR, SCHIECK:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So would this have been the trip that you took him to the airport so he can go to work in Idaho?

Yes, sir,

Q What time did you leave for Panaca on the 8 th to go up and pick up Braise?

A Mmm, somewhere around like 8:00 or 9:00 or something like that, I think, or -- I'm not sure exactly what time. Somewhere after dinner.

Q 8:00 or 9:00 in the evening?

Yes, sir.

Q After you left for Panaca did you make any other calls to Blaise?

Several, I believe several, Α

Let me show you what is page -- it shows the July 8th calls from your cell phone. Do you recognize any of those calls?

XIX-45

Yes. It looks like the same number,

Q And what do those calls reflect?

XIX-43

ROUGH DRAFT JURY TRIAL - DAY 19

10/5/06

NV v. LOBATO TWINING - DIRECT Outgoing calls to Panaca to 728-4589, 1 2 Now, I'm looking at the call at 10:46 pm., indicates 2 3 it was called from Alamo, Nevada to -- or incoming while in 3 Yes, sir. 4 Alamo, Nevada. Do you recall that call at all? 5 A Incoming? Line 1024? 5 6 Q Yes, sir. Α Offhand, I don't. The -- I know I stopped for gas in Alamo. you? 8 8 9 Q The next line, 1025, is a call from Alamo to Panaca, 9 do you recall that call? 10 10 11 Yeah, that looks like when I -- from the time it looks 11 like when I was leaving Alamo and probably letting Blaise 12 12 came out and talked with you? 13 know I was leaving Alamo. 13 It should. 14 Q If you didn't -- if you'd never been to Panaca before, 14 15 how did you know how to find Blaise's house? 15 recollection as to the date? 16 A I had some directions and she was gonna guide me 16 I believe so. 17 in once I got there, 'cause it -- dark, I guess, 17 Q III show you the first page, 18 How was she gonna guide you in? 18 19 A Over the phone. 19 THE COURT: You may, And did she do that? 20 20 BY MR. SCHIECK: 21 A Yes. 21 22 Are these the calls that are reflected on the bill? 22 statement? 23 From 12:45 to -- at 12:45? 23 Yes, it looks like it, 24 Yes. 24 XIX-46 XIX-48 TWINING - DIRECT TWINING - DIRECT That seems a little bit later than I recall, but it could Q So August 2", 2001? -- it could've been that time, I thought it was around 2 3 3 midnight It could've been later,, Yes, sir. 4 After you picked Blaise up in Panaca, where did you 4 5

[WINING - DIRECT

A Yeah, I remember her father picked her up.

Q Picked her up at your parents' house?

Q Did there ever come a time when you were interviewed by the police in connection with this case?

Q Do you recall what date they came out to interview

No, I don't recall the date at all. But ther would be -- there was a -- they took a statement though, so.

Q Okay, would the statement reflect the date they

Q If I showed you the statement would it refresh your

MR. SCHIECK: May I approach, Your Honor?

Q Do you recognize this as the first page of your

Q And what date did they interview you?

go?

A To my parents' house in Vegas.

Q So you drove back to Las Vegas with Blaise?

Q And so you would have got back to Las Vegas on the 9th some —

the 9th.

the 9th?

A With me.

Q At your parents' house?

Let me see. It was -- I don't recall offhand I think it was around a week, I think. Five days, a week, maybe something like that.

XIX-47

Do you recall what day she left?

A I don't offhand.

Do you recall how she left?

Yes. sir.

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A Yeah, it would have been early in the morning on

Q Did -- where did Blaise stay when you got back on

Yes, sir,

Q How long did she stay there?

It looks -- the day of the statement 8/2/01...

Q And when they interviewed you on August 2, 2001, did you give them anything?

A I believe I gave them my phone records.

Q The phone records we've just looked at?

Yes, sir.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Q Did you have those ready for them or not?

I think -- I think I had them -- I know I had them there, yeah. I believe they were -- they were readily accessible.

Q Do you know Larry Lobato?

Blaise's father?

O Yes

I've met him.

Had you talked to him about -- or prior to the police coming to see you?

A Yes.

20 Q Had you discussed the date of July 8th?

A Yes,

Q Why did you give the police your phone records on August 2<sup>nd</sup> when they came to interview you?

A To show them that I was going to pick her up.

W v. LOBATO 10/5/06 TWINING - DIRECT WINING - DIRECT

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q After August 2, did there come a time that you talked to the police again?

Yes, sir.

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q And, as a result of that conversation, do you know whether the police went to your house?

MS. DiGIACOMO: Objection, vaque.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MS, DiGIACOMO: As to time,

THE COURT: Withdrawn,

BY MR. SCHIECK:

Did you -- as a result of that conversation do you know whether or not -- do you know, first, did the police go to your house and, second, if they did, when that was?

I don't recall exactly what date it was, but there was -- homicide detectives came to my house and served a warrant for a previous -- I had broken a window from before that I didn't pay restitution on.

MS, DiGIACOMO: Objection, relevance.

THE COURT: Counsel approach.

(Off-record Bench Conference at 1:47:04, until 1:50:07)□

THE COURT: The objection is overruled,

BY MR. SCHIECK:

Q Do you remember the question?

A The question was, did Metro police come to my

XIX-50

A 155, I think or something like that,

Q Okay, And did you get out of jail?

A Yes,

Q Did you ever know whether or not your house had been searched or your room had been searched at your parents' house?

Yes, When I was in jail for that day, the homicide detectives came to the house and searched the house.

MS. DiGIACOMO: Objection, Your Honor, foundation

THE COURT: Sustained.

MS. DiGIACOMO: Move to strike.

THE COURT: Granted,

BY MR. SCHIECK:

Q Were you ever served with an inventory of items seized from your house?

A Yes, sir. It was at my house when I got — when I returned there from jail.

Q Were items of yours on that list?

Yes, sir.,

Did it include shoes? Q

Yes, sir,

Q Okay. What size were those shoes?

A Somewhere between 145 and 15s.

You've got large feet?

XIX-52

### TWINING - DIRECT

house and the other question was -

Q When?

A Okay.

Q Do you recall when they came to your house?

A When would be on my -- the date I was arrested. I don't recall what date it was exactly. There should be a record

Q Do you recall what month it was?

your house you were arrested because you had an outstanding

Α That's correct.

officers at the jail?

Yes, sir.

Q Did you provide them with something?

they confiscated my shoes,

Q What type of shoes?

of that

Was it December? I mean I don't -- no, I don't. I don't recall actually. I mean if you have the paperwork. I don't have the paperwork with me.

Q Did — you indicated you were — when they came to warrant?

Q Okay, Did you have contact with the homicide

A Yeah, I gave 'em information for a DNA test and

XIX-51

Nike tennis shoes

Q And what size shoes?

TWINING - CROSS

Α Yes, sir,

MR. SCHIECK: Thank you, That's all I have, Your

Honor,

THE COURT: Cross?

MS. DiGIACOMO: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. DIGIACOMO:

Q Good afternoon.

A Good afternoon, Ms. DiGlacomo,

Q How old were you in 2001?

A 2001, would have been 38.

How long had you known Steve and Kathy by the end of June 2001?

I've know Kathy for a couple of years I think, and Steven I'd just met through Kathy.

Q When they were living together?

A Yes, ma'am,

Q And are you sure when you met Blaise?

Mmm, within — within several weeks, yeah. Within several weeks.

Okay. So when did you meet her? 0

I think it was -- I'm gonna say the end of May,

Q The end of May?

NV v. LOBATO 10/5/06
TWINING - CROSS TWINING - CROSS

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A Yeah,

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q All right. Well, let's approach it a different way. When she went home on July 2 to Panaca.

A Mm-hmm.

Q Do you know approximately how long you had known her at that point?

A A couple months, I believe.

Q Okay. So a couple months. So possibly it was the end of April when you met her?

A Yes, it's possible,

Q Okay. So you would have know her the entire month of May and the entire month of July?

A Yeah --

Q I mean, excuse me, June?

A — June, Yes,

Q Okay. And in fact when you first met her she wasn't living with Steve and Kathy, she was just hanging out there, correct?

A Oh, I -- I believe so.

Q Okay, And she would hang out there and she would do drugs, correct?

A Yes.

Q Did you do drugs with Steve and Kathy as well?

A Yes.

## XIX-54

TWINING - CROSS

Q Did you do drugs with Blaise, as well?

A Yes,

Q Methamphetamine?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Do you know who supplied the methamphetamine when you did it with either Blaise or Blaise, Steve and Kathy?  $\quad \square$ 

A Offhand, no. It was -- people had it around.

Q Okay. So there's times when you brought the methamphetamine to the patty?

A Yes, ma'am,

Q And times when Steve or Kathy brought the methamphetamine?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q And times when Blaise even had the methamphetamine,

A If I recall, I would assume that I don't recall offhand, but I would assume so. We were all — we were all doing it

Q And do you recall testifying at the prior proceeding that Blaise did know how to get drugs without help from you?

A Yes, ma'am,

Q Or Steve or Kathy?

A Yes, ma'am,

Q Okay. So she didn't need you or Steve or Kathy to

XIX-55

supply her the drugs?

A No.

Q When she stayed with you at the end of June until she went home July 2, how long did she stay with you?

A I think it was less than a week. It was -- like I said before I'm not sure exactly,

Q The time that she stayed with you the end of June, what was your relationship with her?

A Trying to boyfriend -- trying to be boyfriend and girlfriend. I liked her.

Q And so it's fair to say you liked her and you wanted a relationship with her?

A Yes, ma'am,

Q At that time were you intimate with her?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q You start — you said that you had started out as friends with her through Steven and Kathy, at what point did it become a more intimate relationship between the two of you?

A Probably the first time we fooled around,

Q Okay. But I mean when —

A I don't what -- I don't know what time -- I mean —

Q What time period?

A Well, yeah.

Q Was it before she moved in with Steve and Kathy?

# XIX-56 TWINING - CROSS

A I'm not exactly clear when — when that transition was, you know, the —

Q Oh, It is possible then, before she actually moved in with Steve and Kathy that she would have stayed over for the night?

A Yeah, it's possible,

And she, at times, would stay with you at your place as well?

A As I recall, yes,

Q And the times that she started to stay with you, is that when the relationship or the intimacy began?

A Yeah, I would say so.

Q Okay. The bags that you helped Blaise load up on July 2, were those the same bags she brought with her from Steve and Kathy's to your house?

A For the most part. There might have been like a -- you know, I think there was some plastic bags.

Q Okay. Do you recall if she had any like luggage pieces?

A Offhand I don't recall. I remember what sticks out is some leopard bags, I think.

Q Like shopping bags?

Yeah, I believe so,

Q Okay, but it's possible she did have some luggage?

)IX-57

\11/ v. LOBATO 10/5/06

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

TWINING - CROSS TWINING - CROSS Yeah, I think. Possible. THE COURT: Yes. Q And when she was staying with you for that week or 2 MS. DiGIACOMO: First, counsel, it's going to be so, did she bring her belongings inside your residence? page 4 of his trans -- or voluntary statement to the police, Yes, I believe so, BY MS. DiGIACOMO: 5 Q Well, you helped her pack 'em into the car, correct? Q I'm showing you a 39 page statement, voluntary A Right statement, does that look familiar to you? So is it fair to say that she did bring them in your A Yes, ma'am. Q Okay. Is this a transcribed copy of the statement house? 8 Yes, I believe so. 9 you gave to the police? Do you remember anything unusual about her A On — yes. Yes, ma'am, 10 belongings? 11 Q On August 2, 2001? 12 A No, ma'am, A Yes, ma'am. Q When you drove up there on July 9<sup>th</sup> and got to Q If you could read page 4 to yourself and let me 13 Blaise's residence, that was the first time you had met her 14 know when you're done reading that, 15 (Pause in the proceedings) A I may have met them briefly before, like when -- at 16 Q Did you discuss on page 4, in your statement, Steve and Kathy's the -- but I don't recall for sure, 17 regarding whether or not -- anything more than other you Q And you said that when you were driving the top 18 drove the white Mustang to Panaca? was down on your Mustang convertible? 19 A There's nothing else on there — well, it mentions my A Yes, ma'am. convertible, they didn't need the VIN number, about Steve and 20 Q I missed it, was that the way up or the way back? 21 A That was the way up there, 22 Q Okay, but nothing else about the car, whether the Q All right, Did you drive with it down on the way 23 top was up or down when you drove it? back? 24 A No, ma'am, XIX-58 X1X-60 TWINING - CROSS TWINING - CROSS A No. ma'am, Q Would you trust me that it's not mentioned in the Q Okay, And so when you got to Blaise's house is that rest of the statement either? when you put it up, or did you do it when you were at the gas A Yes, ma'am, I trust you. 3 station in Alamo? 4 Q And I show you page 160, counsel, of your prior testimony, I believe Blaise's dad helped me do it at her house, 5 The motor was broken on so it took two people, 6 Α If you say it's not in there I believe you. Q I'm gonna show you -- counsel, I was wrong, page Q Have you reviewed your prior statement and prior 7 testimony before coming to court today? 156. If you could read from 156 to the end of 160 and let me I've not today, I did previously. know when you're done. 9 Q Within the last couple of weeks? (Pause in the proceedings) 10 A Yes. 11 A This is my --Q And would you agree with me that nowhere 12 Prior testimony. previously did you state that you drove with the top up or 13 -- previous proceedings? down? 14 Q Yes, A Okay. Α That I didn't -- I don't recall if that was in there or 15 not 16 (Pause in the proceedings) Q Okay, is it possible it was in there? 17 A And what was the question? It's possible it was in there, yes, 18 Q Keep reading all the way through to 160, Α Q Is it — would you like to review your statement and 19 (Pause in the proceedings) This looks like the highlighting of that phone bill that testimony? 20 That I -- that I did mention before, or? 21 defense -Α Q Correct. 22 Q Keep going, there's going to be more about the car, Sure, If you'd like me to. 23 (Pause in the proceedings) MS, DIGIACOMO: May I approach, Your Honor? 24 Okay, the question again?

XIX-59

\I<u>V v. OBATO</u> 10/5/06 TWINING - CROSS TWINING - CROSS Q Q Okay, Let me just make sure that you 1 And how long did you stay when you got there? 2 [unintelligible] to 160. All right, that looks like -- the phone 2 A Less than half an hour. 3 Q So you would have gotten there a little bit around 3 call, 4 A It says that -- about me — when I was -- the police 4 12:45, a little before 1:00 and left by 1:20`ish? officer in Alamo. 5 I would say that's a good time frame. 5 6 6 Q Oh, that's the --Q How long did it take you to get back to Las Vegas? 7 I think like -- I think it's like three hours. I don't 7 Α Right here, Α recall for sure. 8 Q Okay. But within pages 156 to 160, 161 of your 8 testimony you're discussing your drive up to Panne and 9 Did you have any problems with your car on the way 10 picking up Blaise, correct? 10 home? 11 A That's correct, ma'am, On the way home, no, ma'am. On the way -- no, A 12 Q All right, Anywhere in these pages did you mention 12 ma'am, 13 about your top being down, the need to put it up or anything 13 Okay. You did have problems on the way up, like that? 14 14 correct? 15 15 No, I didn't see that in there. A Yes, ma'am. When you spoke to the police on August 2, 2001, 16 16 Q Okay. And with regard to --Q 17 MS. DiGIACOMO: Do you have EE, counsel? 17 you were prepared to discuss what you knew about the case, 18 MR. SCHIECK: Do I have it or do I know what it is? 18 correct? I think I do. 19 19 A Yes, ma'am. 20 20 MS, DiGIACOMO: May I approach, Your Honor, Q In fact, you had spoken to Becky Lobato numerous 21 THE COURT: Yes, times before you talked to the police on August 2nd? 21 22 BY MS, DIGIACOMO: 22 Yes, ma'am. On August 2nd? 23 Q I'm going to show you Defense Exhibit EE that you 23 Q Right. Between the time that Blaise was arrested on July 20<sup>th</sup> – 24 looked at previously. This was your cell phone bill. XIX-62 XIX-64 TWINING - CROSS TWINING - CROSS Okay, 1 A Okay, 1 A 2 2 -- until you gave the statement on August 2, 2001, Now — or your father's cell phone bill. 3 A Correct 3 you had spoken to the defendant's mom Becky numerous 4 4 times? This is not the entire bill, correct? 5 Correct. This looks like to be from the 1" to the 8th, 5 Α 6 Q And you'd spoken to her father as well? I believe I said before. The 1" to the 9th. 6 Q 1 to the 9 . Okay. 7 7 A Correct 8 A Yes, ma'am. 8 Q How many times would you say you spoke to Becky? 9 I don't recall for sure, Probably between the two of Q And we don't have home records or your land line A 10 records from that time period, correct? 10 them, maybe a dozen times, 11 A I don't know if you have them or not. 11 Q All right, And do you recall making any three-way calls? 12 Well, they weren't shown to you in court today, were 12 13 they? 13 Yes, ma'am, 14 No, they weren't. Q What were those about? 15 You weren't asked to provide them, were you? 15 A When — you mean — you're talking about when Blaise was incarcerated? 16 Α No, ma'am, 16 17 17 Q Right Okay. What time was it that you left to take Blaise 18 A The --18 back to Las Vegas on the early morning hours of July 9th? A It looks from the — it must have been around 1 19 Q After she was arrested July 20th? 19 o'clock in the morning, it looks like. 20 As I recall, she was unable to -- I'm sorry. They 20 21 Q Are you gathering that from the phone calls? 21 were unable to receive collect calls in Panaca at their phone, A Yeah, from the best of -- 'cause I recall -- I thought 22 so Braise would call me from CCDC and I would make the call 22 23 23 it was a little bit earlier than that, but it must have been up there so that her parents could talk. around 1:00 it looks like, guarter to 1:00, something like that. 24 When she would do this she'd call your home phone,

**IV v. LOBATO** 10/5/06 TWINING - CROSS WINING - CROSS correct? Q And you had spoken with Becky several times about A Yes, ma'am, 2 talking to the police as well, correct? 3 3 And then you would call her parent's home in As I recall, yes, Panaca? 4 Q Now the reason that you went to pick up Blaise and 5 A Yes, ma'am. 5 brought her back to Las Vegas, I believe you told the police 6 And then that way she can talk to her parents? 6 was so that the both of you could lay low, stay away from A Yes, ma'am. Steve and Cathy during that time period, correct? 8 Did you stay on the line when they were talking? 8 I believe that's what I said, yeah. I believe I said 9 A Yeah, I pretty much had to. lay low and hang out. 10 All right. But you weren't taking place in the 10 Q In fact, when she was there between the 9<sup>th</sup> and conversation? 11 11 when her father picked her up, you didn't go out or do 12 I probably was, yeah. I know I was actually. 12 anything other than go out for food, correct? Q When you did these three-ways, do you recall a time 13 13 As I recall, we were pretty much kicking back, 14 when Blaise snapped at her father for discussing the case 14 Q So you didn't leave the house other than when you 15 because the calls were recorded? 15 went to get food? 16 I recall — somewhat, yeah, 16 I don't recall that for sure. 17 17 Q Okay, If I was to show you your statement that you Q Yes or no, do you recall it or not? 18 A Yes, ma'am, 18 gave to the police, would that refresh your recollection? 19 Q Okay. There was at least one time she did snap at A Yes, ma'am. 19 her father for discussing the case on the phone? 20 Q Okay, 21 A Yes, ma'am, 21 MS, DiGIACOMO: Page 10, counsel. 22 Q Now you said you talked to Becky and/or Larry 22 BY MS. DIGIACOMO: 23 approximately a half a dozen times between the time of her 23 Q I'm gonna show you page 10 of your statement. arrest and the time you talked to the police? 24 Okay, I did say other than go out and get food. I XIX-66 XIX-68 TWINING - CROSS TWINING - CROSS didn't recall. Α Actually I said I think it was probably a dozen, I 2 estimated. You didn't recall leaving the house other than just to 2 3 Q Oh, a dozen. I'm sorry. Okay. So approximately go out and get food? 3 that many times in between those two dates? 4 A Correct 5 A Yeah. Yes, ma'am. 5 Q While you were there, do you recall watching a news 6 Q During those conversations you were talking about report regarding a homicide? the case, correct? Yeah, I believe so. 8 A Yes, ma'am, 8 Q Do you recall what date that was on? 9 Q And you actually had discussed the date of July 8th, A I think it was maybe the 9<sup>th</sup> or the 10th, 9 correct? 10 10 Q All right, It was shortly after you brought Blaise 11 A Yes, ma'am, 11 back from Panaca, correct? 12 And that's why when the police came and talked to 12 A Yes, ma'am. 13 13 you you had your phone records ready? Q And Blaise was present with you when you watched A Yeah. Yes, ma'am. 14 14 this news report, correct? 15 Q And you also had your information regarding your 15 A She was at my house, yes. Mustang with the VIN number ready, correct? 16 16 Q She was watching the news report with you? 17 A Oh, I had that -- I think it was in my insurance -- my 17 I don't recall for sure, but I think that's -- I think she 18 insurance card I think I was looking at. 18 was. 19 Q Okay, But you had all that documentation together 19 Q Would it refresh your recollection if you looked at before you were interviewed by the police? 20 your prior statement that you gave to the police? 20 21 A Yes, ma'am, 21 A Yes, ma'am.

