EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRX, CTCOURT CIVIL/CRIMINAL DIVISEON1112IJAT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

r)

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. C177394

Plaintill,

vs.

DEPT. NO. II

KIRSTIN BLAISE LOBATO,

Defendant.

Transcripts of Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE VALORIE J. VEGA, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

"ROUGH DRAFT"

JURY TRIAL - DAY 3 VOLUME III

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 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.

<u>NV V. LOBATO</u> 9/13/06

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: BILL KEPHART

Chief Deputy District Attorney 200 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-3482

SANDRA K. DIGIACOMO Deputy District Attorney 200 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-6450

FOR THE DEFENDANT: DAVID M. SCHIECK

Special Public Defender

333 South Third Street, 2nd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

(702) 455-6265

SHARI L. GREENBERGER, ESQ,

SARA ZALKIN, ESQ. 506 Broadway

San Francisco, California 94133

motion by the State to be allowed to put forth voir dire questions to the jury regarding the penalty phase.

So the State may be heard.

MR, KEPHART: Well, Your Honor, basically, the legal analysis that applies here has to do with that what we have briefed. This is, first -- first of all, let me start off. I had an opportunity to read <code>Holbrook v5</code>, <code>State</code> that the defense had submitted as well. That case is a 1974 case that deals with a punishment sentence by a judge. Since 1974, there's been much litigation with regards to what 175.552 pertains to. And back in 1974, I would venture to say that the -- that in cases involving first degree murder that had -- that was not the death sentence, the judges did the sentencing. And since then there has been much litigation mainly proffered by the defense bar that the jury should have the prerogative for the sentencing. And since then --

THE COURT: Because we had the three-judge panels.

MR, KEPHART: Yes. THE COURT: Okay,

MR, KEPHART: Okay. And that has more to do with the — with the death sentence itself, but what I'm saying is that at one point in time in the -- in the law in the State of Nevada the judges did the sentencing for first degree murders

111-4

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2006 PROCEEDINGS

(THE PROCEEDINGS BEGAN AT 10:04:39)

(Prospective jurors are not present)

THE BAILIFF: All rise, please,

Department II is now in session, the Honorable

Valorie J. Vega presiding. Please be seated.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

THE COURT: The record shall reflect that we're convened outside the presence of the jury in State versus Lobato under C177394. The defendant is present, together with her three counsel, The two prosecuting attorneys are present.

The Court over the evening hours had the opportunity to review the case submitted yesterday by Mr. Schieck, as well as the research memorandums submitted by the State.

The Court, additionally, reviewed NRS 175.552. The Court's made copies of those three things which I'm gonna have made part of the record as Court's Number 3, collectively.

THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you,

 $I'm\ trying\ to\ think\ who\ has\ -\!\!-\!\!-\ who\ has\ brought\ forth$ the motion, essentially, that was briefed. It was really a

that were not the death sentence. And by much litigation by the defense bar, now it is the prerogative of the jury to decide unless, certainly, both parties had stipulated with regards to waiving that and with the defense waiving it as well.

But the -- our position with the legal analysis here is that -- is that you need to make a determination whether or not the actual sentencing body in this particular case was the judge or the jury. And we know that last time it was the jury because of the -- because of the stipulated waiver of the -- of the jury decision.

The situation that would come back from a -- on an appeal if a jury made the decision is that the legal analysis is is whether or not the jury had actually determined and rejected other type sentences. So to speak, if the jury would have decided in this case and gave the defendant a 20 to 50 plus a 20 to 50, then you could arguably say that they had rejected the other sentences because they made that determination. Here, they did not have that opportunity.

I will also point out, Your Honor, that in the last trial there was certain reasons why the State opted not to have the defense, I mean, have the jury, as well as the defense, decide the penalty and that had to do with the lateness of the time they returned, as well as the note that was provided to the Court and their concerns with the family of the defendant

<u>NV v. LOBATO</u> 9/13/06

themselves. So we feel that the jury has not had an opportunity to speak on this issue of penalty and we think that under the statute, under 175.552, that they should have that opportunity, Your Honor,

Okay, Thank you.

MS. ZALKIN: Good morning, Your Honor,

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Zalkin.