Q In fact, you had spoken to the defendant's father

XIX-67

22

23

24

earlier in that day, correct?

As I recall, yes, ma'am.

22

23

24 ///

Q Okay.

MS. DiGIACOMO: Page 11 and 12.

√ V V. LOBATO 10/5/06

TWINING - CROSS **TWINING - CROSS** BY MS. DIGIACOMO: about right. Q I'm gonna ask you to read this page from here down Okay, And do you recall telling the police as well 2 2 Q that her father was in town so he went ahead and picked her and then the next page. A Okay. Yeah, Monday or Tuesday would've been the 4 up? 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>11</sup>, is that correct? 5 I know that he picked her up. I don't recall if he Α Q The 9<sup>th</sup> or the 10th, 6 was in town or -A 9<sup>th</sup> or the 10<sup>th</sup>. Yes, Monday or Tuesday. And I said O Well, do you — 7 Braise — 8 8 -- he was coming to town or something. Q Well, does this refresh your recollection after looking 9 9 Do you recall telling the police that you had planned at your statement as to whether or not Blaise was watching on taking her back either at the end of the weekend or on 10 0 11 that report with you? Monday to Panaca, but her dad happened to be in town so he 12 It refreshes — well, while I'm reading it I said she 12 went ahead a picked her up on Friday? 13 was there, so -- and I never did finish the sentence, 13 A That sounds familiar. 14 Q Okav. 14 Q Okay. Is that -- that's what you told the police? A I know she was there with me. I don't recall, she If that's what's in my statement. I don't recall, to 15 15 might've been sleeping. tell you the truth. 16 16 17 17 Q Well, do you recall them asking you next, was Q Do you want to look at your statement again? anything said about it, meaning did the two of you talk about 18 Yes, please. it, and you said no? Okay. Let me show you page 11 and then page 15. 19 19 Q A Yes. 20 20 A Okay, 21 Okay. 21 Maybe it's just page 15. Ω 22 A Yes, ma'am. 22 MS. DiGIACOMO: Court's indulgence, Okay. 23 Q So it's possible she was there then watching the 23 May I approach again, Your Honor? report with you? 24 THE COURT: You may, XIX-70 XIX-72 **TWINING - CROSS** TWINING - CROSS A Yes. ma'am. MS. DiGIACOMO: Okay. 1 2 'Cause the police asked you, well, did she -- was 2 BY MS, DiGIACOMO: there anything said about it, correct? 3 Q I am gonna show you the top of page 11 right here, 4 A Yes, ma'am, 4 and then I'm gonna show you page 15. Q How many times did you talk to the defendant from 5 A Okay, jail after she was arrested on July 20<sup>th</sup> until you spoke to the 6 Q Yeah. If you'd mark that and read that to yourself police on August 2nd? and let me know if that refreshes your recollection. 8 I couldn't even estimate. 8 A Yes, ma'am. Q Numerous times? Q Okay. That refreshes your recollection? 9 9 10 A Yes, ma'am. 10 A Yes, ma'am. Q And she would always have to call your home phone Q Okay, And so you actually had planned on taking 11 11 to make those collect calls, correct? her home at the end of the weekend or on Monday, but her 12 12 As I recall, yes. I don't think my cell phone would father happened to be down there and went ahead and picked 13 13 her up? accept those either. 14 14 Q The time that she was there between the 9 th of July 15 15 Yeah, we had a -- her and I had a little conflict and and when her father picked her up, she talked to you about he picked her up, 16 16 going into rehab and getting cleaned up, correct? 17 Q You had a fight before she left? 17 18 Yes, ma'am, that is correct. 18 Not a fight, just --Q When her father came to pick her up, do you recall Q Disagreement? 19 19 what time of the day it was? 20 A Yes, ma'am, 20 For some reason right after lunch stands out, 21 Q Okay. And do you recall what day of the week it 21 was? Was it the -- before the weekend that her father just Q Yet do you recall telling the police sometimes 22 22 between 1:00 and 4:00, it was mid-afternoon? 23 happened to come pick her up? 23 24 If that's what my statement says then that sounds 24 A Yes, ma'am. XD<-71 XIX-73

10/5/06 10/5/06

TWINING - CROSS **MINING - CROSS** Possibly Friday? BY MS. DIGIACOMO: When you picked up Blaise at her house on the early Α I'm sorry, I -- can I see that again? 2 2 3 Q Sure. morning hours of July 9", she brought back just a few Α I don't recall what day it was at all, 'cause possibly it 4 belongings, not as much as she had left with when she came 5 was Wednesday or Friday -- Wednesday to Friday, home July 2"d, correct? 5 6 Let me see, Okay. I'm gonna show you page 10. 6 Yeah, I believe so, 7 MS. DiGIACOMO: May I approach, Your Honor? 7 Q Okay. She just brought like one bag? THE COURT: Yes, Probably something like that. BY MS. DIGIACOMO: Q Okay. It wasn't all the belongings that you helped 9 9 10 I'm gonna show you page 10 of your statement. 10 her load up on July 2nd? Look at that and let me know if that refreshes your recollection 11 11 A No, ma'am. when she got to your house and then when she left? 12 12 Q That week between July 9" and July 1,3", 2001 13 Yes, ma'am. when she was at your house, you had talked -- or she had 13 talked about going into rehab and getting cleaned up off of 14 Okay. When was it that she left your house? 14 15 The 13". drugs, correct? 15 16 And so if Monday was the 9, Friday would've been 16 A Yes, ma'am. the 13"? 17 17 Q But doing that week the two of you were also doing 18 Yes, ma'am. 18 drugs as well? 19 THE COURT: Has his statement been marked? As I recall we weren't -- we were doing marijuana, 19 Α 20 MS, DiGIACOMO: No, it has not. 20 we weren't doing meth. 2/ THE COURT: Okay. We should do that. 21 You were doing what? 22 MS, DIGIACOMO: You didn't make the defense do 22 Marijuana. 23 Q Marijuana not meth? 23 24 (Off-record colloquy) 24 I believe so. XIX-74 XIX-76 TWINING - CROSS TWINING - CROSS MS. DIGIACOMO: Your Honor, for the record, the Q But you did tell the police you were doing drugs? statement -- or the voluntary statement by Mr. Twining is --2 Α Probably, yeah. I'm sure I did. 3 3 When she went up on July 2<sup>nd</sup> to go up to her has been marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 272. It's the 4 same copy of what I have been discussing with Mr. Twining parents, you were talking to her, 'cause at this point you're still and showing him, as well as the front page is the same as 5 kind of having a relationship with her, correct? 6 what defense counsel showed him, 6 A Yes, ma'am. 7 THE COURT: The record shall so reflect. 7 Q And the two of you had talked about her coming MS. DiGIACOMO: Thank you. back down to see you on July 4" and spending that together, 8 9 BY MS, DiGIACOMO: 9 correct? 10 Do you recall a time when somebody defecated or 10 I believe so, yes. 11 urinated inside the interior of Blaise's car? 11 Q Okay. But she ended up not coming back down? 12 Only from hearsay. 12 Correct. 13 Q Okay. Did you learn it from Blaise? 13 Q Okay. But you did want her to? 14 Α Yes, ma'am, 14 A Yes, ma'am, 15 Q Did you learn it when she was still living at Steve 15 Q And when she was gonna come back down on July and Cathy's? 4" she was gonna drive herself down in her car, correct? 16 16 17 A Yes, ma'am. 17 A I think she had car problems and was unable to do 18 Q Okay. And did she also tell you that she had to 18 that. 19 clean the car to get rid of what was in there? 19 Well, you didn't talk about going up and picking her 20 Yes, ma'am, She had it cleaned, I believe. 20 up at that time, correct? And that would've been before she came to stay 21 21 I don't recall, actually. with your at the end of June, 2001? Q Okay. But you did talk about her coming down to 22 22 Las Vegas for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July? 23 That's correct, 23 A Yes, ma'am. MS. DIGIACOMO: Court's indulgence, 24 24 XIX-75 XIX-77

1<u>V v. LOBATO</u> 10/5/06

| TWINING - REDIRECT. | NINING - REDIRECT

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

 $\label{eq:MS.DiGIACOMO:Pass} \ \text{MS. DiGIACOMO: Pass the witness.}$ 

THE COURT: Redirect

**REDIRECT EXAMINATION** 

BY MR. SCHIECK:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22 23

24

Q It's your recollection she didn't come down 'cause of car problems?

A No, I don't think that's why she didn't come down. I think she had -- I think she had other engagements up there with her parents and stuff, but I believe her car wasn't running then.

Q You were asked about your phone bill. The phone bill that was shown to you, Exhibit EE, that ended on July 9th, that was the last day of the billing cycle?

A The phone bill we were looking at?

Q Yes.

A Yes, sir. Actually I'm not sure of the end of the billing cycle, but that was the end of the -- that was the last date on that particylay set of pages.

Q If I could show you EE.

MR. SCHIECK: If I may approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: You may.

BY MR. SCHIECK:

Q Tell us what the bill request is the billing date?

A Billing date, July 9, 2001, it says up here.

XIX-78

## TWINING - REDIRECT

Q That's -- the last day reflected is July 9th?

A Yes, sir

Q Is this what you would've -- or a copy of this what you gave to Detective Thowsen?

A That's correct, sir,

Q And Detective Thowsen came back and talked with you after that?

MS, DiGIACOMO: Objection, leading.

THE ACOURT: Sustained.

BY MR. SCHIECK:

Q How many times did Detective Thowsen ask you for the next bill?

A I'm sorry, the question?

Q How many times did Detective Thowsen ask you for the bill that follows that one?

MS. DiGIACOMO: Objection, leading, and assumes facts not in evidence.

THE WITNESS: I was never asked —

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I was never asked,, I offered him

that. I was never asked for those.

BY MR, SCHIECK:

Q Were you ever asked for any other bills?

A Never asked for bills, I offered those.

XIX-79

Q You told us about the police coming to your house, and this was after they had interviewed you on August 2nd sometime? You don't remember the date?

A No, I don't remember the date.

Q Okay, When they came to your house then did they say by the way, do you got the phone bill for August?

MS. DiGIACOMO: Objection, Your Honor, leading.

THE WITNESS: I wasn't at my house, I was in jail when they were at my house.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MS. DiGIACOMO: And Your Honor, I'd move to strike the answer.

THE COURT: Granted.

BY MR. SCHIECK:

Q You've talked with the district attorney in this case?

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you talk to them back in 2002 before the prior proceeding?

A I believe I did,

Q Did you talk to them before this proceeding?

21 A Yes, si

Q Did they ever ask you for the phone bill?

A No. I would've provided it if they asked me for it I would've tried to. That's a long time ago. Not if they have

XIX-80

#### TWINING - REDIRECT

records of —

Q Have you ever gotten a subpoena for those bills?

A No, sir.

Q You were asked about the top on your Mustang being down when you drove up to Panaca on July 8<sup>th</sup>. Had anyone ever asked you before about your — whether it was up or down when you drove up there?

A No, sir.

Q Who was the first person that asked you that?

A I believe it was Ms. DiGiacomo.

Q Okay. And when was that?

A I think it was at our meeting prior to these proceedings.

Q And prior to that no one had ever bothered to ask you that before?

A No. I don't know if she just asked me now, or I don't recall if it was brought up when I went to their -- I should clarify,, I don't recall if it was brought up when we had our meeting, but I -- she did just bring it up now for sure

You mean here in court?

A Yes, sir.

MR. SCHIECK: Thank you. That's all I have, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: Recross,

10/5/06 NV v. LOBATO TWINING - RECROSS

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

# MS, DIGIACOMO: Yes, Thank you,

## **RECROSS EXAMINATION**

BY MS. DIGIACOMO:

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

2

3

5

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Just so we're clear, the defense asked you about whether or not the top was up or down during the direct examination, and then I followed up on my cross, correct?

If you say he did. I don't recall actually, the -- I know he -- I just recall for sure, I know we were just talking about it now --

Q Okay, But —

-- 'cause we looked back through the records,

Q Yeah, The records would indicate that the defense brought it up first,

A Okay,

Now you said that first you thought we had discussed it in a prior meeting that we had a couple weeks ago, but then you said you don't recall that?

Let me think about it. The -- I think we did talk about it -- Blaise's dad helping me put it up.

Okay. So that's your recollection?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Okay, You also recollect that you talked to us before the last proceeding, correct?

I don't recall for sure. I think we did.

#### XIX-82

### TWINING - RECROSS

Q Okay. Well, you tell me, how long before the last proceeding did we meet?

I don't recall. I thought I met with both sides last time. Subpoenaed by you guys, I know that

Right. But it's possible that you were subpoenaed but you never met with us?

It's possible, yes.

Q Okay, 'Cause do you recall what office you were sitting in when you met with us?

Α No, I don't recall.

Did you recall where you met with us just a couple Q of weeks ago?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Okay. So it's possible that you're wrong that you met with us before the last proceeding?

Α Yes, ma'am, it's possible, It's true,

Q It's also possible you're wrong that you brought up the fact that the top was up or down when you talked to us a couple weeks ago in that meeting?

Now that I think about it, I'm pretty sure we did talk about Blaise's dad helping me put it up,

Okay. But you don't know for sure, do you? MR. SCHIECK: Objection, asked and answered, Your Honor,

XIX-83

WINING - RECROSS

MS. DiGIACOMO: That's fine. withdraw.

BY MS, DIGIACOMO:

Q When --

I'm pretty sure, I'm pretty sure, Yeah, I'm pretty sure,

Okay. When you spoke to us a couple weeks ago, it was after you had already spoken to the defense, correct?

A I've spoken to them several times on the -- you know, on the phone briefly..

Okay. But you do recall telling us that you'd already met with the defense when he met with us, correct?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q All right, Now you said that the police never asked for any other phone bills from you, correct?

Correct.

Q Okay. They didn't even ask for these, you volunteered them, correct?

I believe so, yes,

Q The ones that are marked EE?

Correct.

Q All right. The defense never asked you for any other phone records, did they?

I don't believe so. I think they were already -they'd already been turned in as evidence.

## XD(-84

# TWINING - RECROSS

Q Okay. Just the cell phone records, but no one ever asked you for other cell phone records, correct?

A Not to my knowledge,

Q Okay.

Not that I recall.

Q The State nor the defense asked you?

Yes, ma'am, I don't believe they -- that I've been asked for them or I would've provided them.

Q When -- now you said that Blaise told you that she was having car problems on the 4<sup>th</sup> and that's why she couldn't come down? Is that your testimony now?

THE WITNESS: I believe my —

MR. SCHIECK: Objection, Your Honor, that misstates the evidence.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. DIGIACOMO:

Q Okay. You said that Blaise was having car trouble so she couldn't come down on the 4<sup>th</sup>, correct?

I believe what I said was she -- she had been having car troubles, but I think they had previous engagements with her parents. They were going to some party or some 4<sup>111</sup> of July event or something,,

And that information that you're testifying to you had to have learned from Blaise?

<u>IV v. LOBATO</u> 10/5/06

2

4

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

TWINING - RECROSS

A Yes, ma'am.

2

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9 0

2

13

lq

15

16

17

18

19

20

22 23

24

Q You didn't talk to anybody else in Panaca, correct?

Not about 4<sup>th</sup> of July party, no, ma'am,

MS, DiGIACOMO: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Redirect.

MR. SCHIECK: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Bailiff.

Counsel approach.

(Off-record bench conference from 2:30:59-2:31:47 pm.)

THE COURT: Mr. Twining, the jury has a question for you, which I am going to read to you. After I have read you the question, please answer it. After you've answered it the attorneys will have an opportunity to pose any followup questions to you which they deem appropriate,

"Would Blaise often call home to her family while she was staying at your home from July 9 th to July 13th?"

THE WITNESS: I don't believe so.

THE COW: Any followup by the State?

MS, DiGIACOMO: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any by the defense?

MR. SCHIECK: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This will be marked as Court's 87.

You may step down from the stand, THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

XIX-86

you understand that? 3 DEFENDANT LOBATO: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: You may at your own request waive and give us this right and then take the witness stand, be

compelled or required -- be required to testify in this case. Do

placed under oath, and testify. If you do, you would be subject to cross-examination by the prosecution and anything that you may say, whether it be on direct examination by your counsel or on cross-examination by the prosecution, would be the subject of fair comment when the prosecution speaks to the jury in final closing arguments, Do you understand that?

DEFENDANT LOBATO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If you choose not to testify then the Court will not permit the prosecution to make any comments to the jury because you've not testified. Do you understand that?

DEFENDANT LOBATO: Yes, Your Honor,

THE COURT: If you elect not to testify and your counsel requests of the Court, the Court would then instruct the jury that the law doesn't 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 can be drawn from the failure of a defendant to testify. Do you understand this as well?

XIX-88

THE COURT: Would counsel approach? (Off-record bench conference from 2:33:07-2:34:33 p.m.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we're gonna take a 15 minute stretch break. In 15 minutes please be in the hallway. The bailiff will meet you there to return you to your seats in the courtroom.

During this evening recess you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves nor with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial. And you're not to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with the trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, television, radio, and Internet. And you're not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

The jury may exit at this time

(Jurors are not present)

THE COURT: The record shall reflect that the jury has exited.

Ms. Lobato, have you had the opportunity to discuss with your counsel your right to remain silent? I'm gonna cover that with you at this time,

Under the constitution of the United States and under the constitution of the State of Nevada you cannot be DEFENDANT LOBATO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions about any of these rights?

DEFENDANT LOBATO: No, I do not.

THE COURT: The Court further advises you that if you have a felony conviction and more than 10 years has not elapsed from the date that you were convicted or discharged from prison, parole, or probation, whichever was the latter, and the defense has not sought to preclude that from coming before the jury and you elect to take the stand and testify, the prosecution in the presence of the jury would be permitted to ask you if you'd ever been convicted of a felony, what the felony was, and when it happened, but not further details could be gone into. Do you understand this as well?

MR. SCHIECK: Court's indulgence for one second,

THE COURT: Yes, Mr, Schieck,

MR. SCHIECK: Her question was whether or not they would be allowed to refer to prior conviction in this case, which obviously the answer is no because that conviction was set aside by the Supreme Court.

THE COURT: That is correct.

Did you have any other questions?

DEFENDANT LOBATO: No, Your Honor,

THE COURT: Very well,

XIX-89

\IV v. LOBATO 10/5/06

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Have you made the decision as to whether you are going to waive your Fifth Amendment rights and testify, or whether you are going to take the Fifth at this time? DEFENDANT LOBATO: May I be permitted a little 5 time to consider that during this break? 6 THE COURT: I will take us off the record for about 5 minutes and you can confer with counsel. That decision has 8 to be placed on the record outside the presence of the jury. 9 **DEFENDANT LOBATO: Okay,** 10 THE COURT: So we will reconvene in 5 minutes — 11 DEFENDANT LOBATO: Okay, 12 THE COURT: -- and go off the record <sup>s</sup>till that time. 13 (Off-record at 2:38:52 p.m, until 2:54:32 p.m.) 14 (Jurors are not present) 15 THE BAILIFF: Department 2 is back in session. 16 THE COURT: The record shall reflect that we are 17 reconvened outside the presence of the jury in State versus 18 Kirstin Blaise Lobato under C177394 in the presence of the 19 defendant, her three counsel, and the two prosecuting 20 attorneys. 21 Ms. Lobato, have you made your decision? 22 DEFENDANT LOBATO: Yes, I have. 23 THE COURT: What are you going to do? DEFENDANT LOBATO: I'm going to choose not to XIX-90 take the stand. 2 THE COURT: You're gonna take the Fifth and use your right to remain silent at this time? DEFENDANT LOBATO: Yes, Your Honor,

the presence of the defendant, her three counsel, the two prosecuting attorneys, and the ladies and gentlemen of the jury,

Mr. Schieck.

MR. SCHIECK: The defense would rest, Your Honor, THE COURT: Would counsel please approach?

(Off-record bench conference from 3:02:57-3:04:08 p.m.)

(Jurors are present)

THE COURT: The record shall reflect that we received a juror's note that Court and counsel have reviewed at the bench. In the evening hours when the Court is in recess there is a janitorial crew that comes in and goes through the courtroom and cleans it up. And they -- they are the only ones who are in here when we are not.