MS, ZALKIN: It's our position that there's a presumption of vindictiveness that arises by the prosecutor where nothing has changed between the appeal and the situation now. The case law that I've looked at, which includes <code>Holbrook vs. State.</code> which as of this morning had not been superseded by statute or otherwise overruled, is that there's a difference when there's been a plea of guilty and then a sentencing that subsequently is vacated and remanded for trial and then after hearing a trial, a court might say, well, I wasn't aware of all of these facts at the time I took the guilty plea; I

OtherweeTyou know, as another -- as another issue, I would point out that the statute, by its own terms, requires a written waiver. That did not happen last time. At least according to the State's research memorandum, they concede it was per an oral agreement with the defense. And I think that's relevant because our client wasn't on notice that

111-6

a conviction. And in this particular case, in light of the jury's note to the Court indicating that they were afraid of the defendant's family, they wanted escorted to the -- to the —

THE COURT: Parking lot,

MR, KEPHART: To the parking lot. We made a conscious decision to waive their decision to sit on the penalty in light of the fact that we felt that that may give rise to an appeal issue.

Two, the jury since then has indicated that they would have liked to have been involved in the sentencing. I spoke to many of them personally. And when we've talked about it amongst our self and talked to it with our — with the district attorney, his position is that he felt that it was the decision of the jury to make the decision. And that -- and that's exactly what the statute is calling for and that's exactly what the defense has been asking for for many years, that they want the jury to decide these type of penalties.

So that's the extent of what I can say, Judge. I can't go any further and say that we're -- that it's a surprise, that we're being vindictive, and they're surprised at why we're doing this. But it is the jury's decision. The defendant wants to exercise her right to a jury trial. And in these type of cases, the jury makes the decision on the penalty.

111-8

THE COURT: There was a point of common ground

should she exercise her constitutional right to appeal.

believe a stiffer sentence is warranted.

especially where she's asserting factual and, I think more properly, actual innocence, that she would be subject to the possibility of life without parole in the event of a conviction. So I think that it's -- I think that the prosecution should be required to rebut. I believe we've raised a presumption of vindictiveness where the facts haven't changed. They agreed to this the first time around. The lateness of the hour of the verdict and concerns of the jurors, I don't think are really germane. And Al think that as a matter of equity and as a matter of detrimental reliance, assuming that this oral agreement was relied upon, and certainly it was a shock to counsel yesterday off the record when the State advised that they wanted to have the jury decide the sentencing. We were not previously aware that that was even going to be an issue. And we don't understand why they're taking this tact now after she's exercised her constitutional right to appeal.

MR, KEPHART: Your Honor, with respect to the defense and their concern about our vindictiveness, we brought a motion for discovery putting them on notice that we wanted information that they intended to use in any penalty phase that we would be involved with. Two, we -- in doing these cases in the State of Nevada, we perceive certain times that there is possible appeal issues that may be involved after

between what was submitted by both sides, and that common ground was that a sentence should not be imposed that is purely vindictive, as vindictiveness should not play a role in any sentence, And I think that's really what the case that the defense has put forth stands for that proposition, that that was a situation where somebody came back before the same decision-maker. And the Supreme Court said, all things being equal, the sentence should not be modified in any way. And if there has been a change, then the trier of fact needs to make a record as to what that change was and why a modification from the prior sentence should be imposed.

In this particular situation, the case came back from the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court did not make any ruling that the previously-issued waiver would remain in place. The decision gave no direction or guidance on that specifically but, rather, said it's remanded for retrial and the retrial is going to include various additional witnesses that the Court had precluded in the first trial. In this particular case now, we've had a number of years pass since the first trial and the first sentence, and the defendant is now out of custody. And some of the witnesses that were available at the first trial are not available for this trial. There will be some readings but, of course, the jury is not gonna have the benefit of seeing them live. And there's going to be additional witnesses called from

111-7

NV v. LoBATp 9/13/06

1

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the -- from the listing of witnesses that has been read to the jury, additional witnesses that were not called to testify the first time around.

I don't see that there's any violation of law with having the jury do the sentencing phase. Rather, it appears that that would be in compliance with the state statute, NRS 175552. So the Court grants the State's request to put forth voir dire questions to the jury advising them that they may be called upon to do a penalty phase if there is a conviction of first degree, to make sure that there isn't anyone who is philosophically or religiously unable to perform that function.