This will be marked as the Court's next in number,

THE CLERK: 88,

17 THE COURT: Thank you.

The defense has rested case in chief,

State?

MR. KEPHART; We have nothing further, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, with both sides resting their cases in chief, that concludes the presentation of evidence and testimony for the purposes of this trial, It is now

x1X-92

the time for the Court to instruct you on the law that applies to

THE COURT: Very well,,

We'll go off the record for a few more minutes until the bailiff returns the jury to the courtroom.

(Off-record at 2:55:22 p.m. until 2:55:26 p.m.)

(Jurors are not present)

THE CLERK: On the record.

THE COURT: Mr, Schieck's asking to go back on,

The same parties and counsel are present,

MR. SCHIECK: I object that we have admitted those things that [unintelligible] to be admitted or were admissible, and we are ready to rest.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

(Off-record at 2:55:49 p.m. until 2:57:25 p.m,)

(Jurors are present)

(Off-record at 2:59:06 p.m. until 3:02:27 p.m.)

(Jurors are present)

THE BAILIFF: Department 2 is back in session.

Please be seated,

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: The record shall reflect that we're resuming the trial in State versus Lobato under C177394, in

this case.

The Court has prepared written instructions for you.

Some of them are long, some of them are a little complicated.

Some of them are long, some of them are a little complicated, and some of them contain exact quotations from various statutes or from Supreme Court decisions, both U.S. Supreme Court and State of Nevada Supreme Court decisions, So to make sure that I don't omit or misstate anything, I will be reading through them to you.

The instructions are all numbered in the upper right and corner. I will first give you the number of the instruction and then I will give you the body of law. To assist you I have prepared copies of the instructions, which the bailiff will now hand out to you.

(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: The original instructions, which I am going to read through, are signed on the back page. The copies which you have are not signed. That is one way that you can always tell the difference between the original for the file and your own,

Also this is a form of verdict that's been prepared for your convenience. The clerk has done what we call blue backing to it. It's stapled to a blue backing\_ The Court's instructions will also be blue backed after I complete reading

X1X-93

10/5/06 VIV V. LOBATO

2

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3 4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

them.

11 14

22 23

8

Please do not write on the original instructions that are blue backed, as they are to be maintained in the official file kept in the clerk's office. The copies which have been just distributed to you, those you may write on if you find that helpful. I would ask that you please write your name across the top of the front page so that when you get back into the jury deliberation room and you have them all spread out across the table you'll be able to find your own.

As I go through them you can circle things, underline things. Sometimes I see the ladies and gentlemen of the jury kinda dog earring certain pages that they want to go back and refer back to, and you can do that as well. Others will listen to the Court read through the instructions and on the front page write down a couple of numbers of certain instructions that they want to go back and refer to. Both the original copy -- or the original of the instructions and the copies that you have with you, you may take with you into the jury deliberatiOn room and refer back to.

#### **JURY INSTRUCTIONS**

THE COURT: Instruction Number 1. It is now my duty as Judge to instruct you in the law that applies to this case. It is your duty as jurors to follow these instructions and to apply the rules of law to the facts as you find them from the

X1X-94

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

Instruction Number 2. If in these instructions any rule, direction, or idea is repeated or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none may be inferred by you. For that reason you are not to single out any certain sentenc; or any individual point or instruction and ignore the others. But you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and regard each in the light of all the others. The order in which the instructions are given has no significance as to their relative importance,

Instruction Number 3. An information is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of her guilt.

In this case it is charged in an information that on or about the 8<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2001, the defendant committed the offenses of, murder with use of a deadly weapon and sexual penetration of a dead human body, felony Nevada Revised Statute Section 201-450, within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statutes in such cases made and provided and against the peace and

dignity of the State of Nevada.

Count 1, murder with use of a deadly weapon, did then and there willfully, feloniously, without authority of law and with premeditation and deliberation and with malice aforethought, kill Duran Bailey, a human being, by the said defendant, beating the said Duran Bailey with a blunt object and/or by stabbing and/or by cutting the said Duran Bailey with a deadly weapon, to-wit: a knife.

Count 2, sexual penetration of a dead hurnan body, did then and there willfully, feloniously, and without authority of law, sexually penetrate a dead human body, to-wit: Duran Bailey, in the following manner, by inserting a knife into and/or cutting the anal opening of the said Duran Bailey,

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

Instruction Number 4, In this case the defendant is accused in an information alleging a open charge of murder. This charge may include, murder of the first degree, murder of

X1X-96

the second degree, and voluntary manslaughter. The just must decide if the defendant is guilty of any offense, and if so, of which offense.

Instruction Number 5. Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought, either express or implied. The unlawful killing may be effected by any of the various means by which death may be occasioned,

Instruction Number 6. Malice aforethought means the intentional doing of a wrongful act without legal cause or excuse, or what the law considers adequate provocation. The condition of mind described as malice aforethought may arise from anger, hatred, revenge, or from particular ill will, spite or grudge towards the person killed, It may also arise from any unjustifiable or unlawful motive or purpose to injure another, or with reckless disregard of consequences and social duty.

Malice aforethought does not imply deliberation of the lapse of any considerable time between the malicious intention to injure another and the actual execution of the intent. But denotes an unlawful purpose and design as opposed to accident and mischance.

Instruction Number 7. Express malice is that deliberate intention unlawfully to take away the life of a human being, which is manifested by external circumstances capable of proof. Malice may be implied when no considerable

X1X-97

\IV V. LOBATO 10/5/06

provocation appears or when all the circumstances of the killing show an abandoned and malignant heart.

Instruction Number 8, The prosecution is not required to present direct evidence of a defendant's state of mind as it existed during the commission of a crime. The jury may infer the existence of a particular state of mind of a party or a witness from the circumstances disclosed by the evidence.

Instruction Number 9. Murder of the first degree is murder which is perpetrated by means of any kind of willful, deliberate, and premeditated killing. All three elements, willfulness, deliberation, and premeditation must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt before an accused can be convicted of first degree murder.

Willfulness is the intent to kill. There need be no appreciable space of time between formation of the intent to kill and the act of killing. Deliberation is the process of determining upon a course of action to kill as a result of thought, including weighing the reasons for and against the action and considering the consequences of the actions.

A deliberate determination may be arrived at in a short period of time. But in all cases the determination must not be formed in passion, or if formed in passion, it must be carried out after there has been time for the passion to subside and a deliberation to occur.

XIX-98

A mere unconsidered and rash impulse is not deliberate, even though it includes the intent to kill. Premeditation is a design, a determination to kill, distinctly formed in the mind by the time of the killing. Premeditation need not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute. It may be as instantaneous as successive thoughts of the mind. For if the jury believes from the evidence that the act constituting the killing has been proceeded by and has been the result of premeditation, no matter how rapidly the act follows the premeditation, it is premeditated.

Instruction Number 10, The law does not undertake to measure in units of time the length of a period -- strike that. The law does not undertake to measure in units of time the length of the period during which the thought must be pondered before it can ripen into an intent to kill, which is truly deliberate and premeditated. The time will vary with different individuals and under varying circumstances.

The true test is not the duration of time, but rather the extent of the reflection. A cold calculated judgment and decision may be arrived at in a short period of time, but a mere unconsidered and rash impulse, even though it includes an intent to kill, is not deliberation and premeditation as will fix an unlawful killing as murder of the first degree,

Instruction Number 11. The crime of first degree

murder includes the crime of second degree murder. You are instructed that if you find that the State has established that the defendant has committed first degree murder, you shall select first degree murder as your verdict.

You may find the defendant guilty of second degree murder if, one, some of you are not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of murder of the first degree. And two, all 12 of you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant is guilty of the crime of second degree murder.

If you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime of murder has been committed by the defendant, but you have a reasonable doubt whether such murder was of the first or of the second degree, you must give the defendant the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of murder of the second degree,

Instruction Number 12,, Murder of the first degree includes murder which is any kind of willful, deliberate, and premeditated killing. All murder which is not murder of the first degree is murder of the second degree. Murder of the second degree is murder with malice aforethought, but without the add mixture of premeditation and deliberation,

Instruction Number 13. Manslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice, express or

XD(-100

implied, and without any mixture of deliberation Voluntary manslaughter is a voluntary killing upon a sudden heat of passion caused by a provocation apparently sufficient to make the passion irresistible.

The provocation required for voluntary manslaughter must either consist of a series and highly provoking injury inflicted upon the person killing, sufficient to excite an irresistible passion any reasonable person, or an attempt by the person killed to commit a serious person injury on the person killing. The serious and highly provoking injury which causes the sudden heat of passion can occur without direct physical contact.

For the sudden violent impulsive passion to be irresistible resulting in a killing, which is voluntary manslaughter, there must not have been an interval between the assault or provocation and the killing, sufficient for the voice of reason and humanity to be heard; for if there should appear to have been an interval between the assault or provocation given for the killing, sufficient for the voice and reason of humanity to be heard, then the killing shall be determined by you to be murder. The law assigns no fixed period of time for such an interval, but leaves its determination to the jury under the facts and circumstances of the case.

Instruction Number 14. The heat of passion which

XIX-101

<u>IV v. LOBATO</u> 10/5/06

will reduce a homicide to voluntary manslaughter must be such, an irresistible passion as naturally would be aroused in the mind of an ordinarily reasonable person in the same circumstances. A defendant is not permitted to set up her own standard of conduct and to justify or excuse herself because her passions were aroused, unless the circumstances in which she was placed and the facts that confronted her were such as would have aroused the irresistible passion of the ordinarily reasonable person if likewise situated. The basic inquiry is whether or not at the time of the killing the reason of the accused was obscured or disturbed by passion to such an extent as would cause the ordinarily reasonable person of average disposition to act rationally and without deliberation and reflection, and from such passion rather than from judgment,

Instruction Number 15, The crime of murder may include the crime of voluntary manslaughter. If you find the State has established that the defendant has committed murder, you shall select the appropriate degree of murder as your verdict.

You may find the defendant guilty of voluntary manslaughter if, one, some of you are not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of murder of either the first or second degree, and all 12 of you are

XIX-102

convinced beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant is guilty of the crime of voluntary manslaughter.

If you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the killing was unlawful, but you have a reasonable doubt whether the crime is murder or voluntary manslaughter, you must give the defendant the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of voluntary manslaughter.

Instruction Number 16, You are instructed that if you find the defendant guilty of murder or voluntary manslaughter, you must also determine whether or not a deadly weapon was used in the commission of this crime. If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that a deadly weapon was used in the commission of such an offense, then you shall return the appropriate guilty verdict reflect quote "with use of a deadly weapon", unquote,

If, however, you find that a deadly weapon was not used in the commission of such an offense, but you find that it was committed, then you shall return the appropriate guilty verdict reflecting that a deadly weapon was not used

Instruction Number 17. Quote "deadly weapon", unquote, means any instrument which if used in the ordinary manner contemplated by its design and construction will, or is likely to, cause substantial bodily harm or death, any weapon, device, instrument, material, or substance which under the

circumstances in which it is used, attempted to be used, or threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death.

Instruction Number 18, The State is not required to have recovered the deadly weapon used in an alleged crime, or to produce the deadly weapon in court at trial to establish that a deadly weapon was used in the commission of the crime,

Instruction Number 19. The killing or attempting killing of another person in self defense is justified and not unlawful when the person who kills or attempts to kills actually and reasonably believes one, that there is immanent danger that the assailant will either kill her or cause her great bodily injury, and two, that it is absolutely necessary under the circumstances for her to use in self defense force or means that might cause the death of the other person for the purpose of avoiding death or great bodily injury to herself.

A bare fear of death or great bodily injury is not sufficient to justify a killing. To justify taking the life of another in self defense, the circumstances must be sufficient to excite the fears of a reasonable person placed in a similar situation. The person killing must act under the influence of those fears alone and not in revenge. An honest but unreasonable belief and the necessity for self defense does not

XIX-104

negate malice and does not reduce the offense from murder to manslaughter.

Instruction Number 20, The right of self defense is not generally available to an original aggressor. That is a person who has sought a quarrel with the design to force a deadly issue, and thus, through her fraud, contrivance or fault, to create a real or apparent necessity for making a felonious assault.

The original aggressor is only entitled to exercise self defense if she makes a good faith endeavor to decline any further struggle before the mortal blow is given. Where a person without voluntarily seeking, provoking, inviting, or willingly engaging in a difficulty of her own free will is attacked by an assailant. She has the right to stand her ground and need not retreat when faced with a threat of deadly force.

Instruction Number 21. Actual danger is not necessary to justify a killing in self defense. A person has a right to defend from apparent danger to the same extent as she would from actual danger.

The person killing is justified if, one, she is confronted by the appearance of immanent danger which arouses in her mind an honest belief and fear that she is about to be killed or suffer great bodily injury, and two, she acts solely upon these appearances and her fear and actual beliefs,

XD<-103

'Vv, LOBATO 10/5/06

and three, a reasonable person in a similar situation would believe herself to be in like danger.

The killing is justified even if it develops afterward, that the person killing was mistaken about the extent of the danger.

Instruction Number 22, If evidence of self defense is present, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not act in self defense. If you find that the State has failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not act in self defense, you must find the defendant not guilty.

Instruction Number 23. If a person kills another in self defense, it must appear that the danger was so urgent and pressing that in order to save her own life or to prevent her receiving great bodily harm, the killing of the other was absolutely necessary and the person killed was the assailant, or that the slayer had really and in good faith endeavored to decline any further struggle before the mortal blow was given,

Instruction Number 24. A person who commits a sexual penetration of the dead body of a human being is guilty of sexual penetration of a dead human body, Quote, "sexual penetration", unquote, is defined as any intrusion, however slight, of any part of a person's body, or any object manipulated or inserted by a person into the genital or anal

XIX-106

considered by you only for the purpose of determining the credibility of that witness. The fact of such a conviction down not necessarily destroy or impair the witness' credibility. It is one of the circumstances that you may take into consideration in weighing the testimony of such a witness.

Instruction Number 29, An quote, "alibi", unquote, amounts to contention that the defendant was not present at the time and place where she is alleged to have committed the' offense charged in the information. It is the State's burden to establish beyond a reasonable doubt each of the essential elements of the offense and the presence and involvement of the defendant.

If after a consideration of all the evidence you have a reasonable doubt as to whether the defendant was present at the time and place the crime was committed, she is entitled to a verdict of not guilty.

Instruction Number 30, To constitute the crime charged there must exist a union or joint operation of a act forbidden by law and an intent to do the act. The intent with which an act is done is shown by the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

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

XIX-108

openings of the body of another.

Instruction Number 25. The purpose of the statute is to deter the act of sexual penetration of a dead human body, and motive is not an element of that crime,

Instruction Number 26, The flight of a person immediately after the commission of a crime, or after she is accused of a crime, is not sufficient in itself to establish her guilt, but is a fact which if proved may be considered by you in light of all other proved facts in deciding the question of her guilt or innocence

Whether or not evidence of flight shows a consciousness of guilt and the significance to be attached to such a circumstance are matters for your deliberation,

Instruction Number 27. No act committed by a person while in a state of voluntary intoxication shall be deemed less criminal by reason of his condition. But whatever the actual existence of any particular purpose, motive, or intent is, a necessary element to constitute a particular species or degree of crime, evidence of intoxication may be taken into consideration in determining such purpose, motive, or intent. Intoxication alone cannot reduce murder to voluntary manslaughter.

Instruction Number 28. The fact that a witness had been convicted of a felony, if such be a fact, may be

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.

Instruction Number 31. 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 a reasonable doubt. Doubt to be reasonable must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation. If you have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the defendant, she is entitled to a verdict of not guilty.

Instruction Number 32. It is a constitutional right of the defendant in a criminal trial that she may not be compelled to testify. Thus, the decision as to whether she should testify is left to the defendant on the advice and counsel of her attorney.

XIX-109

XD<-107

\IV v. LOBATO

You must not draw any inference of guilt from the fact that she does not testify. Nor should this be -- nor should this fact be discussed by you or enter into your deliberations in any way,

Instruction Number 33. 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,

Instruction Number 34, 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 be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. Therefore, all of

testimony of that witness, or any portion of their testimony, which is not proved by other evidence,

Instruction Number 36. 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 or her 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 are not bound, however, by such an Opinion. Give it the weight to which you deem it entitled, whether that be great or slight, and you may reject it if in your judgment the reasons given for it are unsound,

Instruction Number 37, Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring to the consideration of the evidence your everyday commonsense 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

XIX-112

xix,110

the evidence in the case, including the circumstantial evidence, should be considered by you in arriving at your verdict.

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

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

You must disregard any evidence to which an objection was sustained by the Court, and any evidence ordered stricken by the Court. Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must also be disregarded

Instruction Number 35. The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by their manner upon the stand, their relationship to the parties, their fears, motives, interests, or feelings, their opportunity to have observed the matter to which they testified, their reasonableness of their statements, and the strength or weakness of their recollections.

If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire

accordance with these rules of law,

Instruction Number 38. In arriving at a verdict in this case as to whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty, the subject of penalty or punishment is not to be discussed or considered by you and should in no way influence your verdict. If the jury's verdict is murder of the first degree, you will at a later hearing consider the subject of penalty or punishment.

Instruction Number 39. If during your deliberation you should desire to be further informed on any point of law or hear again portions of the testimony, you must reduce your request to writing signed by the foreperson. The officer will then return you to court where the information sought will be given you in the presence of and after notice to the district attorney and the defendant and her counsel.

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

Instruction Number 40. When you retire to consider your verdict you must select one of your number to act as foreperson who will preside over your deliberation and will be your spokesperson here in court. During your deliberation you

XIX-113

NV V. LOBATO 10/5/06

will have all of the exhibits that were admitted into evidence, these written instructions and a form of verdict which has been prepared for your convenience.

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

Instruction number 41. 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 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.

Mr., Schieck, you had no surrebuttal, is that correct? MR. SCHIECK: Correct, Your Honor.

MR, SCHIECK: Well, the State had no rebuttal so I didn't think I could —  $\,$ 

MS. DiGIACOMO: The State did have rebuttal.

THE COURT: Well, they had the —

MR, SCHIECK: Oh, I'm sorry. That's right.

THE COURT: That's right, We had discussed that at

XIX-114

fit together.

This big picture here is that the defendant committed murder and she killed Duran Bailey on July 8, 2001, This is not about how somebody killed Duran Bailey in retaliation for a rape of Diane Parker, This is not about somebody killing the victim with scissors. And this case is not about the defendant having to fend off an attacker and use self defense. You're not gonna find any pieces of the puzzle that are gonna put together that picture for you, because that's not what this case is about. It's about how the defendant took out her anger and her rage on the defendant -- or excuse me, on the victim, Duran Bailey, on July 8, 2001.

What I'm gonna do for you first is we're gonna go through a time line, what did the evidence show the time line to be.

First, you know from Jeremy Davis' testimony May 23, 2001, that's when the defendant left her car at Jeremy Davis' house. That's when he was -- he left on that Friday the 25 to go to Caliente for a softball tournament, he returned on May 28 , and the car was gone.

At this point, you know, next, June 26, 2001, that's when her car was being towed down the street at the apartment complex, a Steve Pyszkowski -- I cannot say that word -- Pyszkowski's house. And then you next know July 2,

XIX-116

the bench at sidebar, but we hadn't put it on the record, so I wanted to do that now.

Proceeding with the closing arguments. State may proceed.

MS, DiGIACOMO: Thank you, Your Honor. □ **STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT** 

MS. DiGIACOMO: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

It has been four long weeks and you've gotten a lot of information thrown at you in that time. Now it's your job to go back there and try and piece everything together. And the way you should look at this is like it's a puzzle. But I submit to you it is not a three-year-old's Puzzle that only has six pieces in the box and it's really easy to figure out how they go together. This is one of those complicated puzzles where you have to dump it out, there's tons of pieces, you have to flip it over and start to figure out how you can even go about putting it together.

And keep in mind sometimes in boxes there's pieces of puzzles from another puzzle, and sometimes you might be missing a piece. But when you put together what you have it does give you the big picture. What I intend to do with my argument here today is give you that big picture so that you know when you're looking at all the pieces how they're gonna

2001 is when the defendant goes back to Panaca. And sometime in the month of June 2001 she's living with either Steve and Cathy or she goes to stay with Doug. But on June [sic] 2, 2001 she goes back to Panaca. She drives her own red Fiero to get there.

What do we know from the evidence next? July 5, 2001, the defendant goes to the doctor. And how do you know that, because you have State's Exhibit 133, These were admitted into evidence without the custodian of records testifying. And you're gonna have these when you go back there.

And when you look at these records and you see the handwritten notes from the doctor on the 5 th of July that's one full page, and then he even flips over to a back page. You're gonna notice that nowhere, nowhere in these handwritten notes by the doctor regarding the exam, regarding while she was there, said she claims she was depressed or suffering from any anxiety. She strictly went there because she was suffering or she thought she was being poisoned with phelantin [sic] sulfate.

And in fact, there's followup notes on the back where after he got the results back, which are in here as well, called mom and talked to her about it and said that because patient is doing well at present with unremarkable physical

XD<-117

NV v. LOBATO 10/5/06

exam, there's really no need for a followup.

And then your next notes you're gonna have are for July 13, 2001. And you're gonna see there's a telephone call from mom. Patient is having restlessness and anxiety. Has appointment for 7/16/01 on Monday. Told to start Alevium [sic] as directed. If you remember, she testified she got the prescription from the doctor that day and went and got it filled, and to visit the ER if symptoms worsen.

We know July 5<sup>th</sup> she goes to the doctor strictly for poisoning. She's not having any problems with anxiety or depression. And also you know on this date, July 5<sup>th</sup>, from Chris Carrington through his grandmother, the defendant's mom and the defendant are fighting, and that's why Chris Carrington came home and told his grandmother I'm coming home 'cause they're fighting down there.

July 6, 2001. Defendant's mother testified that she took off that day to stay home with her daughter. And you know Chris Carrington was down there again that day, and they were fighting again over the defendant going back to Las Vegas, And he came back and he told his grandmother that they're fighting over her going back to Las Vegas. And if you recall, the grandmother didn't believe he went back down there because she wasn't there, she was back in Las Vegas,

MR. SCHIECK: Objection, Your Honor, that

XIX-118

misstates the evidence. There was no testimony to that.

THE COURT: The jury shall use their collective recollections, The Court will overrule.

MS. DIGIACOMO: And at this point the defendant has been off of drugs since she's come home July 2'• And 5th you'll notice when she did the blood work up for her July office visit, there's no methamphetamine in her system. So at this point she's needing drugs again. And you know that from the testimony of Jeremy Davis as well because when she was doing drugs she wanted to do it all the time. She'd been a couple of days without, she's fighting with her mom, she's used drugs in the past to deal with her family problems, deal with her issues, and so she's craving it and she wanted to go back to Las Vegas.

And there's a lot of talk in this case about phone records, but look at the phone records. There's another way that you can interpret those phone records, other than what you heard from the witnesses on the stand, it was Blaise and Doug talking to each other. If you look at the phone records for Friday afternoon, it could also be that mom is home and she's looking for Blaise calling Doug, calling the police, calling her father at work, Looking not for Doug, looking for her daughter.

On July 7, 2001, the defendant's down in Las Vegas

and mom doesn't know where she's at, so mom goes back to work on that Saturday. Now Chris Carrington says that he was down there and saw her on that Sunday, but if you recall, he testified he would've gone over there after he had finished with his yard work. It was about that time that his grandfather had the heat stroke and he ended up driving his grandmother to the hospital, was with her the rest of the day, or was going to pick up the sister -- her sister at the lake and bring her back, Chris Carrington could not have been there on July

And also look at who he said was present on July 7th. He says that when he would've been there in the afternoon that mom would've been home. No, she was at work that day. Chris Carrington was not down there on the  $7^{th}$ , He was down there on the  $6^{th}$  but not the 7th,

On this morning of the 7' on her way to work she did drop off the urine sample that was collected on the 6th1 what she had of it. She testified that there wasn't a lot and so she woke up her daughter to get one last sample. State submits to you, the reason there wasn't a lot in that urine sample is 'cause Blaise took off the day before, so she only completed part of the urine sample, the 24 hour urine sample, when she was there the morning of the 6<sup>th</sup>, or possibly in the afternoon of the 6th.

X1X-120

And again, look at the phone records on the 7<sup>th</sup> as well. Be interpretive that not only is mom looking —

MR. SCHIECK: Objection to what they interpreted, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained,

MS. DiGIACOMO: But it can be interpreted. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you?

THE COURT: You may rephrase.

MS. DiGIACOMO: When you look at the phone records, those — when you look at them there's phone calls back and forth, but it could be again Doug and the parents looking for Blaise.

On July 8, 2001, time of death, The big window comfort of comfort for the coroner is between 8 and 24 hours before the body was pronounced dead, which was at 3:50 a.m. So the State submits to you, because of the fact that the defendant was down there partying since 7/6, the night of the 7/7, she says her attack occurred early morning hours, late evening — or late night hours, that it was sometime before sunup on July 8<sup>th</sup> that she killed Duran Bailey,

We know from the defense witness and Diane Parker that Duran Bailey had sold drugs before and he had traded sex for drugs before. He traded sex before with Diane Parker,

This murder was committed by the defendant.

X1X-119

X1X-121

NV v. LOBATO 10/5/06

Again, you have the testimony of Jeremy Parker [sic] that she liked to do drugs and she wanted to do it over and over again, She never had to buy drugs, but she always knew where to get it, And she told Jeremy I have a source, but she never knew -- he never knew who that was. But she even tells the detectives, in Las Vegas I know where to get drugs,

So she's down there and somehow she comes into contact with Duran Bailey, And somehow they end up back at his place, the trash dumpster where he would stay sometimes on the weekend.

The first stab wound to Duran Bailey was to the scrotum, and how do you know that? Because his pants were down around his ankles when he was found,, But also think about it, that's a stab wound that was before he died, it would've bled. If you look at his pants, there's no stab wound through the pants, there's no blood in the groin or crotch area,

State submits to you that what happened was somehow the defendant hooked up with Duran Bailey for drugs, but he obviously wasn't gonna want money in exchange for it, he's gonna want sex in exchange for drugs. But the defendant's not gonna have anything to do with this smelly old guy. He goes back there, drops his pants, she probably acted like she was gonna go down and give him fellatio, boom, first stab wound was to the scrotum,

XIX-122

At that point what's any guy gonna do that's in pain here? Cup themselves. They're vulnerable, they're gonna be crouched over. But she doesn't stop stabbing him at that point. And think about it. You have the injuries to the left palm, and there's only on the right hand one on the back, as if he's cupping himself here, she's still stabbing. He's got this hand up because now she's stabbing at his face. She stops and somehow she goes back to her car and she gets a bat.

And think about it. She told Dixie that she left -told the police she left after she stabbed him or tried to cut his
dick, and saw him stumbling or laying on the ground crying.
She saw that vision because that's when she went back to the
car and she got a bat and she came back, and that's when the
blunt force trauma occurred. She probably hit him in the
mouth, kicked him over, punched him with the bat, punched
him with her fist. We know she can knock out a guy who's
6'6" from Chris Carrington.

MR. SCHIECK: Objection. There was no evidence the guy was 6'6", Your Honor.

MS. DiGIACOMO: 6 foot, excuse me.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MS. DiGIACOMO: We know that she can knock over a guy that's 6'6" from a punch in the mouth.

He goes down, The skull fracture occurs when he

falls. And Doc Simms told you that the head trauma itself, the blunt force trauma to the head is gonna render him unconscious. And at that point it's very easy to go for the calculated stab wound to the carotid artery.

But she's not done at that point. After he bleeds out, and Doc Simms told you it would've been within a matter of minutes. What did she do, stabs him a couple of times in the abdomen, makes sure he's dead. Stabbing him, just to – see is he moving. He's not And at that point she, after he is dead, she takes her knife and rips through his rectal area and his anus, and then she pulls up that penis and amputates it at the base. If you see the pictures, the pubic hair, everything is still attached to the penis.

And also too, keep in mind that that stab to the carotid artery, it went down approximately inches to get to the carotid artery. I believe it was two inches to get down there And he finally expires.

At this point, what does she do? We know there's drag marks on the curb away from the big pool of blood.

MR, SCHIECK: I'm gonna object, Your Honor. There was no testimony they were drag marks. They were transfer marks.

MS. DiGIACOMO: Actually there was several witnesses —

X1X-124

THE COURT: Overruled,

MS. DiGIACOMO: Thank you.

On the curb where all the blood spatter is, if you keep in mind it's all low as if he was down on the ground when he was getting these blows or the final stab wound that he probably bled down, There's no arterial spurting up high. And you can see the drag mark of the blood on the curb where he was probably pulled by his right arm -- 'cause it's found like this and his left arm is found down by his side -- towards the dumpster. But she's not strong enough to get him in the dumpster, so then she just throws trash over on top of him.

And then what does she do? She gets in her car and she high tails it out of there and she gets back to Panaca, and the freeway's right there. And she even told Dixie that she didn't think anyone saw her with her attacker, if you want to call it that. She knew no one saw her commit this crime. She was only worried about somebody seeing her very distinctive car. Because think about it, her license plate, something out of the normal, it's not usual. It's not, you know, "I sell for you" like a real estate person, it's something very unusual that would stick in somebody's mind 'cause it's not a license plate that you see often in that kind of sexual context.

Defendant says that -- to the police that I

XDC-125

XD(-1.23

NV V. LOBATO 10/5/06

committed, I did this, but it was in a different area of town, But it's very possible she was just jumbling her two different stories, the story of the car was to Jeremy getting defecated, and this alleged attack.

Just think about it. When they first tell you look, your car is very distinctive, is that it outside? Her first thought is somebody borrowed my car. And this isn't about these Mexicans that live in Diane Parker's apartment complex either, Think about that She doesn't know their names, knows what apartment they live in, but they're gonna go and attack this person with scissors and in revenge for this rape of Diane Parker, a person that they don't know that well. When the police told you that they tried to followed up with these people, they learned from the apartment complex they were hard working people, and when they ran them they had no criminal history whatsoever. That doesn't make sense. It was the defendant.

And her attack did not happen in May 2001, it didn't happen a couple of months before. If it did, why on July are they — with Dixie are they checking the Internet then? Because Dixie had the frame of mind it had just happened, based upon how upset the defendant was. Why was she going to the Y to get a paper right after she talked to Laura if it wasn't recent? Why would she want that day's paper?

XIX-126

And also look at why would the defendant be suffering from anxiety and depression on the  $13^{\,\rm th}$  after the murder and not on the  $5^{\,\rm th}$  unless, as she told Michele Austria, her conscious is getting to her.

And also too, you have no security reports from the Budget Suites for May, June, or July regarding any sort of attack by the office or by the fountain on in that parking area, no blood found on the ground, no penises severed, no penises slashed, You have Duran Bailey in July that was found with his penis severed.

And again, look at her statement to the police. Go through it carefully. Detective Thowsen told you it is not uncommon for somebody who's been on drugs to jumble their stories around, not uncommon at all. And she's jumbling the incident with Jeremy and the incident with Duran Bailey.

And think about too, Dixie made clear, as the one thing she definitely made clear when she was on the stand, when she talked to the defendant on July 18<sup>th</sup> that it was two separate incidents. There was the attack incident and then there was this thing that happened with her car where somebody defecated, urinated, and vomited in it, and they were two completely separate incidents. It's not until she gets to the police two days later where the defendant is jumbling these. She made clear two days before they were not the

same incident.

Now there's been a little bit of testimony too about a crime like this where there's sexual mutilation postmortem, that this is usually male on male. That doesn't mean a woman couldn't have done this. Think about it, defendant carried a knife for her protection, for protection. Even though she had a knife collection, she did carry it for protection.

When Dixie talked to her for those first couple hours; do you recall what she said that they did? They did the first part of one of her anger management classes,, The defendant needed anger management when she talked to Dixie.

She knew the area where this crime occurred, because you know that from Steve Pyszkowski, because that was within his territory. Tropicana to Rainbow, I believe it was Sahara and 1-15, right smack in the middle of his territory.

And also Jeremy Davis told you when she was on drugs she was not the same person. In fact, that was what led to their breakup, because drugs were number 1 to the defendant and Jeremy was number 2.

And think about her conversation with the police on the ride home. She's still talking about the horror that she went through when she was 5 years old when she was sexually molested, and she's still upset because nothing really happened. She still has this anger 12 years later, 13 years

XIX-128

later. And when the police ask her, what about her past would make her particularly emotional about the situation, she tells them in her statement about being tortured every day for a year when she was 5 years old by her mother's boyfriend, and that her mother knew about it and let it happen. She has some deep seeded issues and anger, not only from this, but then she was raped again at 13, and the police were no help apparently, told her don't worry about even reporting it, raped again when she was 18 by her -- or excuse me, 17 by her best friend's father.

It's very clear the defendant's someone who committed this murder. No proof of any prior attack, no evidence that Diane Parker, her neighbors committed it. And when you listen to her statement, listen to all the times she uses past tense in it. She knew she killed her victim.

But you know what she's gonna have to do? She's gonna have to minimize when she wants to get this off her chest. Think about it. She has a lot of guilt, her conscious is getting to her, she's suffering from anxiety and restlessness by the 13 , 5 days after or 6 days after this happened She needs to talk, she needs to get it off her chest,, So what is she gonna do to do that? She's gonna minimize. She's gonna make the listener have some sympathy for her,, That's why she's gonna say I was attacked, I defended myself, just so she

NV v. LOBATO 10/5/06

Dixie even told you, if she had come to me and told me yeah, I killed this guy and then I cut off his penis, she would've called the police. But she had concern for Blaise because she thought Blaise had been attacked. In order for Blaise to talk about this and start to get it off her chest, like

can start to get it off her chest, but that's not what happened.

she did with even Michele Austria, she's gotta minimize her own actions. And Detective Thowsen told you that's very common even when giving confessions. They want to talk about what they did but they need to kinda justify it in their own mind, and that's what she was doing.

Now after the murder -- back to the time line -- she high tails it back to Panaca, And people see her from 11:30 a.m. through the night. You have multiple witnesses that came in and marked on the little calendar. And look too, the phone call from the house to her mother to her cell phone 'cause she's at work is about 10:00 a.m. That's probably when the defendant got home.

Later that night she goes back to Las Vegas with Doug. Early in the night to, I believe he said to lay low so that Steve and Cathy wouldn't bother them. But I submit to you that it was to lay low to see is this being reported? Because you remember she told Dixie that she'd been looking in the paper? Doug told you that they did watch a news report the

XIX-130

next day or the following day regarding a murder, but nothing was said about it.

And she's leaving her car behind because she doesn't want it to be seen. It's a unique car. Yes, it's sitting in front of her parent's house 'cause she's not driving it, she's not taking it back to Las Vegas. She doesn't want any connection to it and that's why she's going to Doug's for the weekend, she's gonna lay low. And look, there are no phone calls from her parent's house to Doug's where they knew she was. There's no contact with even her parents 'cause she's laying low.

July 13<sup>th</sup>, this is when her father comes to pick her back up and takes her back to Panaca. It's when her mom calls the doctor and we have those medical records because she's more anxious. this is when she's getting on her medication as well. She gets on Lorazepam.

Now on July 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>, that's probably when the defendant went four-wheeling with Michele and got the injuries to her abdomen. Because you remember Michele testified it's very possible we went that weekend too. And her father when he picked her up on the 13<sup>th</sup>, there was no injuries on her, And I don't -- I believe Chris Carrington even when he says he saw her on the 13<sup>th</sup> there was no injuries on her as well.

July 16<sup>th</sup>, this is when the defendant goes back to the doctor and gets Prozac prescribed to her. Her mother went and got this prescription filled as well, This was for the depression. The Lorazepam was for anxiety from the 13th.

Then you have between -- sometime between July 16<sup>th</sup> and the 20<sup>th</sup>, that's when the defendant's conscious is really weighing heavy on her about what she did. And if you remember when she talked to Michele about cutting a guy's dick or cutting it off, which is what Paul Brown heard, she told her I've already been going to a doctor because of how I'm feeling about this. My conscious is weighing on me, When she goes to see Dixie as well, it's weighing on her. And she tells Michele that she's gone to the doctor and she's on medication for it, for her depression and her anxiety.

So her conversation with Michele, even though she says it was before July 4<sup>th</sup>, it had to have been after the 13th and/or the 16<sup>th</sup> because she had been to the doctor regarding it and was on medication, She didn't get on medication until the 13th.

Then July 18<sup>th</sup>, this is when the defendant goes to her safe house. She goes, she wakes up Dixie, she gives her a hug and she says I did something bad. And she also tells Dixie at that time she's not driving a new car, and I believe she said something to the effect that I'm not driving it again, I don't

XIX-132

want to even be near that car or I don't want anyone seeing me driving that car. And she's driving her dad's truck at that time. And she also tells Dixie, I swear this time I'm getting off drugs because she did get out of control. She's getting off drugs.

Now Dixie, keep in mind she wasn't a proprosecution witness. I think that was clear. But the State did not reverse that testimony, and I think that's pretty apparent because she was not very cooperative with the State. But the conversation that she had with Dixie is crucial in this case because before they even knew up there that this body had been found with a severed penis, a homeless guy that, as the defendant said, smelled like old socks that hadn't been washed in two weeks. She goes to Dixie and she tells her that it was on a hotel street just went of 1-15. She tells her it happened between buildings or in an alley or something like that. She tells her that she cut the guy's penis off and tossed it. Do you remember Dixie making that motion, tossed it\_ And the penis is found right next to the body.

The defendant was so upset, she gave the impression to Dixie it had just happened. She thought within a couple of days, but recently. And the defendant was afraid that somebody had seen her very distinctive car license plate, and she told Dixie I'm not driving that car, I don't want

XIX-131

VV V. LOBATO 10/5/06

anybody to see it.

She told Dixie I'm afraid I may have killed him, that's why her conscious was weighing on her. She needed to talk to somebody, she needed to get this off her chest that she had killed somebody. And Dixie then got on the computer and tried to help her look to see if there was anything reported in the news agencies. And remember what Dixie told you she put in for that search? Severed penis. Not got penis, not slashed penis, severed penis was the search engine -- or the search terms that they used. And that's why Dixie went to her friend Laura because she was concerned and she wanted to find out if this really happened and to help Blaise.

But there are a few points that Dixie was trying to minimize. First of all, she tried to expand the time line. She tried to deny that she thought it had just happened. And throughout direct examination she brought up that she had looked in the papers back to July 1.

 $\label{eq:MS.GREENBERGER:Misstates} \mbox{ MS. GREENBERGER: Misstates the evidence, June } \mbox{$J_{st}$,}$ 

MS. DiGIACOMO: No, Your Honor, it doesn't. I said direct. It wasn't until cross-examination she changed that, THE COURT: Ov erruled.

MS. DiGIACOMO: During the State's direct examination it was July 1st, Three separate times, pointed out

XIX-134

to her, you never said that before. Not in her statement to the

police, not the two times she had previous testified.

On cross-examination the first time it was July 1. The second time defense counsel said don't you mean June 1<sup>st</sup>? And that when Dixie goes oh, yeah, yeah, you're right, it was June 1<sup>st</sup>, And now it goes back to June 1<sup>st</sup>, which again was never told previously to the police. There were not parts where it was stopped, the tape was stopped and turned off. She never testified to it before.

Also she said that the attacker that Blaise described was very, very big, and compared it to some other students. Again, this was new information that we heard for the first time. It was not in her prior testimonies, it was not in her statement to the police. And in fact, Laura even told you that a couple of days before they came down to testify Dixie was trying to convince her that I did tell you she said it was big — he was big.

But keep in mind too, something else Dixie added, which again was knew, was that first all she remembered is the defendant saying that she stabbed up, and she thought into the stomach. State submits to you that first stab up was to the testicle, to the scrotum.

And again, Laura told the detectives, don't go talk to Dixie before you go talk to Blaise because she will tip her off.

It's very clear that Dixie cares a lot about Blaise, the defendant, and wants to help her. However, she got pulled into this because that's who the defendant confessed to and that's what got this ball rolling.

Now on July 20<sup>th</sup>, that's when Laura finally gets a hold of somebody in homicide down in Metro, gets a hold of Tom Thowsen, And she told you that within talking to them three hours later they were at her door taking a statement.

They interviewed her, she warned them riot to go see Dixie first, and then they go to the defendant's house. They take a statement from her, and that was fairly quick. They arrested her, they take her outside. She's allowed to say goodbye to her parents, tells her dad I told you I did something awful, tells mom I did it and I gotta do what I gotta do, and she leaves.

July 21<sup>st</sup>, this is when Becky starts creating this alibi. You have the witnesses that told you that they talked to her the day after Blaise's arrest about the date July 8 <sup>th</sup> arid how important it was. Jo Dennert, the next door neighbor came over and talked to Becky the day after she was arrested. She talked to her cousin -- or her niece Shayne the next day after about the July 8 <sup>th</sup> date. She talked to other people. She tried to go to find Chris Carrington in the supermarket and found his grandmother and told her you're not talking to my son -- or

XIX-136

my grandson, you're not gonna confuse him about these dates. She ends of talking to Chris anyway, She talks to Doug multiple times, she talks to Clint, Ashley's friend, she talks to all the witnesses in this case. And now we have an alibi. Even though she claims she didn't know about the July 8 <sup>th</sup> date until after it came out in the paper July 25th,

Keep in mind that the only people that really see Blaise between July 5th and July 8<sup>th</sup> are related to her. You have her mother, you have her father, you have her sister who basically tells you I don't remember not seeing her, but none of them can specifically tell you until the 8th.