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, given the Court's ruling, which we do understand, we just want to preserve the right that should there be a first degree murder conviction and should there be a harsher sentence imposed that we will be revisiting this issue at that time should that come to pass. I mean, right now we're sort of speculating that she's gonna get convicted or get a harsher sentence. If that does come to pass, that is a motion that we want leave to file at that time asking the Court not to impose a harsher sentence- Just so the Court's aware, we're preserving that right,

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. SCHIECK: Okay, And at that time we will address specifically areas that we feel vindictiveness show in

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, one last thing, and we brought this up, I believe, at calendar call when we were provided with the report of Kristina Paulette on the DNA done on the combings.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR, SCHIECK: We were provided with a number for Ms. Paulette, and we have called and left a message. We have received no call back. So we can —

MS. DiGIACOMO: She was gone.

MR. SCHIECK: Okay,

MS, DiGIACOMO: And so, you know —

MR_ SCHIECK: I'm not -- I'm not saying —

MS, DiGIACOMO: I talked to her this morning, so 14 she's back.

MR, SCHIECK: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So you can place another call,

MR. SCHIECK: We can call her then in the break and speak with her,

THE COURT: And then if it become -- if it continues to be a problem, then let me know again.

(Off-record colloquy)

MR. SCHIECK: And we're ready, Your Honor, I'

23 sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. The record shall reflect that

111-12

this case.

2

3

4

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

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

> 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything further that we need to make of record before the jury arrives?

MR. KEPHART: No, not by the State.

MR. SC-HECK: I think the only outstanding issue had to do with the Jeremy Davis reading, but we can address that after we've impaneled the jury and we can talk about that,

MR, KEPHART: No, we can do that.

MS biGIACOMO: Yeah.

MR. KEPHART: We can do that now,

MS, DIGIACOMO: Well, I forgot a transcript for the Court. I did look at it. Two of them I'm fine with but one of them I disagree with that they want redacted. And so I need to get the copy of the -- the Court a copy.

THE COURT: Okay. And we had two photographs, 69 and 70, that I had a question reply,

MS, DiGIACOMO: Are those the ones with the skull? We still haven't talked to the coroner.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. DiGIACOMO: We've been playing phone tag.

THE COURT: So that's still pending, too.

MS, DiGIACOMO: Yes,

THE COURT: Okay,

defendant's counsel was conferring and I wasn't sure if they had anything else that we needed to make a record.

I'm gonna take us off the record and then the jury will be arriving in ten minutes.

(Court recessed at 10:21:00 until 10:53:25)

(Prospective jurors are present)

THE BAILIFF: All rise,

Department II is now in session, the Honorable

Valorie J. Vega presiding. Please be seated.

THE COURT: The record shall reflect that we are now resuming trial in the presence of the proposed jury panel in the case of State versus Kirstin Lobato, C177394,

The record shall further reflect that the defendant is present, together with her three counsel, the two prosecuting attorneys are present, and the ladies and gentlemen of the potential jury have been seated by the bailiff.

We are resuming with the voir dire examination by the State,

MR, KEPHART: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Kephart, you may proceed.

MR. KEPHART: Thank you, Your Honor.

Last night we had a little opportunity to reflect on some of the answers that everyone made here yesterday, and I want to kind of go back and ask a few questions.

2

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mr, Cantor, you indicated that you felt with what was going on in your business, I guess, or in your -- in your personal life right now that you could not give us attention, your attention to this case. And you've heard how long we potentially believe it would be. Has that changed at all since you talked to us yesterday?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CANTOR: No.
MR. KEPHART: Okay, With that in mind, do you

MR. KEPHART: Okay, With that in mind, do you believe that you could be — would you be — well, let me ask you this. With that in mind, do you think that somebody in your frame of mind, if you were seated in the defendant's seat or even in the prosecutor's seat, that you'd want somebody like you on a jury?

PROSPEC_IIVE JUROR CANTOR: No, not if you don't have full attention or if you have other things on your mind.

MR- KEPHART: Okay. Thank you, Mr, Cantor. I appreciate that.

Mr, Snowden, I think you indicated that as well yesterday. Well, 056've had an opportunity to think about that, figure out what's going on in your life right now,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SNOWDEN: Right.
MR, KEPHART: Do you still have that same belief?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SNOWDEN: Right.

MR. KEPHART: So my question is then is do you

111-14

believe if you were seated in the defendant's table that you'd want somebody with your frame of mind sitting in a trial, judging what she's done?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SNOWDEN: No, I would not, MR, KEPHART: Ms. Real. Wendy.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR REAL: Mm-hmm.

MR. KEPHART: You also indicated that same thing.

PROSPEC, IIVE JUROR REAL: Mm-hmm,

MR, KEPHART: Since you've thought about it overnight, hav6 you changed your opinion at all with that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR REAL: It just depends if I

have to work Saturday or Sunday, work my shifts.

MR, KEPHART: Excuse me?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR REAL: It would just depend if I would have to work Saturday or Sunday. If I don't, then I probably would be able to give my full attention.

MR, KEPHART: Well, we're not gonna be in session here on Saturday and Sunday. I don't anticipate that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR REAL: I know, but I would —

MR. KEPHART: Okay,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR REAL: I would be at work,

you know, for my ten-hour shifts.

MR, KEPHART: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR REAL: If I'm -- it's a very

physical job,

2

3

4

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

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. KEPHART: Mm-hmm.

PROSPEC IVE JUROR REAL: So I would need rest.

Plus, I have a five-month-old so —

MR, KEPHART: Okay, Well, the followup question is, then my question is, is do you think that you would want individuals like you, with your frame of mind, seated in this jury if you were seated in the defendant's seat?

PROSPEC LIVE JUROR REAL: No, I would not.

MR. KEPHART: Thank you, Ms. Real.

That's Number 65.

And, Ms, Glynn, Lori Glynn.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: Glynn.

MR, KEPHART: Your number is 74, the last two digits. The same question. You've had an opportunity to think about this, You've been here two days now. And you told us about some issues that you had at home and you said that you couldn't give us your full time and attention. You still have that, you still feel that way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: Yes, I do.

MR,, KEPHART: Do you feel that you could be — you'd feel if you were seated in one of these, one of the seats up here, it would be unfair to the defendant or even the State?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: Yes, I do,,

111-16

MR, KEPHART: Okay, Ma'am, you also indicated, and I just want to know if I wrote this down right or not, initially when the Court spoke to you, you indicated that you had concerns with your — with your financial situation. You felt that you would lose your home.

PROSPECt iVE JUROR GLYNN: Yes, I could,

MR. KEPHART: And you said something about your four children and that —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: There's a total of six.

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Initially, did you tell the Court you had four or six?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: I told them I had three small boys at home.

MR, KEPHART: Okay.

PROSPEcINE JUROR GLYNN: I have six children.

MR. KEPHART: Okay, Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: Mm-hmm.

MR. KEPHART: May we approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yes,

(Off-record bench conference at 10:58:01 until 11:02:14)

THE COURT: At this time the Court excuses for cause Juror Badge Number 231, Karl Cantor, and Juror Badge Number 259, Michael Snowden,