And then you have John Kraft, John and Ashley and her father are all new. They did not testify previously. The come in here and they say that she was there the morning of July  $8^{th}$  at 7:00 a.m. That's new,

And keep in mind too that the witnesses that talked about her car not being moved, recall that? Everyone says no, it stayed there from July e<sup>d</sup> `till the police got it on July 20th, Well, Mrs. McCroskey thought that it was closer to the property line, a little bit over, and so did Ashley as well. When you look at the photographs from the police you'll see it's dead smack in the middle of their yard. It's not even close to the McCroskey's property line. That car was moved.

Now these are the two things that the State has to

XIX-137

X1X-135

\<u>IV v. LOBATO</u> 10/5/06

prove. We have to prove every material element of the offense as charged and what crime was committed, and we also have to tell you who committed it. Well, that's been established, it was Blaise Lobato.

So now your instructions on murder. Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice of forethought, either expressed or implied. It's gotta be an unlawful killing, which means it can't be self defense, which would be not justified, not excusable, Killing must be with malice of forethought, and that can be either express or implied.

In this case it's not justified, meaning this is not self defense. And when you look at the instructions on self defense you'll see it's a reasonable person standard, It has to be somebody, a reasonable person in that situation would've reacted in that way. And also the person killing must act under the influence of those fears alone and not in revenge.

Look at the photographs in this case of the body. This is revenge. This is anger,, Even the defense expert said it was directed anger.

Defendant's actions again are inconsistent with self defense If you look at Instruction Number 26, that's your — what we call the flight instruction, and that tells you that, first of all, somebody fleeing the scene. That can be viewed, if you interpret it that way, as consciousness of guilt. Somebody

xlx-138

who has just been attacked and reacting in self defense doesn't normally flee the scene. She didn't call the police in this case either.

She told the detectives that she drove off because she didn't think anyone would care. It wasn't because she was afraid of her attacker, it was because she didn't think anyone would care. She knew that there was no fear about her attacker seeing her because she knew that he was dead, and that's all the past tense that you have in your -- in her statement.

Also what did she do after her self defense? She ditched the car, she got rid of the evidence, she got rid of the clothes she was wearing that she said had blood on them, she got rid of the knife that she used. It's not something that somebody who's just been attacked and reacted in self defense does. Why would you worry about somebody seeing your car if you had just been attacked?

You had to protect yourself. Why do you go to Dixie and say I did something bad? Why did you tell your mom I did it and need to do what I gotta do? Why leaving a note for Jeremy that says that I've gotta leave -- oh, sorry. Not Jeremy, Why when the police tell you that they've got a distinctive car, do you say somebody borrowed the car if you acted in self defense and you were truly attacked?

XIX-139

Now manslaughter,, Again, it's a reasonable person standard. It's your average everyday person. It's not somebody who's on a methamphetamine binge when you look at the reaction. It's gotta be an irresistible impulse. Well, in this case you've got multiple instrumentalities of death, you've got the blunt force trauma, you've got all the incised wounds and you've got a calculated infliction of injury. After he was down you have the carotid artery. This is more in line with malice of forethought, which is murder. That injury right there to the carotid artery, that was calculated.

Malice of forethought, expressed malice, it's the deliberate intention which is unlawfully to take away the life of a fellow creature which is manifested by external circumstances capable of proof. There's also implied malice, which can be implied when no considerable provocation appears or when all the circumstances of the killing show an abandon and malignant heart.

First degree murder. There are three things that the State has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt. That it was willful, that it was with deliberation, and it was with premeditation and deliberation.

Second degree murder is all murder which is not first degree murder. So if we don't prove those three things, then it falls down to second degree.

XIX-140

Willful, this is the intent to kill, In this case you have multiple stab wounds, with the last one being a very calculated injury. You also have a lot of blunt force trauma used. That suggests to you her intent to kill. Wasn't to wound him. She wounded him with the stab to the scrotum when she knocked him vulnerable. It was an intent to kill.

You have to have expressed malice, which we talked about. There needn't be no appreciable space and time before forming the intent to kill and the act of killing.

Deliberation, the process of determining upon a force of action to kill. Here you get two different instrumentalities of death, a blunt force trauma and the knife wounds. This is when you have a chance to reflect upon your decision to use such force. And it can be done fairly quickly. All you have to do is weigh the consequences for and against.

And when I say it could be done quickly, the easiest example is when you're driving your car and you're doing about 50 in a 45 and you're getting close to a light that's green. As you get about 100 feet from the intersection the light turns yellow. At that point what do you do? You go through the thought process in your mind in a matter of seconds to decide, do I stop at the light or do I try and accelerate and run through it? And in that matter of seconds you'll think, okay, are there other cars around me that are

going? If I slam on my brakes right now can I stop in time? Does it look like there's any traffic coming from the other direction? Within a matter of seconds you make the decision, weighing th consequences for and against, to either slam on the brakes and stop for that red light or to accelerate and go through it.

It doesn't have to be a long period of time. It can be a very short period of time. You don't have to go home and make a list. Here's the list for using this force, here's the list against. No, it's just a matter of going through in your mind, considering your actions and weighing them.

But the key here is it must not be formed in passion. If it's formed in passion it must be carried out after there's been time for the passion to subside and deliberation to occur. It can't be like with voluntary manslaughter, the — when we talk about the heat of passion. The basic example is husband comes home, finds wife in bed with another man and just doesn't react, just you know, kills him. Doesn't have time to think, just does it. And that's what this means. You've gotta have that time to deliberate. It can't just be a reaction, you have to actually weigh the consequences.

Premeditation. This is the determination to kill formed in the mind by the time of the killing. And this again doesn't have to be a very long period of time. When she first

XD(-142

shoves the knife into his scrotal sack, she's made her plan, her determination, she's started. And again, it may not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute. It may be as instantaneous as successive thoughts of the mind. And there's the injury to the scrotal sack, the first one the State submits to you. Again, if any one of these elements of willfulness to premeditation or to deliberation are missing, then you're at second degree murder.

And then you've got sexual penetration of a dead human body. That's Count 2, This is a little simpler. Your elements are any intrusion, however slight, into the anal opening of the victim, and here you have the stab wound that goes all the way through and into the rectum, then you're guilty. That's it, It doesn't matter what the motive was or if it was sexually motivated, it doesn't. If you penetrate a sexual organ after the person's dead, however slight, you're guilty of the crime, And right there you had, you can see that the cut wound went all the way into the rectum.

Now in opening, defense counsel argued all physical evidence excludes the defendant in this case. And that's very misleading. It doesn't exclude the defendant. It doesn't mean she could not have killed this crime. No, all it means is there was no evidence found at the scene that she left behind that's physically tied to her, Her DNA is not at the scene.

Think about it in the reverse. If like one of those

coffee cups had her DNA on it, would that mean she was the killer? No, because there's probably hundreds of people's DNA at that crime scene. What does it mean? It means she was there. That's all it means.

So the reverse or the inverse doesn't mean it excludes her because her DNA was not on the chewing gum, because her DNA was not on the cigarette butt, does that mean she didn't do it? No, it doesn't. It just means we didn't - find her DNA there,

The tire impressions, because they didn't match her car, does that mean she didn't do it? No. We don't even know when those tire impressions were left. It just means that those tire impressions weren't left by her car.

Think about the garbage at the scene and the white paper towels, Is her DNA — you know, we didn't test every piece, which probably wasn't physically possible anywhere with the resources that the police department have, does it mean that she didn't do it because we didn't find anything? No. Just like if we have found a hundred different people's DNA there, does that mean they're all the killer? No. All it can tell you is that somebody left their biological matter there.

The footwear impressions, does that mean she wasn't the killer? No, The CSAs told you that the footprints were partially wet. The thicker ones in the back were partially

XIX-144

wet and then they walked off. Well, that body had been there for quite some time, it had decomposition on it, it had been there for a matter of hours. If the killer had left those footprints, wouldn't they have been dry?

It's more consistent with the dumpster diver, like we had Richard Shott that came after the fact. He didn't even report for a couple of hours because he was afraid that they were gonna think it was him or, you know, then he was more afraid after he didn't report that oh, what if somebody saw me, then I could really be in trouble, No. It's very possible there were other people in and out of that dumpster and that they could've stepped in the blood that was wet in the back and left it.

Think about it. The footprint that's on the cardboard box, it was flipped over, it was facing the victim's body. I mean the defense wants you to believe, yeah, that had to have been the killer because it was flipped over. But we don't know when all that trash was put there. We don't know when that cardboard was flipped over. If you look at it, what you can see in the picture, there's blood pooled in the corner as if it had been sitting in the pool of blood on the other piece of cardboard. So we don't know when that happened.

None of these things exclude her, they don't. If we had any of these things that matched her, all it would do is

XDC-143

confirm for us that she's the one that did it. She told us she did, it would just confirm yes, she was there, It does not exclude her. It does not mean she didn't do this.

Look at all that trash. Tons of people's DNA there. Doesn't mean whoever's DNA was found there was the killer. Even with the things closest to the body, we don't know how they got there. Don't know that that's the killer either. That's trash. The plastic bag that's found around the victim looks just like the other plastic bags that you see in this picture, It would've been nice to have her DNA there, but we don't need it because we know she was there because she told us she was there.

Also the scissors theory that their doctor testified to, it's not plausible in this case. First of all, there's no blunt force lacerations on the body to the face and everything as the doctor testified. Clearly, according to Doc Simms, those were incised wounds, there was no tissue bridging. It's impossible to snip the carotid artery without taking out half the neck, It's too far down in there. It's impossible to like stick the scissors in there and snip it or whatever his theory was. It's not plausible\_

And think about it. If somebody's gonna -- to do this kind of crime or murder, are they gonna bring scissors to that fight? Nor And if they are they're gonna use it like a

XJX-146

stabbing weapon. They're not gonna use -- they're not gonna change their hand three different ways to a certain possible where the handles are between these two fingers and stabbing and then turning it around into blunt force where -- think about that, When the handles are like this and the blades are facing the wrist, would somebody -- if you're gonna punch somebody, you don't punch with a straight arm, you punch curving, and the scissors would've cut the person. And then they're gonna switch it around again to be able to snip, it doesn't make sense. It's not plausible.

You do have physical evidence that links the defendant to that crime scene, You have it with her car. The positive luminol test and the positive phenolphthalein test tell you there was blood in that car. And it wasn't a false positive because you heard Dan Ford and you heard Louise Renhard testify that it causes a flashing, kind of like a sparkle when you get a false positive, not like what you got on this car door.

These are clearly finger marks, And look at where they are. You have finger marks here, you have a drag mark here, And if you remember, the emergency brake is right here, right next to that seat where this drag mark is, and there's some more here\_ There's a very faint spot right here, but it stops right here where there's this pore -- excuse me, a nonporous material for the top part of the door where you've

got the porous on the bottom, and it's harder to clean blood out of a porous surface than a nonporous surface,

That does give you some physical evidence that links her to the crime, that's blood. The fact that they couldn't confirm the DNA doesn't matter. You're not gonna get both of those positive tests with presumptive tests for luminol and phenolphthalein without there have been clean blood there. It's not —

MR. SCHIECK: Objection, Your Honor, that misstates the testimony, They said they both could be false positives.

THE COURT: Sustained,

MS, DiGIACOMO: It's not reasonable that you're gonna get a positive for luminol, a positive reaction for phenolphthalein where it's not sparkly, it's like what you see here, a constant illumination and have a false positive. It's not copper salts. If it was copper salts, why isn't it everywhere if Panaca is so inundated with copper salts?

In this case keep in mind you have a real insight into whether or not defendant really was the one there, Look at what she says,, Look closely at her statements. And think about this,, She knew the street location, she knew the area where the crime was committed when she told Dixie, not what she told the officers, by then she was jumbling her stories,

XIX-148

But she told Dixie she knew the area. She was able to tell her it was some sort of parking lot or alley, you know, some more secluded place,, She had a good idea what the victim smelled like, odor of alcohol and dirty diapers, That's a pretty distinct smell. And even Detective Thowsen told you that this victim had a distinct smell.

She knew what major injury that this victim had. It had not been released to the public that his penis had been severed, but she knew. And she also knew that somebody had moved the body, trying to possibly put him in the dumpster. She told that to the police when they said, well, is there a dumpster nearby? She's like well, no, well I don't think I could've put him in the dumpster. I don't think I could have done that,, That's what she says. She knew that somebody had tried to move that body.

And the only person -- and think about too, she knew what the dumpster enclosure looked like. When she got to that jail cell at CCDC when she's being booked in, she's like yeah, it was just like this except for I could see through the roof —

MR. SCHIECK: Objection, misstates the testimony. She said it was uncovered, according to Detective Thowsen, THE COURT: Overruled.

MS, DiGIACOMO: She said that she could see

XIX-149

KV-147

through and see the car awning. And you saw the trash dumpster enclosure, Three concrete walls, curbing around the side, chainlink fence on the top that you could see through and see the car awning right there.

The only way that she was able to describe the place, the body, the injuries, the you know, where it happened, how it looked, the only way she knew that, 'cause she was there. That's not coincidence, not coincidence at all. Is it coincidence that the only recorded penis severing or cutting of a penis was this man? There's no other reported for that year. Is that coincidence? No.

The reason she could describe all those things to Dixie and even the police, 'cause she was there. And we're gonna ask you to convict her because she's guilty of the charges.

THE COURT: Who will be doing the closing argument for the defendant?

MR. SCHIECK: I will, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Schieck, you may proceed,

## **DEFENDANT'S CLOSING ARGUMENT**

MR, SCHIECK: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm gonna try not to be too long up here. But I'm sure you can understand the importance --

MS. DiGIACOMO: Sorry,

XIX-150

burden is to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt of every element of the crime charged.

This case has been sort of different than a lot of cases in that it seems like it's been presented in such a fashion that the prosecution is actually defending themselves from the lack of evidence and trying to convince you that somehow they've proven anything in this case,

The theory of this case —

MR. KEPHART: Your Honor, I'm gonna object to that. There is absolutely nothing to suggest that except for I know it's argument, but when he's doing that he's disparaging the State with regards to that type of argument. That's inappropriate and he knows better than that.

THE COURT: The Court's gonna overrule the objection.

MR. SCHIECK: How many times in this case are examination of witnesses, whether it was their witness, Dr. Simms, the expert, the coroner that came in, or Dr. Laufer or Mr., Turvey, how many times were questions posed with this, isn't it possible it happened this way? Isn't it possible that Blaise was there? Isn't it possible that it was a 4 inch knife? Well, actually it's much more likely it's a 6 inch blade. Well wait a minute, that doesn't fit our facts in this case, Isn't it possible it was a 4 inch knife? And the doctor, Dr. Simms was,

XIX-152

MR. SCHIECK: -- of making whatever points need to be made in this case. And after listening to that closing argument you can be assured there are a number of points that need to be made in this case.

However, rather than go directly into those, rest assured I will get to those. I'm going to focus on what my argument was planned to be before we listened to that story,

As I was sitting there I was counting some interesting language used by the prosecutor in her closing. And quite frankly I lost track after awhile of how many times she said it's possible it happened this way. Somehow this came to pass, Somehow Blaise came into contact with Mr. Bailey. Somehow they ended up at the dumpster. Somehow they think Mr, Bailey had drugs when he was a homeless person. Somehow they believe there's evidence that there was a sex for drugs thing going on. Somehow, somehow, somehow, somehow. It goes on and on and on.

And then there's a switch later on, and it's sort of like well, look at this, there's nothing to disprove this, therefore it must be true.

You have to remember when we come into a criminal case, any criminal case, whether it's a murder case, whether it is a drug case, whatever type of criminal case in the United States, the State has the burden. And in this case their

well, it's more likely it was a 6 inch blade to do this damage. And then they showed him the picture and said well maybe it was two cuts. You see where there's kind of a little thing up there at the top of the cut, maybe it was two cuts with a 4 Inch knife. And on cross he said well, the way that the penis was being held could very well account for that mark, not the fact that it was a 4 inch blade.

And if you do go back and listen to Blaise's statement, which I urge you to do because there's no evidence in that statement that's gonna convict her in this case, she indicates to the detective how large -- or how long the blade was on her knife. And Detective Thowsen said you're holding up your fingers, about 3 and a half inches. So she didn't even say it was a 4 inch blade. Detective Thowsen estimated she was showing him a 3 and a half inch blade. Which again, their expert says wasn't used in this case.

Well, isn't it possible? I suppose anything's possible. That's their case against Blaise Lobato. Isn't it possible, and somehow this happened.

Sometimes you have to wonder why we're here in a case like this. And if you think about it and you've had, lord knows, almost four full weeks now to think about why we're here with the evidence that doesn't exist in this case, And the answer will come to you if you sit back and take a look at the

XIX-153

NV v. LUBA! 0 \_\_\_\_\_\_ 10/5/06

way this case went from the very beginning.

State wants you to focus in on a couple of things that happened at the beginning and then forget everything else in the case as if it doesn't matter, it's not important. The lack of physical evidence, not important. The last of corroboration, not important. The fact that there's an alibi, not important. Why isn't it important? Well, it's important because it was never investigated in this case by the people that were assigned to investigate homicide cases in Clark County.

What happened in this case is that snap judgment was made to arrest Blaise Lobato in Panaca, Nevada and for the next 5 years the State and the detectives have attempted to prove their case after they made the arrest, instead of doing it the right way and getting your facts right before you arrest someone and charge them with murder.

Let's look at some of the things that happened at the beginning of this case, There's a body found by Mr. Shed, and it's found sonieilme on the evening of July 8" • He's not sure exactly what time he found it. He says he didn't call the police right away. He didn't want to get blamed for this But indeed, he did call the police and Officer Testa responded at 10:36 p.m. on the E3<sup>th</sup> of July, 2001.

Detective -- excuse me, Officer Testa determines

XIX-154

that, in fact, he has a dead body here and does the correct thing, backs out of the scene. He's positive the footprints were there, At least Officer Testa is able to tell us that so we don't have to listen to, isn't it possible that one of the many crime scene analysts or officers or other people that were inside the crime scene tracked blood around in there? Officer Testa was clear, those prints at 10:36 were there when I got there.

It's not clear when they finally got around to photographing those footprints because they were at the scene for an awful long period of time doing a variety of things, collecting evidence, discarding evidence, things of that nature,

Crime scene analysts arrived. We heard from Crime Scene Analyst Ford, We heard from Crime Scene Analyst Renhard testified. They get there and their job is now to preserve the crime scene, to collect evidence. And what do we hear from Mr. Ford about how they collected evidence, because there was a lot of garbage there at the scene. He says decisions were being made to put things in bags and that those bags were later transported and looked at back at the lab, and if they felt it wasn't important they discarded it.

You'll recall that we got into that on crossexamination. And I asked him, I said did you log in even what you impounded? No, there's no record of what we impounded. Did you log in what tests you did on those items that you discarded? No, there's no record of that. Did you make a list of the things you threw away? No, we didn't make a list of anything that we threw away. What you have are the few things that we decided to collect that might have some value in this case.

While they were at the scene they obviously saw the footprints. We've seen the photographs where they came in and put the camera with the tripod over the top of the footprint in order to take a one on one photograph. Which while I was talking to Mr. Geller, cross-examining him, he referred to is how we did it in the olden days. So at least in 2001 we were still in the olden days and that's how they did it. Because they felt of all the evidence that they discarded in the case, that those footprints had evidentiary value. Why else would they have photographed that? Why else would they have gone to Mr. Shaft and said, could we take a look at your feet, at your shoes to see whether or not it's you that left those footprints, and they eliminated him as being the person that left the footprint.

So in this case of the one person other than police officers that has been shown to have been in the dumpster, we know it wasn't him that left those footprints, because he was eliminated when they examined his feet,

XIX-156

From that the State gets back to their isn't it possible that it was someone else? Well, it's possible someone beamed in there, left those footprints and beamed out too. But there's no evidence of that. And what the State has to do in a criminal case to convict someone is to prove the facts, to prove it happened, not come in here and say isn't it possible. Isn't it possible that they're prosecuting an innocent person? Isn't that a possibility in this case if they want to talk about possibilities?

So they're at the scene for a long time\_Coroner Investigator Shelley Pierce-Stauffer is called from the coroner's office because the coroner's office is the one that makes the declaration of death and then transports the body to the morgue -- or to the medical examiner's office for the autopsyr And she declares death, according to Detective Thowsen's testimony, at 3:50 a.m. on the 9<sup>th</sup> of July, so the next morning. So we know the police are there from 10:36 when Officer Testa arrives until at least 3:50 when Shelley Pierce-Stauffer declares death, indicating full rigor mortis, which we'll get back to the importance of that declaration at 3:50 a.m.