Would you two gentlemen please report back to the

111-17

NV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

Office of the Jury Commissioner and you may exit at this time. PROSPECWE JUROR BISHOP: Yes, ma'am. Okay. We're gonna have two additional jurors then 2 2 THE COURT: Were there any of my questions that relocate from group two and move up into group one. That 3 you would have answered? 3 would be Robert Osborn, 328, and Vickie Bishop, 340, 4 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: No, ma'am, Mr. Bailiff, would you put the easel --THE COURT: Okay. The State may proceed, 5 5 THE BAILIFF: Yes, Your Honor, MR, KEPHART: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 6 THE COURT: Mr, Osborn, would you go through the 7 7 Ms. Bishop, you — Mrs. Bishop? exercise with the board that's on the easel? PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Mm-hmm. 8 8 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Okay, Okay, My 9 MR. KEPHART: There -- okay. You had indicated name is Robert Osborn. I'm retired. I was in construction. that your daughter had been convicted of drug possession. 10 10 I'm married. My wife and I have five children between us. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Yes. 11 11 She's also retired. I've been in Clark County for twelve years. MR. KEPHART: And she's due to be sentenced in 12 12 And I moved in from California, Los Angeles. And I have been October here in Las Vegas? 13 13 -- I have a high school education. I was in the military, the PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Yes. 14 14 15 Navy. 15 MR. KEPHART: Do you remember what kind of drug THE COURT: How long were you in the Navy? that is 16 16 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Two years. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Methamphetamine. THE COURT: What did you do? MR. KEPHART: Okay. And how old's your 18 18 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: I was in damage daughter? 19 control. PROSPECIWE JUROR BISHOP: Twenty. 20 20 MR. KEPHART: She still live with you? THE COURT: And what did your wife retire from? 21 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: She retired from PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: While she's waiting 22 22 on sentencing she is. 23 the Wells Fargo Bank. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And what did you do in MR. KEPHART: Oh, okay. And how many other 24 24 11I-20 111-18 construction? children do you have? 1 2 PROSPECLIVE JUROR OSBORN: I was a project 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: One, 3 manager and an estimator. 3 MR. KEPHART: Just her or one other one? 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Another one. 5 5 Ms. Bishop. MR, KEPHART: Older or younger? PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: My name is Vickie PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Younger. Sixteen-6 6 7 Bishop, 340, I work for Desert Valley Pediatrics 7 year-old. [unintelligible]. I'm married and have two children. My 8 8 MR. KEPHART: Son or daughter? 9 husband is employed with Delta Airlines. I've been in Clark PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: A daughter, 9 10 County for eight years, and I moved here from Georgia, And I 10 MR. KEPHART: If you know, how long had it been have a high school diploma. I've never been in the military. that your daughter's been using methamphetamine? 11 11 THE COURT: Thank you, PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Well, she was --12 12 13 Mr. Osborn, did you listen to the Court's questions of started when she was about sixteen years old. 13 14 the first group? 14 MR. KEPHART: Okay. When was it that you first 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Yes. 15 found out about it? THE COURT: Were there any of my questions that 16 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: When she started 17 you would have answered? 17 losing weight, being up all night. Then her behavior started PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Not that I can becoming a little erratic, like she normally is. 18 18 MR. KEPHART; Okay. What do you mean? What 19 recall. 19 do you mean by that? 20 THE COURT: Okay, 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: No. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Just running around 21 the house, talking 90 miles an hour. Basically, the staying up 22 THE COURT: Thank you, 22 Ms. Osborn — or, Ms. Bishop, rather, did you listen and losing weight. 23 23 to the Court's questions? 24 MR. KEPHART: Did you do anything about that or — 24

<u>NV v.</u> LOBATO 9/13/06

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

5

a

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Oh, yes, We've been in and out of rehabs, counseling.

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

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. KEPHART: Okay, Has it — would you agree that it's basically taken the situation where when the law has gotten involved now it's kind of coming to an end?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Yes, She's got to pay the consequences for her actions.

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Okay. Were you -- how did you find out that she had been arrested? Did you get that call in the middle of the night?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Yes, sir.

MR. KEPHART: Okay. And was she by herself, was she with somebody else?

PROSPEC_1VE JUROR BISHOP: She was with someone else,

MR. KEPHART: Okay, Somebody that you knew? PROSPECINE JUROR BISHOP: Met occasionally, MR. KEPHART: All right, And have you been with

her, basically supiCdriing her since she's been arrested? PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: Well, yeah.

 $\label{eq:MR} \mbox{MR, KEPHART: Besides, I mean, supporting her otherwise but} \ -$

PROSPEU 1VE JUROR BISHOP: Yes,

MR, KEPHART: Okay. All right, You heard some of

111-22

the show CST. Have you ever watched that show?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Yes,

MR, KEPHART: Okay, I kind of asked an openended question that I had to go away from, and it was basically would you accept that CSI is basically for entertainment?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Yes,

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Now I'm not saying that there's things on CSI that don't happen, that aren't true. But have you ever seen anything on there that you thought was pretty sensational?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: No. I don't — can't recall anything,

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Do you realize that there's a big difference between what you see on TV and what happens in real life?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Yes,

MR_ KEPHART: Are you familiar with Panaca,

Nevada?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Who?

MR. KEPHART: Panaca, Nevada.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Panaca? No,

MR. KEPHART: Panaca, Have you ever been

through Panaca, Nevada?

111-24

the questions that I asked yesterday of the panel. You guys were sitting over here, And I think I even alluded to Mr. Osborn's situation with his niece.

PROSPELL WE JUROR BISHOP: Mm-hmm, MR, KEPHART: And my questions are when you

heard that this was a murder case and then you were given, basically, somewhat of a description of what was going on, what we're charging the defendant with here, what went through your head?

PRO'SPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: To be honest, I didn't really think anything 'cause I don't know anything that's going on right now.

MR. KEPHART: What went through your head when I started asking people if they had -- know what methamphetamine was?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: That it probably had something to do with this.