Shelley Pierce-Stauffer tells us that when she's there she actually is in the crime scene helping remove some of the debris from the body. She's not a crime scene analyst, she's a coroner investigator, but she's helping out apparently\_ And

she physically sees these paper towels stuffed in the opening of where the penis was removed from She is dear on that She didn't even want to see her report when she testified to refresh her recollection, because she said that's not gonna refresh my recollection. If it's in my report, it's in my report. That doesn't refresh what I remember, But I remember those towels and I remember them taking those paper towels and putting them into a paper bag. And I held up one of the bags, and you'll get all of this evidence when you got back into the jury room to deliberate.

But you'll see these bags are designed to document items that you take so that you can take them back to the lab with the name of the person who impounded the evidence and sealed it and they put their number on there. And that way we know what evidence is impounded in the case.

The evidence of paper towels that are stuffed into the wound, it's fair to assume would've been put there by someone that was involved in the death. What a ripe source of information to have to test to see if there's fingerprints. Someone would've had to touch those towels to put them in there, for DNA, for hair, for other materials that might've been on those, yet those disappear. Those were discarded at the — apparently at Metro they were looked at and discarded, one of the things that Mr. Ford talked about.

X1X-158

And she recalled that they were under the plastic. And you've got the photographs. You look at those photographs and decide whether or not you can see that the plastic that is wrapped around the sides, and you can see that in the photographs, is not over those paper towels.

Now that plastic you'll see in the picture gets pulled back, and the papers towels are gone. There's no more paper towels. You see a picture over, pulled back, towels gone. You can see the penis has been amputated, which means the towels had to be moved in order to see the penis was amputated because they were shoved in the holes. Those towels are lost. The plastic is put back on the body because we see it. It appears at the morgue, along with some loose cigarettes that were on the body, according to the pictures at the scene, that were just laying in the body bag.

Now that plastic is in evidence. The plastic that you'll see was molded, as if with hands, around the body of the deceased person. To this day has never been tested by anyone. It's in evidence. Look at the bag. We had testimony on it I had them look and said is there any tape on here showing that any of this has been tested? Never tested, Something that in all likelihood had to be touched by the perpetrator, never tested.

They finish up at the crime scene, collecting

whatever they decided they were gonna collect and not discard. They take some fingerprints. And we had testimony that they found one on the beer can and one on the surge suppressor. If those fingerprints had come back to Blaise Lobato, you can be sure that the State would be standing up and saying slam dunk guilty, she was there, she did it, case over, case closed.

But because it's not hers, don't worry about that, That's not important, that someone else was there and touched the beer can and touched the surge suppressor that's over the body. Don't worry about that, because it's possible that she was there and didn't leave any fingerprints, didn't touch a thing in there.

Or then again, isn't it possible that they wasn't there and that's why they have no evidence? Isn't that more likely from a scientific standpoint to say the lack of evidence speaks volumes in this case. The lack of physical connection to the scene speaks volumes that they've got the wrong person and haven't proven their case?

But it's possible that she was there and that she did this, didn't touch anything, didn't get blood on her hands and touch anything, didn't leave a single fingerprint behind anywhere. They've talked about Mr. Ford getting into the dumpster and looking around and there was a lot of garbage

XIX-160

in the back, and it appeared that maybe someone had gotten in the dumpster and thrown the garbage out to cover the body. There's no prints inside the dumpster. There's no prints on anything that match to Blaise Lobato. But it's possible under the State's burden of proof in this case that she did. Well, the burden of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt. It's not it's possible.

The detectives get finished up and they return to the homicide department, and apparently there's still police officers on the scene with the tape up and Mr. Ford is still there. Because low and behold, on that Sunday morning -- excuse me, that Monday morning, Diane Parker walks up and says, you know, I might know who that guy is, I was a victim of a rape a week ago and that's the guy that did it, and I want to know if it's the guy.

Well, Mr. Ford, according to Detective Thowsen, calls him and gives him this information, And homicide Detective Thowsen gets his partner LaRochelle, who we didn't hear from in this case, and I think he said Sergeant Manning went with him and they went out and talked to Diane Parker at her apartment. Now her apartment is fairly close to the scene. You heard him describe that. It's over the wall in the next apartment complex. Not quite on the aerial photograph but very close. He said it's easily within walking distance. And he

IS

goes over there and he talks to her to find out, you know, what she knows. He's invited in apparently and they look around. They see some knives in the kitchen, they ask to look at the footwear and they look at the footwear. Thank you very much, and they leave. They don't take a taped statement and they leave.

In fact, at one point in his testimony I think there was a question from the jury that talked about well, why didn't you do more checking into the other people that were there in the apartment complex that had witnessed the altercation between Mr. Bailey and Ms. Parker. And he said well, it was a long day and we were getting tired and at some point you just gotta, you know, call it a day.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$  KEPHART: Your Honor, objection. And may we approach, please?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Off-record bench conference from 4:54:02-4:56:35 p.m.)

MR. !KEPHART: Judge, I'm gonna withdraw that objection

THE COURT: All right.

MR, SCHIECK: I think we were talking about Diane Parker and that Detective Thowsen had been over there and talked with her and gotten some preliminary information from her. He further testified that he went back and took a taped

XIX-162

statement from her on July 23 <sup>rd</sup> and showed her a photograph of Mr. Bailey and Mr. Bailey -- excuse me, Ms. Parker was able to identify Mr. Bailey, and that's when she gave her taped statement.

Now let's just contrast that scenario. You have an individual at the crime scene who lives in the neighborhood, who says she knows or thinks she knows the person that's been killed, and that she's been a victim within the last week of a sexual assault by this person. That's the information that Detective Thowsen gets when he goes over to talk to her the first time. Doesn't take a crime scene analyst, doesn't record a statement, doesn't spray luminol around and look for any blood evidence at that point in time. And this is still -- the blood is still fresh, Doesn't do anything other than look around, kick the tires in the apartment and say I'm moving on, and goes back to the homicide office.

Contrast that now, someone who knows the victim, has a motive, lives in the area, and is at the scene asking about it, to the next information he gets on the case, which is two weeks later because nothing happens during the next two weeks He gets a phone call from Laura Johnson in Panaca, Nevada, 170 miles away, who tells him that someone told her what someone else told the other person. So we have third hand hearsay now. Someone told Dixie who told Laura, and

this information now comes to Detective Thowsen, What does he do? He gets a crime scene analyst, and Maria Thomas testified when she got the assignment to go up there, she thought that she was going to impound a car. She takes all of her crime scene analyst materials with her, apparently including a camera, because we have photographs that she took when she got there.

And Detective Thowsen grabs his partner and they immediately rush up to Panaca 170 miles away, talk to Laura Johnson, go and talk to 18 year old Blaise Lobato at her house. And in the very first parts of the conversation reveal to her that he knows that she's been the victim of a sexual assault as a small child, that she'd been hurt in the past, causing her to break into tears because he had checked that out when he was back in Las Vegas and had the reports -- or had the information that she had been a victim in the past. Uses that to get her emotional, takes a 30 minute statement from her, gets a consent to search and impounds a pair of black high heel shoes, and you've seen photographs of those. Ask yourself whether those shoes match the footprints you see at the scene of the crime.

But he impounds them, he takes them, and they have a small spot of Blaise's blood on the big toe area, as I recall the testimony. No blood from the scene, nothing to tie

XDC-I64

those shoes to the scene. Takes photographs of Blaise, takes photographs of her hands, takes photographs of her car, seals her car up, puts it on a tow truck that's already been arranged, and loads her in the car and zips her back to Las Vegas. Just based on the thirdhand hearsay from Laura Johnson and the contents of the interview he does with her.

He does not get a statement from the parents, he does not ask Larry Lobato, who is called and does come home and sees Blaise before she's taken away, does not say, you know, where was she at on the 8th, you know? Was she in Las Vegas, was she here? No questions. Doesn't ask Rebecca Lobato, the step-mother, any questions. Doesn't talk to Ashley who lives there in the house, doesn't ask her any questions, doesn't go next door and knock on the door and say, you know, we're investing a homicide and we have a suspect who's Blaise, what can you tell us? It happened on July 8 , Maybe we should check this out and do some investigation before we arrest someone.

No, they arrest her, load her in the car, drive her 170 miles back to Las Vegas. Don't put the tape recorder back on, have further conversations with her, during which she volunteers that now she remembers that her father had given her that -- the particular knife that she was talking about.

At her house she had signed a consent to search

XDC-165

card, had waived her Miranda Rights. At the jail she gives up her shoes. They take a buccal swab from her. She's cooperating with them every step of the way.

Now they have the 18 year old girl down from Panaca without her parents at the jail, in a holding cell. Do they take another interview with her? Maybe she's calmed down now. Maybe they could get more information. Maybe they're gonna followup on her statement that this happened over 30 days ago. Gee, Detective Thowsen, might that not be a fact you want to ask about, is that she's talking about something that happened more than 30 days ago, which would've put it way before July 8th?

No further questions. Click, machine goes off, no further questioning. We solved our case. We have someone in custody. We submitted to the DA to prosecute. Well, maybe we should do some investigation now. Now that we've already made up our minds, let's do the investigation to justify the arrest we've made. And that's what happens throughout the rest of the investigation. It's pointed in one direction and one direction only. What could we do to come up with something to convict Blaise Lobato? Because we've made up our mind, because she said the magic word penis, that this is the same case that she's talking about. Let's ignore everything else.

XIX-166

Well, okay, let's not ignore it, let's call it something else Let's say, oh, if it doesn't fit she's minimizing, okay, because she said she was attacked by an old -- or excuse me, by a smelly black man, and that she defended herself and that she cut his penis or tried to cut his penis off. Listen to the statement for the exact words. That's all that has to match in his mind to make this case. Forget everything else, that's enough in his mind.

Well, she said it was at the Budget Suites on Boulder Highway, and that she could see the fountain. She doesn't say it was behind a dumpster, she said she had just gotten out of her car, it was next to her car. Well, she must be minimizing those facts because they don't fit. If it doesn't fit its minimization, If it kinda sounds like something we can use, now she's telling the truth.

They want you to convict Blaise solely on what's in that statement, and want you to ignore everything else that exists in this case. And that's why they have to go, isn't is possible, and somehow, maybe it happened this way, ignore everything else, because she said penis when she was interviewed by Detective Thowsen.

Why didn't Metro investigate other suspects in this case? They talk about well, we talked to the manager of the apartment complex and we got some names and we ran

scopes and we didn't — we didn't see anything in there that would give us an indication that we need to investigate any further, Well, they ran Blaise and all they found out is she'd been a victim in the past. But they sure ran up there real quick to arrest her.

Do they go knock on a door and say, you know, guy got killed over here behind a bank and it's the same guy that raped Diane Parker, and we understand maybe you witnessed," you know, some of that situation, Could you tell us what you know? Where were you at on July 8 th, by the way? Those tennis shoes you're wearing, do you mind if we look at your tennis shoes? That would've been real easy to do, wouldn't it?

No, because they've already got Blaise in custody. They've made their case. Let's forget looking at anything else that happens in this case. Let's forget about talking to anybody up in Panaca that wants to talk about the case and tell us what happened.

Now Mr. and Mrs. Lobath's daughter has just be arrested in Panaca, whisked away in a car, and the detective doesn't even remember if he left his name and his card as to where he was taking their daughter. Panaca's a small town, and you can pretty much guess that when the out of town police rolled in in front of the Lobato house and the tow truck is hauling away Blaise's car, and Sheriff -- Deputy Sheriff Cary

X:IY-168

Lee and Maribah Cowley are running around in their marked cars, that everybody in Panaca at one time was out watering their lawn to see what was going on, On July 20 th, the very day she was arrested, you could bet that spread through the entire town in minutes. Over the fence, over the phone, down at the grocery store, you know that was the topic of conversation, that Blaise had been arrested and her red Fiero with her "fornicator" license plate had been towed away by homicide out of Las Vegas,

What are reasonable parents to do? Just do nothing and sit there and wonder what's going on, or do you try to figure out what happened? Do you talk to people? They knew Blaise had been there from the 2 <sup>nd</sup> to the 9<sup>th</sup>, At that point it's the 20<sup>th</sup>, it's just a matter of going back and doing things to refresh your recollection as to where you were and what you did. Things such as phone records, things such as medical bills, you know. We took her to the doctor, what day was that? Let's look at the bill, it's July 5 <sup>th</sup>. You don't make that up. You don't make up phone calls. You don't make phone calls during that week trying to set up an alibi for Blaise.

But Mr. Bailey wasn't killed until the 8, so why would anything that happened on the rd, 4th, 5th, 6, or 7th have any relation with trying to set up this alibi? These witnesses came in and recollected to the best of their ability as

XD<-167

to what was transpiring that week. We gave them a calendar and had them write their names, put their initials down as to what they could remember. If they didn't remember we didn't have them mark it down on there. Nobody wants them to make things up in this case.

3o Anne Dennert, the next door neighbor, doesn't really even socialize with the Lobatos. But she remembers it's her -- it was her long time friend Dale Towery's birthday on the 8<sup>th</sup>, and that when she was doing her dishes, looking out into her front yard, that Blaise whipped a big turn in the middle of the street in front of her house riding a four-wheeler. She must've been doing her dishes because that's where the window's at that she saw her through. And she recalls that she sent her friend an e-mail that day because it was his birthday and she knows his birthday is July 8th.

Those are facts you can't make up. You can't make up somebody's birthday. It was her breakfast dishes and she indicated she's not sure of the exact time, but she knows when she does her dish she, it's when the kids are taking their nap, and she knows when the kids take their nap, it's usually between 11:00 and 1:00. It's not a fact that Becky Lobato went over there and said Jo Anne, don't you remember you were doing your dishes looking out and saw this, and it just happened to be Dale's birthday? That's not a made up --

X1X-170

Becky What° forced her to say that? Is that the State's position? I suppose that's possible, but it doesn't fit. There's too much corroboration for everything else in this case to say Jo Anne Dennert is making that up.

You saw Mr. and Mrs. McCroskey. Is it reasonable for you to believe that Becky Lobato is putting the strong arms on the McCroskeys to say, Mrs. McCroskey, I know you've lived here for 75 years, but could you go ahead and give an alibi for Blaise and say that car never moved when she came back? Could you do triat for me? Do you think Mrs. McCroskey would do that for her? Or Mr. McCroskey, who every morning would go for a walk and the car was right there on the street, and if it wasn't there he would've noticed it wasn't there?

Yet the State in their closing argument come up here and put a slide up that says on July 6 <sup>th</sup> Blaise Lobato got in her red Hero with "fornicator" plates, went to Las Vegas and got on a three day binge, culminating in the death of Mr. Bailey, and then high tailed it back to Panaca. But somehow no one ever saw that car move.

And you've seen the photographs of where the car was located at. And Mr. and Mrs McCroskey sat right there and the State asked them well, couldn't it have been a little bit further the other direction? And both of them, to my recollection, and it's your recollection that counts, said no, that

looks about where it was at the whole time, it didn't move, was parked right there.

Well, if it was parked there how did Blaise drive it to Las Vegas? And if she didn't drive it to Las Vegas then why would all this stuff about cleaning the car have any relevance at all in this case because the car wouldn't have been a the Nevada State Bank because it didn't move. And so if the car's not there, there's no reason to need to hide the car. There's no reason to clean the car out, the car wasn't even there at Nevada State Bank.

Now we could probably expect this, it's possible that she took someone else's car and went to Las Vegas for those three days. I don't remember where my car was at back then, maybe she took my car too. But there's no evidence of that. There's no one that came in here and said she took my car, she ever drove my car, my car was missing, my car was gone. That's not even their theory. Their theory is it was the red Fiero. The problem is they can't get past the point that the car never moved. All the witnesses that came in here, not one said that car moved, and certainly not for three days.

Well, they hadn't made the left on July 6<sup>u,</sup> argument at the point in time when they asked Mrs. McCroskey. But they said Mrs. McCroskey, what time do you go to bed? Well, I go to bed at, 11 o'clock I think she said, whatever you recall.

XIX-172

And then I get up the next morning at 7:00 or 7:00'ish. Well, isn't it possible the car left, you know, while you were asleep? She said yeah, it's possible, I was asleep. How would I know the car left? All I know is every time I looked out my window the car was there, and every time during that time period the car was there.

On cross-examination I asked her well, do you usually sleep between 9:50 in the morning and 3:50 in the afternoon on a Sunday? She gave me a little look like what the heck is that? She said rux

Well, why did that question have any relevance at all? It's because Dr. Simms, the State's doctor, came in here and told you the time of death, to his best estimation. And doctors can pinpoint the exact second someone died without a stopwatch and being there and observing it happen, so he can only give you a range of timer And his testimony was, to a reasonable medical certainty, it was 12 to 18 hours. It could've been longer and it could've been shorter. And he said he would be more certain if you went to 10 to 24 or 8 to 24, because that's a wider range of time. But to a reasonable medical certainty, it was 12 to 18 hours, which is 3:50 in the afternoon to 9:50 in the morning, or 9:50 in the morning to 3:50 in the afternoon.

For the car to have been gone and Ms. McCroskey

not see it, she would've had to have been taking a nap. She wasn't taking a nap and the car wasn't gone when Mr, Bailey was killed to a reasonable medical certainty.

Now a reasonable medical certainty is a different standard than a reasonable doubt. But you have to take that testimony and decide whether or not reasonable medical certainly, Blaise was in Panaca between 9:50 in the morning on Sunday until 3:50 in the afternoon. She could not have committed this crime.

The State wants you to go back to the 24 hour time frame, which is not — which is to a greater probability. But as the doctor described, it's a bell curve. This is the bigger probability. As you get out toward the edges it flattens out. I'm sure you're all familiar with bell curves.

I tried to draw one, sort of like that, a bell curve. And the greater probability is the major portion of it. And if she -- if you believe she was there during that period of time which the death occurred to a reasonable medical certainty, you must equip.

Now I thought it would be great if I tried to put all the other testimony in that related to the alibi in order to cover the reasonable medical certainty time, as you can see, it's a little bit difficult to do. I'm gonna try to do that by arguing with you

XV-174

We know that -- we have testimony from Mr. Kraft that he went over to the Lobato house at 7:00 arm, in the morning, and that Mr. Kraft had an assignment that he was gonna be taken away to Minnesota, away from his family and his pregnant wife, and he was sure it was that day because it was that day he fell asleep on the couch and got the crick in his neck and had to go to the doctor the next day, and we had the medical bills that show, in fact he did go to the doctor on the 9<sup>th</sup>. Corroborates his recollection that it was the 8' that he went and saw Larry, went home, fell asleep, got the crick.

Andwe know from his wife that she was over there later that evening at 6 o'clock, and he remembers that day too because he had to go get his wife to come home to make dinner and that the chicken fried steak that she made wasn't so good, You know, whether that had anything to do with the fact that he was in pain from his neck, we know that the next day he went to the doctor 'cause we had the medical bills,

Larry Lobato remembered that Mr. Kraft came over and saw him at 7 o'clock in the morning. Now the 7 o'clock in the morning time relates to the further out time period, the 24 hours that is absolute comfort as the time frame of possibility for the time of death. But you have to remember also that you've got the drive time from Las Vegas back to Panacar

If John Kraft knocks on the door at 7 o'clock in the

morning in Sunday morning and Blaise answers the doors and appears that she was asleep, it's a two and a half to three hour drive from, according to the witnesses that testified and were asked those questions, from Las Vegas back to Panaca, because it's 170 miles with three speed zones in there, You have to slow down when you go through Alamo, and you have to slow down when you go through Caliente, and you have to slow down to make the turn as you're coming into Panaca.

We heard that from Mr. Boucher who hs no ax to grind in this case. Worked for the Department of Transportation for how many ever years he said, a long time, lived in the area for a long time. He knows how long the drive is. So you have to go back from 7 o'clock back even earlier than that for her to drive back, get her jammies on and get into the futon. Takes us back -- if you take a three hour drive to 7 o'clock, it takes you back to 4 o'clock in the morning, which is only 10 minutes away from the time frame the doctor said is the outside of the possibility of time of death.

Andyou have testimony from Rebecca Lobato who has a routine that she follows when she goes to work in the morning. She gets up at 5:45, walks out of the bedroom they sleep in, past where Blaise was sleeping during that week, goes out, starts the coffee, goes to the garage and has a cigarette, 'cause that's the first thing that she does in the

XIX-176

morning is have that cigarette,, And that Blaise was there at 5:45 a,m, on Sunday morning, because she worked on that Sunday. That was the last day before she does her double back on Mondays.