MR, KEPHART: Did you have any concerns about what you heard we were charging with and the fact that your daughter has been involved with methamphetamine?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: No.

 $\,$ MR, KEPHART: Okay. Mr, Osborn, you heard me — thanks, ma'am.

You heard me talking yesterday to the group about

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: I might have but I blinked my eyes.

MR, KEPHART: Okay. What brought you to Las Vegas?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: My work.

MR. KEPHART: So we were building a lot here and it helped you come here and work?

PROSPEU_NE JUROR OSBORN: I was working for a company that had jobs here,

MR, KEPHART: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: So they moved me up here.

MR. KEPHART: Ms. Bishop, what brought you to Las Vegas?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: My husband was born and raised here, and then Delta transferred him back home,

MR. KEPHART: Okay. He works for Delta Airlines, Is he a pilot?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: No, he's a supervisor of the ticket counter,

MR. KEPHART: Okay, Ladies and gentlemen, in this particular case because of the type of nature — type of crime we're involved with, unlike any other case, the jury makes a

111-25

NV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

2

3

4

5

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

decision on what she deserves as a — what shell get as a punishment in the event that you find her guilty of first degree murder. This is not a capital case, meaning that the death penalty is not an option in this particular case. However, there are -- there are three different types of punishment that would be available to the jury in the event that she's found guilty of first degree murder. And those involve a life without the possibility of parole, meaning in all intents and purposes that she would spend the rest of her life in the Nevada State Prison, life with the possibility of parole starting at twenty years, or a term of years of fifty years with the possibility of parole after twenty. Is there anyone here right now in this panel that feels that there's no way they could ever be involved in a sentencing situation where they would have to say that a person has to spend the rest of their life in prison? And I'll go -- identify yourself and give us your

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

number again,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: 237. I just don't believe in taking hie away totally from anybody.

MR. KEPHART: Okay, So it's your opinion that if you give -- if a person receives a life sentence in the Nevada State Prison then there's no hope for them?

PROSPELLNE JUROR ISOM: If —

MR. KEPHART: Or they don't have any hope or --

111-26

Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: 254, Emigdio

Estrada.

MR. KEPHART: Okay. What's your position? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: I just don't think I'm somebody to be judging someone. I just take it upon religion, I guess.

> MR. KEPHART: And, Mr. Estrada, how old are you? -PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Twenty.

MR, KEPHART: And you heard the three different types of punishment that would be available here?

PROSPECLIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Mm-hmm.

PROSPEC.,i_NE JUROR ESTRADA: Yes.

MR, KEPHART: I'm sorry.

Yeah, she's typing everything. And you heard her, the Judge, tell us that we can't do the head shakes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Yes.

MR. KEPHART: Okay. So what's your — what's your position on the three different sentences?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: I just don't really think a person should spend the rest of their life in jail.

MR. KEPHART: Okay,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Or, I mean, I can't

111-28

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: If its -- if they stipulate that there's no chance of parole, that's pretty much no hope.

MR. KEPHART: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: I think somebody ought to have a shot somewhere down the line.

MR. KEPHART: Okay, So my question then to you is that if you were chosen as a juror —

PROSPEC_IVE JUROR ISOM: All right.

MR. kEPHART: -- and then it came to the point where you made the decision -

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Right.

MR. KEPHART: -- on what the punishment should be --

PROPEL_IVE JUROR ISOM: Uh-huh.

MR. KEPHART: — you do not believe that you could sentence somebody to a life sentence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: I don't.

MR. KEPHART: So you wouldn't consider it? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: I don't think so.

MR. KEPHART: Okay, And you're Mr. Isom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Yes, sir.

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Isom.

Is there -- is there anyone else that has the same?

really go either way, you know.

MR. KEPHART: What do you mean by that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Like say yes or no.

'Cause if you do a crime, you should pay for it, but I don't think it should be the rest of your life without the -- without parole.

MR, KEPHART: Do you think that —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: But at the same time, I do think that they should do time.

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Well, my question then to you would be do you think you could consider the sentence of life without the possibility of parole?

PROSPEC.i_iVE JUROR ESTRADA: Probably not.

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Is there anyone else that thinks or is there anyone else that has that same type of opinion? Okay. The reason I ask that is I --

THE COURT: The record shall reflect no response.

MR. KEPHART: Thanks, Judge.