She says Blaise was there, Blaise was asleep. That corroborates John Kraft saying at 7 o'clock when he knocked on the door he woke her up. Mrs. Lobato says she usually leaves a little bit after 7:00 to go to work to make it to Caliente for her 8 o'clock shift, and she's usually early,

So now you've got 5:45 Blaise is at home in bed asleep. Three hours to drive to Las Vegas from 5:45 in the morning, now we're back to 2 o'clock in the morning. This is outside the possible range given to us by the State's doctor, Dr. Simms- So Blaise couldn't be there to kill Duran Bailey, and perhaps that explains why there's no physical evidence at the scene that ties her to Duran Bailey's death. That's why there's no blood on her shoes. That's why her feet don't match the footprints. That's why her fingers don't match the fingerprints. That's why her car doesn't match the tire tracks at the scene because it wasn't her car.

Well, we already knew it wasn't her car because everybody in Panaca, including the McCroskeys, say the car was in Panaca. How could it leave the skid marks?

MR. KEPHART: Your Honor, I'm gonna object to the

X1X-175

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

term "everybody in Panaca",

2

4

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. SCHIECK: I'll rephrase, Your Honor. That's incorrect,

Everybody in Panaca that testified in this case said the car was there,

MR, KEPHART: Your Honor, I'm gonna object to that too. McCroskeys never said that they remember seeing it on specific days.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. SCHIECK: Now the McCroskeys -- and I'm not gonna go over this in detail, but they said the car never moved\_

If the tire tracks didn't look fresh, the skid marks that went up over the curb didn't look fresh, why did they take the time to document them, to photograph them so that they could compare it to other tires? Did they have so much time on their hands that they said let's check out these tire tracks? Or is it because they looked fresh and could be associated with the crime, and was important enough to document, important enough to check against the red Fiero and get a negative result that excluded her car as leaving those,

Is it possible that those tire tracks weren't related to Duran Bailey's death? Yes. Is it possible they were? Yes,

X1X-178

And if they were, it excludes Blaise's red Fiero, which shoots down that she drove the car to back to Las Vegas for a quicky trip to do drugs and buy drugs or whatever else theory we're going to hear about. Is it possible? Anything's possible in this case\_

When the framers of the constitution got together and put together the Bill of Rights that apply to criminal cases, to every citizen in America, they didn't say, you know what, we think the prosecutors in order to convict have to prove that it's possible that someone committed a crime. They don't -- they didn't say well, let's say that if they can come up with a somehow she might've committed this crime, you should convict her. They didn't say if it's probable, they said beyond a reasonable doubt they have to prove their case, And in this case they haven't proven anything, other than they did a poor investigation, they discarded evidence, they didn't test evidence, they're still testing evidence. As of last week they were still testing the cigarette butts, trying to find that piece of evidence that they can come into court and say ah hah, physical evidence is important because now we've got some Unfortunately, it came out the other way. If the trial would've lasted longer, maybe there would've been more testing done, but there hasn't been. And they haven't proven Blake Lobato is guilty of anything in this case,

XIX-179

You heard the testimony, I'm not gonna reiterate all of it. I've talked more than enough time on this. The gum that was someone else's DNA mixed with Bailey's, it excludes Blaise. The fingerprints, the ones they could match, exclude Blaise. The cigarettes exclude Blaise, The hair, which was tested just on the verge of trial, excludes Blaise. The hair from the pubic combing that has the DNA of another person in a crime that their doctor testified appeared to be sexually motivated. It includes an amputation of the penis and they find a hair someone's DNA that doesn't belong to the defendant. And the State wants you to think that that's not important, that it's possible it someone else's. They wouldn't be saying that if it came back to Blaise.

And it's interesting to recall back to the testimony that even some of this evidence that was collected in the rape kit was sent to a Myriad Labs, and they did some additional testing on the penal and anal swabs where they detective spermatozoa. But they had the entire kit and didn't test that hair, the hair that was in the pubic combings. And I believe it was Mr. Wall that testified is because it costs too much money, and that's why they didn't test it with Myriad Labs, Well, they did test it before the trial actually started, but it excludes Blaise Lobato.

And so perhaps we wouldn't even be here if

X1X-180

Detective Thowsen had bothered to investigate this case before he made his arrest and charged the wrong person, and then tried to justify his arrest through piece by piece investigation and testing over a period of years.

They've talked about well, you've — you know, witnesses were listed in October of 2005 and that's the last time -- the first time they were listed. Well, that's a year ago. Go out and interview them, Detective Thowsen, go out and talk to them. Why are you listed as a witness? What do you got to say? Not one ounce of effort to check out anything in this case that was told to him by Blaise Lobato.

He did swing by the Budget Suites and look around a little bit. Didn't take a crime scene analyst then, Really didn't care too much apparently because he had already made up his mind.

They did call someone from Budget Suites to come in and testify, Zachary Robinson, which is kind of interesting because he didn't even work there at the time I think they would've found someone to come in that actually had some knowledge of what was going on at Budget Suites during that period of time instead of somebody that was hired after the fact. That's the investigation they did on the Budget Suites,

And listen to that tape. Blaise is telling them about an incident that happened at Budget Suites. And after it

<u>NV v. LOBATO</u> 10/5/06

happened I took my car to Jeremy's, and Jeremy says yes, the car was here, Jeremy denies that he did anything to the car, but he verifies the car was there. It corroborates that Blaise was talking about something at Budget Suites more than a month ago when she talked to the detective. He didn't want to hear that. He wanted to hear that he had solved Duran Bailey's death, and that's all he focused on. Nothing else in this case.

And they come in and criticize Dixie because she recalls that Blaise told her it was a larger man, And she was very specific about that, that in talking to Blaise for the three hours that she talked to her, that she said was he as big as -- and I forget the name -- so and so? But finally he got to her grandson, as big as him? And Blaise said bigger, and she described how big he was.

And when Biaise talked to Detective Thowsen back on July 20<sup>th</sup>, she said the guy towered over her, that he was much bigger than she was. Doesn't fit, It doesn't fit Duran Bailey in this case, And I questioned Detective Thowsen about that, she said it was a much bigger guy, and he said well, to her he probably seemed much bigger. He was 160 pounds. And I said well, at the autopsy he was hundred and something else, 136. Well, that was due to blood loss. And I said 24 pounds of blood loss, and he kinda wavered on that,

XIX-182

Duran Bailey was 70 inches tall and 133 pounds at the time of his death, according to the autopsy report. And we got that from Detective -- excuse me, from Dr. Simms, Is that someone that towers over you, someone who is much larger? Someone that matches the description told to Dixie?

Blaise was talking about a different incident. And they say well, people that have done meth, when we take statements from them they jumble things up and they can't get things right and they — and they're basically irreliable in what they tell you when you take their interview. But if they tell you something that we're interested in then, well, you gotta believe that, don't you, because that matches because a penis was involved. This must be the right person. Let's just arrest her and figure out the facts later, and that's what happened in this case,

The State has not proven that Blaise committed any crime in this case. And the witnesses and evidence presented by the defense establish that she couldn't have committed this crime, And the defendant doesn't have the burden of establishing their alibi. The constitution says that if a person claims alibi and presents evidence of an alibi, an element of the offense is at issue, and that is who committed the crime. And the State has the burden of disproving the alibi.

Have they presented any evidence, other than

speculation, conjecture, and is it possible to disprove that Blaise was in Panaca at the time Duran Bailey was killed? And the overwhelming answer has to be no, they have not done that. And you must, therefore, acquit in this case. Thank you.

THE COURT: I'm gonna give the jury a 10 minute stretch break at this time.

Ladies and gentlemen, in 10 minutes please be in the hallway, the bailiff will meet you there to return you to your seats in the courtroom.

During the recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves nor with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial. And you're not to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with the trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, television, radio, and internet. And you're not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

Court's in recess for 10 minutes.

(Jurors are not present)

(Court recessed at 5:35:07 p.m, until 6:00:40 p.m.)

(Jurors are present)

THE BAILIFF: All rise, please.

Department 2 is back in session. Please be seated.

XIX-184

THE COURT: The record shall reflect we're resuming trial in State versus Kirstin Blaise Lobato under case number C177394 in the presence of the defendant, together with her three counsel, the two prosecuting attorneys are present, and the ladies and gentlemen of the jury have been returned to their seats by the bailiff.

I apologize that that 10 minute recess took a little bit longer than we thought, but I think it will all work out in the long run.

We're proceeding forward with the closing arguments. The State now has the opportunity to make a rebuttal closing.

MR, KEPHART: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kephart, you may proceed,

MR, KEPHART: Thank you.

STATE'S REBUTTAL ARGUMENT

MR, KEPHART: Ladies and gentlemen, this case has been long. You've spent a long time here. Maybe some of you might think that there wasn't a lot of evidence presented during the time frame that we've been here. Maybe some of you might think that there was too much evidence, too much just statements that are being made and no corroborated, whatever.

But let me tell you something. The State is in a

XIX-185

situation where you get to look at direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Circumstantial evidence is evidence which you learn basically from circumstances that happen where people tell you what you hear, commonsense that you may have. Direct evidence is something that the defense is talking about with whether or not you can directly say that Blaise Lobato was in that dumpster area.

Spent a lot of time with that. They spent \$12,000 on an expert to come in here and tell us what we already knew. Tell us that we didn't have anything that said that she was in that dumpster in the form of blood, fingerprints, or anything in that -- hair or whatever.

But we have her words, ladies and gentlemen, her words. We're here -- they said why are we here? We're here because of her mouth, because of what she said. There's no one else, you heard no one else has said anything about cutting a man's penis off in the same vicinity and same time when -- from her ---, other than her.

And what's interesting, Mr. Schieck spent over an hour talking about what he thought how the detectives just bundled the case, the detectives didn't do anything here, detectives didn't find anything here. And didn't talk about Dixie at all, except for the fact, the one time when Dixie came in here and changed her story about what was said about how

XV-186

big this man was It was never said before, never heard before until she comes in here after the defense had provided her with an autopsy report, and they had the audacity to ask her whether or not the State has rehearsed the statements with her.

Sometimes it gets pretty offensive, ladies and gentlemen, when we're in a situation what we have, what we gotta deal with We're dealing with the evidence that is presented to LI and we're presenting it to you. Do you think for a minute that if we wouldn't have tested any of those items that we'd be in here, be applauded? 'Cause what they'd be saying is just what they argued here, isn't it possible that if you would've tested those items it would've came back that our client didn't touch this item or didn't leave more hair or anything?

And they want to — and there he is in the same type of argument and throwing it against us and saying, you know what, possibility is not reasonable doubt -- or is reasonable doubt. Well, ladies and gentlemen, you have to completely throw out all of the statements that the defendant made, let alone her own statement and what she told other people.

And you have to, I guess, just accept, just accept their word. Kinda like their expert says, those blood drops that I see in a photograph is blood is what he says. Even though

our experts were right out there, looked at it, took samples of the footprints, and says it was not blood. You know, and then in the same breath says the luminal test in the car is not blood, even though we had two tests, presumptive tests that said that it's blood.

But he can look at a photo, kinda like the other expert with the scissors, just look at a photo. And you know what's interesting, you know why you heard that, you know why you heard that information, ladies and gentlemen? You know why they found that man to say that, is because they want you to believe that a person used scissors to kill him and not a knife. Because Blaise Blaise, herself, her words, told the detective she used a knife to cut the man's penis off.

You know, she told Michele she's depressed because she thought she'd killed him,, She told — Rusty heard the word "cut the penis off". She told Dixie. And you know, it just -- it's interesting that they want to basically tell you to completely disregard circumstantial evidence, There's an instruction that specifically tells you you can look at it, and you give it the same degree of weight you would give direct evidence. The law does not recognize a difference in them other than the way you get 'em. There's no difference in the value.

And it's interesting also when they talk to you and tell you well, we've proven an alibi, we've proven that she

X1X-188

wasn't here. Well, it's interest -- the interest in that is that when Dixie comes in here, you saw her, you saw what was going on with her. She did not want to be here, she did not want to point the finger at that lady right there. She changed her story, she fought with the State. And where's she from? She's from Panaca where Mrs. Lobato, who was in here earlier, was going around telling people, remember the  $\ell_1$ 

Well, you know what's also interesting, ladies and gentlemen, in a previous proceeding, the  $\,_8$ th was all that was testified about,,

MR. SCHIECK: Objection, Your Honor,

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. SCHIECK: There's no evidence of what was and wasn't.

MR. KEPHART: Oh, well, Ms. Lobato, I'll tell you.

Ms. Lobato, when she testified before in her testimony here —

MR. SCHIECK: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Would counsel please approach?

(Off-record bench conference from 6:07:23-6:08:10 p.m.)
MR. KEPHART: And I want to apologize, I need to

clear it up. I'm talking about Rebecca Lobato. Rebecca
Lobata in her previous testimony —

THE COURT: Overruled,

MR. KEPHART: Thanks Judge.

XIX-189

<u>\|\V\ v.\ LOBATO\</u>

-- told -- testified before that at the times that she remembered seeing the defendant and testified about the day on the  $8^{\,\text{th}}$ , in the afternoon on the  $8^{\,\text{th}}$ , she went to work that day. She never said anything about seeing her before she went to work, getting up and seeing her laying on the floor or laying on the futon or whatever, She went to work, saw her in the afternoon.

And for the first time -- and also we hear from Mr. Lobato, He comes in here and now he tells you that at 7 o'clock in the morning John, who we hear from the first time, came over and woke me up and asked me on that particular day, when he was leaving a week later, to help out with checking with my family when I'm gone, the first time.

And what's interesting as well is that Ashley Lobato, if you look at the time frame. The time frame is clear that what we're talking about with reference to when this occurred and how the defendant fits this story about driving back to Las Vegas and getting orl her methamphetamine, she's -- she's in Panaca, ladies and gentlemen, for a weekend or a week with her family over the e of July. What is she doing? She's fighting with her mom. Her mom admits to that, that they're fighting. Her mom admits that she uses methamphetamine, her daughter, to get away from the problems that she has with her family, and the arguments that she has with her mom.

XIX-190

And she leaves Panaca and goes back to Las Vegas, to do what? We're talking about a methamphetamine addict that has problems with methamphetamine, can't control her methamphetamine, wants to get it any time she can, breaks her boyfriend and girlfriend relationships up, can't -- says she's out of control, and she's just gonna sit around in beautiful Panaca and do nothing.

Medical records say she didn't have any methamphetamine in her on the 5<sup>th</sup>. So what is she doing, just sifting around doing nothing. She just got a new boyfriend. You heard from Doug. She just moved in with him and she went -- Doug said they wanted to get together but there was a barbeque on the 4<sup>th</sup>, She went to the doctor the next day because apparently there was some kind of appointment. They went and made that.

She left, came back to Las Vegas, according to her statement, and spent three days on a binge. You look at the phone records. You can see from the phone records that there's a lot of activity going on around that time where the mom's calling work, mom's calling Doug, mom's calling the sheriff's department, for what she says in a previous statement -- previous testimony, looking for a truck, Now she remembers because Larry Lobato came in here for the first time and says it was 'cause she was wearing a jumpsuit, or

getting a jumpsuit,

Well, there's another phone call later. Remember Larry said he went to summer camp like on the 22<sup>nd</sup>? Well, there's a phone call to the sheriff's on the 21'. Isn't it reasonable that's when he got called to get the jumpsuit?

Well, it's interesting is that you have all these people come in here. And you know what's so cool about this is that her own sister, her own sister, when they asked about whether. or not she saw her on the dates of the 5 th, 6th and 7th in that area, I don't remember not seeing her. This is this young lady who's just starting her own career, and she's sitting in here under oath to tell the truth, and says I don't -- I can't remember not seeing her. Did she say oh, I saw her, we did this, this, this and this. No. The only ones you have marked in this area is Chris Carrington, Chris Carrington, Chris Carrington and Michele Austria. And you heard from Michele Austria that she didn't know if it was this weekend or this weekend,

And Chris Carrington, I mean ladies and gentlemen, you saw his testimony, you saw him up here telling you what he believe had occurred. And you heard his grandma specifically come in here and tell you that she remembered it, she remembered the 5 th because her sister was supposed to be there on the 4th but she was late and she came on the 5th,

XIX-192

She remembers the 5<sup>th</sup>. She remembers Chris coming home and saying I can't deal with the turmoil, they're fighting. Then she got a phone call and he went back up there.

Then on the 6<sup>th</sup> he came home and said they're fighting 'cause she's going to Las Vegas. And he got in here and said no, that's not what was said. But grandma came in and said this is my grandson who's kinda brain dead, and told you about the defendant's —

MR. SCHIECK: I'm gonna object, Your Honor, She didn't call him brain dead.

MR. KEPHART: Oh, yes she did.

MR. SCHIECK: She said lame brain.

THE COURT: Sustained,

MR. KEPHART: Okay.

Anyway, and says I remember on the 7<sup>11</sup> he was with me because I had to have him take me to the hospital and he doesn't even remember that. But yet he remembers sitting with the defendant, working out, didn't seem like she was even -- anything wrong with her. But yet she's supposed to be going to the doctor and everyone else is saying oh, she's tired and she -- she's not herself and she's staying out of company with everybody else. And she says on the 7 <sup>th</sup> he had to take me to the doctor, And then he had to drive to the lake and get my sister who was there and bring her to the doctor

XIX-191

IV V. LOBATO 10/5/06

so we could all be at the hospital.

 And it just -- and what's interesting about their exhibit is no one else talks about that. The I mean I guess you could — would give that to them. The 2" everybody kinda put that -- it was also funny, you know, Chris Carrington says yeah, the 2<sup>nd</sup>, I was there on the 2'. I got up on cross and I said well, you know, Chris, after the defense said you haven't changed anything and you've been consistent all along, and he said yes, and I got up and he goes oh, I gotta change it, I made a mistake, it was the r.

Who's talking about the dates of the 2? Who's rehearsing what? So he changed it, he said the r, Well, that's fine- We don't deny that. I mean we've heard that from a lot of people that she was up there. And it's reasonable to believe that she went up there to see her parents on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July.

But it's also reasonable to believe, ladies and gentlemen, that shg,went -- a person that's wanting methamphetamine, that would jeopardize relationships, would fight with her parents, would use methamphetamine to cope with her problems is just gonna sit out that week. She went back to Las Vegas, ladies and gentlemen, and did exactly what she told the police, a three day binge. You have the 6 th, 7th, and 8th, And on the ir day she killed Duran Bailey.

XD<-194

Now let's talk a little bit about Duran Bailey, We're not here telling you that Duran Bailey is a saint. We've never denied that. Did he -- was he convicted of a sexual assault? No, He didn't have the opportunity to sit here and listen and - sit here and listen to the State presenting a case against him. But for all intensive purposes, I guess we could accept that he raped Diane Parker. Did he take sex from her? Okay, he took sex from her. Did he trade sex for dope? Yes. Did he provide dope to her? Yes.

Defendant -- you heard the defendant has been raped multiple times herself. Matter of fact, to the point where her dad has provided her with teaching her how to fight, giving her a weapon, teaching her how to use the weapon. He's a -- used to be a correction officer, knows tactical defense, is interested in weapons, and this is daddy's little girl that he wants to protect, that he cares about, and yes, he loves her.

And he wants -- he knows she's going down to Las Vegas to do methamphetamine. He knows what the lifestyle is himself. She's going to Las Vegas to do that. Give her a knife. She said I got the knife Christmas from my dad. This knife that she no longer has, that she just happened to get rid of this present from my dad, that she threw her own clothes away, And she -- it's reasonable to believe that she knows

how to use it.

And let me give you a scenario of what happened behind that dumpster. Ladies and gentlemen, she went there, she knew where her connects were, she knew where to get dope. And I'm not even telling you that Duran Bailey was selling her dope. But he knew that he -- he was known to sell dope in the past, he was known to trade dope for sex in the past, and she is on her three day binge and she's out looking for dope. She finds him, believability that she had met him before.

They got back into the back of this dumpster area, and is it unreasonable to believe, ladies and gentlemen, that he decided -- kinda like the scenario we pose their expert about being on the pier, where she wanted the dope, he decided he didn't want to trade it or sell -- I mean he didn't want to give her the dope, or he wanted sex for the dope,

Well -- and then his pants are down around his ankles, and the blood stops after she gets down to the point where she's gonna give him fellatio, and she doesn't like the smell of dirty diapers. How else do you smell that unless you're right next to the person? Smells like dirty diapers, right there. And she doesn't want to do it anymore.

But he's at the point he's got his pants down crumpled down below his knees, and he's standing there with

XA-196

his Johnson out and she doesn't want to do it now. She says in her statement the man's towering over me. Well, if she's on her knees he would be towering over her.

And she's right there and he tries to now make her do it when she's not. That smell, that awful smell, no\_You know, no one is gonna do this to me. No one. It's happened to me before, that's why I have a knife. She stabs him in the bottom of his scrotum and he bleeds\_ And what does he do? What's a manly man gonna do? They're gonna grab themself. Continues to stab at him, fights at him.

Well, you know what, what she told Dixie is what happened. She walked away and she looked back and saw him crying. Well, you know what's interesting about that, is she wasn't concerned about anything but her car because she went back and killed him,, She got her bat and she went back in there.

Now listen to the testimony with this. There was a question about kicking, whether or not a kick could do this as well. Remember the testimony? Doc Simms never said that she -- that he received that skull fracture with the bat. He never said that. He said that it was consistent with getting hit in the mouth that a bat would bust your teeth out. And he did say other trauma he would expect, and that would be on the side here and the head, that he would expect to see an

XIX-197

indention. We never presented that,

But we did present if he's standing there in a position where he's been stabbed at, he's been cut, he's defending himself off and he's crying, and he can identify her, she goes back -- and this is where you get to the first degree murder. She had that opportunity to leave, she had that opportunity to go for help, and she didn't exercise that opportunity. She went back 'cause no one's gonna do this to her, no one. Not anybody like this, especially somebody that she didn't think anybody would remember or anybody would miss. And when she went back and smacked him in the mouth with the bat where his teeth busted out, he fell back and he hit his head on that curb, and that's consistent with busting his skull.

Now he's down and he's out and what does she do? She stabs him in the neck, and that's how you see all the blood on the side of the -- go about a foot up on the side of the wall there, And,that's where all that blood collected in the one area right in the back. That's why his shirt's all covered. His pants wouldn't have been there because they were down out of where the blood collected.

And then what does she do? What does she do then, ladies and gentlemen, she cuts his penis off and she cuts into his rectum, because no one's gonna do that -- that's from

XIX-198

somebody that's been through that themselves. She can't come in here and tell you, give me some pity and let -- and find me not guilty of this murder because of self defense because this man attacked me, because you read the instructions, you'd have to find her guilty of the penetration of a dead human body. And that's from somebody -- a sexual penetration of a dead human body. That's from somebody herself that's been raped herself, She's not gonna accept that.

So what happens? An alibi starts getting created about the 21 st by her mom. And you don't tell me for a minute that her parents weren't talking to her from jail right away. And it's interesting, why does she tell her parents on a recorded statement -- don't say anything because we're getting recorded, snap at your father, we're getting recorded -- if she didn't do anything wrong?

Now when you look at what they claim as an alibi, you have to also look at Jury Instruction Number 35 where it talks about -- it talks about the credibility and the believability of witnesses. And you have to determine whether or not you believe them is basically what it's telling you. And you look at -- one of the factors you look at is the relationships to the parties. And it's interesting, is the only people that came in here and talked about anything happening in this area, especially on the 7<sup>th</sup>, were family members, except for Chris,

and you've heard about Chris' testimony. You have to determine the believability of that as well.

Family members, the only people. I mean other people put her -- it's interesting that other people put her in Panaca in the afternoon or maybe noonish on the  $\delta$ , and that's not -- that's not outside the line of what Dr. Simms is talking about. And if she did exactly what she told Dixie, that all she wanted to do was get cleaned up and get the hell back to her dad's house, that's exactly what she did. And that puts her right back here on the  $\delta$  where you see all these people that are seeing her on the  $\delta$  where you see all these people did she go clean up at? Doug's?

They talk about the lack of physical evidence of her at the scene, yet there's so much evidence with regards to what had occurred. You will never forget this trial. The reason why you'll never forget this trial is because of the circumstances that came under it. A man's penis was cut off. You heard about it once before probably with Lorena Babbitt, a man's penis was cut off. You'll never forget that. That's a circumstance that they want you to stretch so far and say that this is a coincidence, that she happens to be talking about it right after it occurs, when after she is worried that the man is probably dead, knows that she cut a man's penis off, is taking Prozac because of the anxiety and depression she's under,

XIX-200

because it's causing her conscious -- she's having trouble with her conscious.

Talk about the physical evidence and a time frame of when things were tested. It comes to a point where you have to just stop testing. Other times you will never stop testing. You've heard of cases even after people have went to prison, they continue doing testing. You've heard of some where they've been exonerated based on the testing and you've not heard of the ones where they're not exonerated.

And so, you know, to point the finger at the State or the police officers and say you know what, you just didn't quit — you quit testing and you tested right up to the last minute on that. It's like if we don't test, I mean they threw the plastic bag in our face on that. And you know what their words were, their words were conclusionary, just like their expert that they hired, that the evidence of the perpetrator was beyond that bag, on the bag, in the trash can.

Where do you stop? What if you find the body in the dump? Where do you stop? Don't you give some credence to the people that are out there looking and trying to do what they can? They say that they -- they made -- they jumped to conclusions and they made the decision and they arrested Blaise and that was the end of it and they didn't do anything else.

Well, you heard they talked to Diane Parker, they went over to her house, they looked at her clothes, they looked at her shoes, they looked at her knives, they discussed it with a roommate, There was nothing they gave a detective that's done over 400 homicides any kind of clue that she was even a suspect, knowing full well that she was a rape victim of the very man that was killed.

And he looked at the -- he talked to the management, he investigated the individuals that didn't even know her. And that — you know, Ms, DiGiacomo talked about that earlier. Do you think it's reasonable for somebody to see, maybe see somebody get slapped, another woman, and then you go out and kill 'em and you do that kinda stuff to them? That makes no sense.

And then what do we — what do we make of this? What are we supposed to do? I mean she said in her statement she'd gotten her car bloody. And they spent almost a day disputing thattalking about copper salts and things like that up in Panaca or the mine field of Pioche. She talked about taking her clothes off in the car because they were bloody and she threw them away. Her dad kind of admitted that he wiped the car out.

And they don't tell you -- did they remind you of the fact that Dixie talks about -- remember Dixie when she was up

XIX-202

stuff that's in the car. Doug Twining -- I mean not Doug, Mr. McCroskey says that he believed that she'd cleaned it before she brought it back over to the house.

He talks about there's no physical evidence at the scene, no fingerprints, nothing. There wasn't a single fingerprint of hers in her own car,, Are we supposed to just say then well, she was never in her car? It excludes her from being in her car, ladies and gentlemen, because she -- no fingerprints in there.

They bring her back to Las Vegas — oh, what about this, ladies and gentlemen, we're just supposed to ignore that? Are we just to ignore what's on these freshly laundered seat covers as the crime scene investigator talked about? Just ignore that? Well, that's not blood, but those spots on the ground in the photograph are.

And when they bring her back to the jail cell and she talks about the inside of the jail cell looking like where this occurred. Well, the defense presented you this cave, and you have — you can look at that too, that happened from the Budget Suites. Which, you know, the detective did go over there and tried to see whether or not — you know, how do you investigate something that didn't happen? How do you do that?

He talks about how he could look out of the inside of

XIX-204

there and the questions were posed to her about what she told Laura about the defendant telling her she went back to hide her car out. And that's super consistent with the fact that when she leaves and goes back on the 9 th she doesn't take her car. I mean she goes back down there to do what, you know, make a run at it and not have her own transportation to get away from that? Well, she has to later call her down. No, they're laying low, the car's not around her, they're down there watching TV togsee if there's any other information about this,

And she tells Dixie, she's up there hiding her car, her parents are gonna help her get it cleaned or maybe paint it and get rid of it Dixie wouldn't tell you that. Dixie kept I didn't say that, I didn't say that, When Laura came in, she said no, that's what she told me. Dixie said get it cleaned. Do you remember that? She said that like get it clean. And she wanted -- I think if she said it louder and louder and louder we'd believe it more, Get it clean.

Well, what are they cleaning, something that happened on Memorial Day? This car with this compulsory clean person here, they drive the car back, the parents say that it reeked, but yet they leave the car rolled up -- the windows rolled up and parked in the July sun in Panaca and it reeked, and he just wiped it out.

What did it reek from, the Memorial Day vomit and

something that looked like the inside of the jail cell and see the carport next door next to it. I mean unless you're out there and you're doing this, it's a pretty good imagination that you're making it up. It fits perfectly in the crime.

You know what's interesting as well is that what she does say in her statement as we're talking about the past tense, how she talks about I didn't think anybody would miss him, I don't -- I didn't think I could put him in -- I didn't put him in and I don't think I could have, she's talking about the dumpster. Why do you need to say I don't think I could put him in it if he was alive? If he's dead, it'd be maybe throwing him in the garbage can, just throw him away. And you see that he's moved towards the dumpster. Somebody tried, she tried to put him in the dumpster, couldn't pick him up,

And they ask, did you hit him with anything other than the knife? And her response was well, it's possible, I have a bat in the car. But you know, when I was on my flutters of the third day of my meth binge, everything went black,

She tells Dixie that it was on north of I -- I mean west of -- east of 1-15, and she gives hotel names of the streets, Flamingo and Tropicana. She didn't say anything about it being down at Budget Suites or anything

But are we supposed to just ignore that? Are we

XIX-205

supposed to just ignore that huge coincidence? She tells Dixie that she severed a man's penis in Las Vegas. She said the man tried to proposition her. The man put his penis in her — tried to put his penis in her mouth. Does that sound like what I was describing to you earlier, that she cut his penis off and threw it. She got ick all over her. Those are the words that Dixie used for what the defendant said. She said that he was old, smelly man, nothing else about size or anything. Happened on West Tropicana and West Flamingo.

They were looking in the paper to see if any news about it at the time when they were there. As she was researching it, she had been researching it before. She believed it happened just recently. Wasn't talking about something earlier. And you kinda seen the exchange there when talking about the June and July.

She said she was extremely upset and crying. She said after it was all done all she wanted to do was get back home to her dad's—She said she used her car and she was worried about her car being seen.

And that gets me back to the point I was talking about earlier, that if she left after she killed him, he's certainly not gonna see her. And if she's in an enclosed area, like what you've seen in this, no one's gonna see that, see into there, unless you're up above or the doors are open. And -- but her

Xi:X-206

car would be seen, and that's what she was worried about. She wasn't worried about herself being seen, she was worried about her car being seen. A little red car. You'd have to disregard what Michele says, you'd have to disregard what Paul Rusty -- Rusty Brown says.

And take a look at their phone records, ladies and gentlemen, And look at the time frames of when they are talking about when the phone calls are going from the mom to Doug's house or to Doug's cell, and when Doug is returning those calls, And look at the same time about when they're calling the highway looking for — they're calling the sheriff's department. And then at a point in time when they know where she's at, when she's in Las Vegas, there's no phone calls going on anymore. There's a big amount of phone calls around -- on the early morning of the 8 th into the 9th -- I mean late evening of the 8 th into the 9th , because that's when Doug's coming up there to get her. And you don't see Doug really picking up on the phone calls again until after about 9 o'clock in the morning on the 8th.

Well, in the realm of Mr. Schieck's bell curve, there's still that reality of the 24 hours, I mean you ask these experts to come in and say what they believe would fit, and they want - -and it's so interesting. They want to fit in the 18 to -- 10 to 18 hours. The doc says that it's more reasonable -- I mean it's

more probable that it happened in the 24 hour span. But to a reasonable degree of medical certainty theyll give you the 10 to 18 hours.

And it's interesting that the defense is arguing that that's where we want it to be, when often times you find bodies in that interval and they want the doctors to spread it out to the outside of that time frame.

And I — you know, when we talked to you guys like four weeks ago and we're asking you to be jurors on this case, both sides was trying to get the fairest jurors that we could find. And part of that is because of the system of justice that the defense and the State are operating under and what all of you are entitled to. And part of that tells us that we want people that are -- have a stake in the community, people that have been around, people that care what happens in their community, people that care what the prosecutions are doing or what the defendants are doing.

And we want people to realize that you don't come in here with blinders on. You don't leave your commonsense outside the door. You use your common everyday experiences to judge what you heard here and what you believe the verdict ought to be.

And I ask you, using your commonsense, is it reasonable to believe that we have a pure coincidence here?

MX-208

Is that reasonable to believe? And that's that step you have to get over as to reasonable doubt. Is it just a mere coincidence, probably one of the biggest ones you've ever heard, that this defendant just happened to be talking about the very thing that happened just days before she started talking about it?

The defense started their closing argument talking about we were saying in our argument, well, it's possible, or it's possible it happened like that. You know what, ladies and gentlemen, that's because you, the jury, are the ones that make the reasonable inference and draw those inferences to determine the guilt or innocence of the defendant. You do that. You don't base it on sympathy, you don't -- it has — can't be influenced by sympathy. You make that decision as a sincere judgment, sound discretion that you're using in accordance with the law that you've been given.

When the defense talks about possible, well my question to you is is it possible the defendant was confessing to a crime that happened in May of 2001? Is that possible, based on all the information that you heard what occurred here, that there wasn't any crime that happened in May of 2001? No evidence of that. Is that possible? Is that something that you're really gonna pick up from that statement? I suggest that you won't.

In this case, ladies and gentlemen, there's nothing

XIX-209

to support a self defense. And the reason why, as I explained earlier, is because there was a cooling down period. There was a point in time where the defendant had to make a choice as to whether or not to walk away from what she started or to finish it. She decided to finish it because she was gonna be identified.

That there is your premeditation, your deliberation, It went to a point where there was a directed wound to the carotid artery. There was a blunt force trauma to the head that knocks him down. Directed wound to the liver area.

And then what happened with the penis later, that's evidence of rage, that's evidence of anger, that's evidence of premeditation and deliberation. That's first degree, Defense didn't even argue that, didn't even argue that, that she's entitled to self defense.

Now when you look at the verdict you're gonna — this is what you're gonna get back there, I don't know if it's with those instructions that you have now. I think the Court gives you like in a little blue packet or something. But you have a series of things to determine. Can you all see that? You have a series of things you have to look at, and all the instructions will walk you through that.

You have to look at whether or not it was guilty of first degree murder with the use of a deadly weapon. Well, I

XIX-210

submit to you a knife is a deadly weapon, and the manner it was used here is a deadly weapon. So you don't have to even look at any other crime that doesn't have a deadly weapon involved.

The argument here, what I just explained to you, supports the guilty of first degree with use of a deadly weapon because of the premeditation. Because of the multiple mechanisms of injury, the multiple mechanisms of — you can't see?

THE COURT: My view of the jury was blocked.

MR, KEPHART: Oh, I'm sorry, Judge, Okay,

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR, KEPHART: And -- I'm gonna need that again,

THE BAILIFF: You're gonna need it?

MR. KEPHART: Yeah.

And you don't need to go any further with that. I mean your decision can't be one based on sympathy. You have to make the determination if you feel in this case that there's self defense there. But then there's arguments talking about at a point where she has an opportunity to abandon that and didn't do that

And then the second one is pretty obvious, ladies and gentlemen, as to -- I mean there's certainly evidence that she's guilty of sexual penetration of a dead human body by the

injury to his rectum,

Now it's interesting when -- like real quickly when you talk about like the McCroskeys and the other individuals who talk about the car being moved or not being moved. And you heard te McCroskeys talk about how they -- they may not even have been there. But they do know when they were there and they saw the car that it hadn't been moved. And that's highly consistent with her coming up there after the — after the 8<sup>th</sup>, 'cause they were gone potentially the 4<sup>th</sup> of July where they drive to Fallon, Nevada and stay for just a couple days. They go there for a period of time and spend time with their family.

Now we showed you this in the beginning, Exhibit 258. And this, ladies and gentlemen, is who we're talking about. We're not talking about this young lady that's sitting here now and has come in here with her dresses on and her hair back and a little longer than that. Matter of fact it's interesting, the very people that supposedly saw her up there that time could not say that she looked any different, other than older, than the way she looks right now. Well, you take a look at it and tell me if she looks any different. That's pretty distinct, wouldn't you say? And if they supposedly had seen her all this time when they're up there with her, you would expect that they'd seen that. And that's what we're talking

X1X-212

about in this case, ladies and gentlemen.

Happened in 2001 when she killed Duran Bailey, When she was the meth addict, when she was the knife toting individual, when she's the one that's moving around Las Vegas and getting out of control, when she's the one that would do anything for methamphetamine. That was in 2001, ladies and gentlemen. It's been long enough. It's long enough, that about time the jury says something about it. It's long enough It's time to finish it. It's time to put an end to this. It's time to put an end to what happened to Duran Bailey.

He's entitled to a degree of respect from the State and from the people who represent the State and from this system. He didn't have an opportunity to go through deciding whether or not he was guilty or not, but did he deserve to die? Did he deserve to die at the hands of somebody that just made that decision?

And that's why we're here, ladies and gentlemen. In the beginning he asked why are we here. We're here because of what she did in July of 2001, what she did to Duran Bailey, that's why we're here, And it's about time we put a stop to it now, and it's time for you to mark it as I did, guilty of first degree murder with the use of a deadly weapon, and guilty of sexual penetration of a dead human body.

When you go back in there and you deliberate,

XD-213

ladies and gentlemen, look at the evidence. Look at what you have in there, Fumble through it if you want. Look and see if there's any stab wounds to the pants. Look if there's any blood in there if you want to do that. You can do that.

But if you want to say that she's not guilty, consider that with regards to everybody that came in here and testified about what she said to them, what she said, came out of her mouth, and what was corroborated in the sense of she said she cut a man's penis off, corroborated. She said it was on West Tropicana or Flamingo. Corroborated. She said it was near a dumpster, Corroborated. She said she couldn't put him in the dumpster, Corroborated. Said that she was bloody and got in her car, Corroborated. Said she wanted to leave and get back -- her car back to her dad's house. Corroborated.

If you don't think she did it, ladies and gentlemen, find her not guilty.

MR. SCHIECK: I'm gonna object, Your Honor, that's not the burden of proof. The burden of proof is that they proved it beyond a reasonable doubt,

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR, KEPHART: If you don't think we've proved it beyond a reasonable doubt, find her not guilty.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you, Your Honor.

X1X-214

THE COURT: Okay.

Ladies and gentlemen, alternate jurors are needed at trial who are prepared to assume a juror's seat should a juror become unable to or become disqualified from the performance of their duties. Before the time that the trial began it was stipulated that whomever became seated in the 13th and 14' chairs would constitute the alternates for the purposes of this trial. That turned out to be Lacey Valdez as Alternate 1, and Joan McCormick as Alternate 2.

In the event that a vacancy does occur on the jury during deliberation, the alternates will then be taken to the room to fill that vacancy.

Dee Grimm has just entered the courtroom. She's the judicial executive assistant for Department 2 who works with the Court in the Court's offices and chambers. She, the bailiff, and the court recorder are going to be placed under oath to take charge of the alternates and the jury,

## DEE GRIMM, BAILIFF & COURT RECORDER□ ARE SWORN

THE CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Shortly Ms. Valdez and Ms. McCormick will be going with Ms. Grimm and providing her with the phone numbers where they can be reached. You will be notified telephonically either to advise you that you need to return to

X1X-215

the courthouse to assume a seat in deliberations, or to advise you that you are relieved of jury services. So you will receive a phone call updating you and advising you of one of those two things,

Until such time as you either go into the jury deliberation room or you are advised that you are relieved of services, you remain under the admonishment of the Court that you cannot talk or converse with anyone on any subject connected with the trial, nor read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with the trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, television, radio, and Internet And you cannot form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you

If we do not see you back again, we thank both of you most sincerely for all of your time and your efforts here with this trial in doing this service for your community.

If you would come out the gate and come around the front of the courtroom. Bring your stuff with you.

We had arranged for dinner delivery at 5:30, and that was when we took our 10 minute recess. The rest of you will be taking — will be taken into the jury deliberation room by the bailiff at this time. Would those of you in the front row please exit and go with Officer Burns, and then those of you in

X1X-216

the back row follow the front row.

(Jurors are not present)

THE COURT: Lisa, can you shut the door? Thank you.

The record shall reflect that the jury has exited the courtroom, the Court's gonna ask that counsel approach the clerk to leave the numbers where you can all be reached, And we will go off the record at this time,

Court Adjourned at 6:54:28 p.m., until the following day,

October 6, 2006)

\*\*\*\*\*

## **AFFIRMATION**□ Pursuant to C177394

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding Transcript filed in District Court, Case No. A528457 does not contain the social security number of any person.

<u>Karl Riley</u> Transcriber

<u>5/10/07</u> Date

MY-218

## CERTIFICATION

I (WE) CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-EN iii LED MATTER.

NW TRANSCRIPTS, LLC
NEVADA DIVISION
1027 S. RAINBOW BLVD., #148□
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89145-6232□
(702) 373-7457

nwtfansc :tS' msn.com

FEDERA MANAGER/OWNER

Kari Riley TRANSCRIBER

XDC-219