I want all of you to take a look at the defendant right here, how she sits.. She's a human being just like you and I. And there may come a point in time where you have to make a decision that she may never, ever get out of prison. And you heard two individuals here say that -- one said that he doesn't think there'd ever be any hope, Mr. Estrada, the

111-29

<u>NV v. LOBATO</u> <u>9/13/06</u>

2

3

4

5

7

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

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

houses,

young man here that says that he doesn't think he could consider that as well. And my question with that is if there came a point in time where you were taken -- that you were given that decision to make and you went back in the jury room and you said, you know what, I know I talked to Mr. Kephart and I told him that I could consider this, but there's no way, there's no way I'm gonna consider that. My position is then you're not fair to the State because you told us one way and now you're back there and you're not even giving us that opportunity.

Is there anybody that has that feeling? I know that you haven't heard the case. I know that you haven't heard all the evidence in that. But is there anybody that has that feeling right now, saying, you know, in any -- under any circumstances I could not consider one of those three types? Maybe you couldn't consider a term of years with parole. Is there anybody that has that, has that —

THE COURT: The record shall reflect no response to the last question arid no response to this question.

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Mr. Arieno, PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Yes,

MR, KEPHART: You indicated that you came from New York,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Yes.

111-30

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Not right now. We're renting.

MR, KEPHART: A house?

PROSPECL1VE JUROR ARIENO: A condo.

MR. KEPHART: A condo. You feel like you have a stake in this community?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Stake meaning?

MR. KEPHART: Do you care about what happens in this community?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Oh, yeah, Yes, I do.

MR, KEPHART: There's a lot of you that have moved here from out of state, unless one gentleman who's been here all his life. And I think any one of you that have been here for the last ten years have seen how Las Vegas has grown immensely. Is there anyone here that feels like they don't have a stake in this community, that they don't care what happens in the community but they like what's happening, what they're getting, but they don't really care what happens? You know, that the court system is none of their business, it's our business, we just [unintelligible] you would just as soon not have anything to do with us, not care about it. Is there anybody that has that feeling? And don't get me wrong. I might have — might have posed it to a point

111-32

MR. KEPHART: And you got a high school education and you've got a business going now,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Correct.

MR, KEPHART: And you've got one daughter. What brought you to Las Vegas?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: The health of my daughter. She's allergic to mold,

MR. KEPHART: Okay.

PROSPECi_WE JUROR ARIENO: And if you get 138 inches of snowⁱ a year, there's a lot of mold in Upstate New York, and we were in the hospital every other week with her, And the doctor said go to the desert —

MR. KEPHART: Okay.

PROSPECiiVE JUROR ARIENO: -- where there's no moisture.

MR. KEPHART: How did you choose Las Vegas? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: I had a friend who

lived here and my parents were gonna retire here.

MR. KEPHART: Okay, How old's your daughter?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Nine years old.

MR, KEPHART: Is she in our school district here? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: She's in the

Henderson School District.

MR, KEPHART: Are you buying a house?

111-31

where you would look bad, but we don't feel that way. And there's some people that really don't care about what happens down here. Is there anybody that has that feeling?

THE COURT: The record shall reflect no response. MR. KEPHART: Sorry to pick on you, Mr, Arieno.

PROSPECi1VE JUROR ARIENO: No problem.

MR, KEPHART: Paul La Chance,

PROSPEC_IVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Yes.

MR. KEPHART: What brought you to Las Vegas?

You've been here four years.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Affordable

MR. KEPHART: Okay. And —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Well, it was — UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Four years ago, huh?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Four years ago.

MR, KEPHART: You're from California?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Yes.

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Mr. Wilcox.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILCOX: Yes, sir,

MR. KEPHART: You came here four years ago,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILCOX: I came here three

or four years ago while my mother-in-law was ill.

MR. KEPHART: Okay.

111-33

ROUGH DRAFT JURY TRIAL - DAY 3

23

24

3

24

NV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

2

3

4

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

4

5

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILCOX: To either get her back up on her feet or, in her case, she passed away to cancer. And coming out of the military, was mostly to be temporarily 'cause I was looking at employment for other two places. And then my mother just passed away here a couple weeks ago, so it's been kind of up and down, sir. But Nevada is a good state,

MR, 'KEPHART: Okay.

PROSPECI_WE JUROR WILCOX: And I just prefer my four seasons instead of the dry heat. So well just have to see how it's gonna go from here, sir.

MR, KEPHART: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Wilcox,

Mr, Willson.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PROSPECWE JUROR WILLSON: Yes, sir.

MR. KEPHART: Yesterday we talked a lot about a situation that occurred, that happened with you when you were fifteen or sixteen years old. We talked about a situation that happened witri'Your vehicle in California. And both those situations seem to have been, for lack of better words, bad contacts with the — with the police department, in both situations. I would say they did. Am I correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Yes, sir, MR. KEPHART: Okay. Obviously, Ms. DiGiacomo

111-34

and I represent the county here and witnesses that we'll have presenting evidence will be Las Vegas Metropolitan Police that. And you told us that you feel that you have lost trust in them. You're a grown adult now. You have three children. You're married. You sound like you have a pretty successful life going on. You've moved here from out of state. And I was just asking, is -- can you tell me if those -- that loss of

MR, KEPHART: If you were seated in my seat and prosecuting this case, would you want twelve individuals of your same frame of mind, knowing what you know and what happened to you in the past, to be seated on that jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: No.

or give a fair shake to the State in this case?

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Thank you, Mr, Willson. Okay. And, Mr, Froschheuser, How do you say

that?

Froschheuser.

Froschheuser,

MR, KEPHART: Did I say it right?

MR. KEPHART: Okay. You know where I'm going with this, so you're —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER:

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: Yes, sir. MR, KEPHART: Okay. And I — you had indicated yesterday that because of, basically, a silly situation that happened with a traffic violation you got roughed up a little bit. Is that correct?

PROSPEC I WE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: A little bit.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: It's close,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: That's what occurred.

MR. KEPHART: When you were eighteen years old? PROSPECTIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: Tossed against the wall,

> MR. KEPHART: Okay, PROSPECLWE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: Yeah, I was

MR. KEPHART: It was something that caused you

111-36

officers. And they are actually — we've heard questions about trust that you have in the police departments would be carried over into this ease here? Do you think that you would do that?

PROPELi_WE JUROR WILLSON: It's a possibility.

MR. KEPHART: So you don't think you could be fair

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: I think there's a good possibility there that I have some doubt.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER:

some concern and you told us about it, is that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: Well, at the time. I don't really talk about it -

MR, KEPHART: Okay,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: -- since you brought it up again. But --

MR. KEPHART: Well, then let me ask you the followup question. Would you want twelve people with your same frame of mind seated there if you were seated, seated on the jury, if you were seated in this seat here as a prosecutor?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: Yes,

MR. KEPHART: Okay, You don't think it would play any part in your decision-making in this case?

PROSPECIAIVE JUROR FROSCHHEUSER: No,, It was

MR. KEPHART: Okay, All right. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Ciciliano.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Yes.

MR. KEPHART: You said that you have Elvin

training, is that right? Did I hear that right

PROSPEL_WE JUROR CICILIANO: Yes.

MR, KEPHART: What is that, EMTI?

PROSPECINE JUROR CICILIANO: It's intermediate.

111-37

NV v. LOBATO

9/13/06

It's just a step above the basic EMT. MR. KEPHART: Okay. 2 MR. KEPHART: Okay. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOIR: While he was 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Just a certain 3 detained. And they dropped that charge if he admitted to the 4 level of things you can do versus what a paramedic can do, 4 burglary. 5 you know. 5 MR, KEPHART: Okay. 6 MR. KEPHART: Okay, You respond — you're a 6 PROSPEL_WE JUROR MOIR: So I wasn't called in 7 captain with the Clark County Fire Department? specifically for the domestic violence. It was -8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Yes, I am. 8 MR. KEPHART: You did a report, though? 9 MR, KEPHART: So you've been with them since 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOIR: Yes, I did, 10 1982. You've worked your way up to the position you're in 10 MR, KEPHART: Did you talk to any of the 11 now? 11 prosecutors that were involved in the case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Yes. 12 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOIR: For the domestic 13 MR_ KEPHART: Did you come from any other fire 13 violence itself? 14 department? 14 MR. KEPHART: Yes, or even the burglary, 15 PROSPELLWE JUROR CICILIANO: No. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOIR: You mean from the 16 MR. KEPHART: Okay. And the fire department 16 District Attorney's Office? 17 responds to a lot of _ a lot of calls involving injuries and 17 MR. KEPHART: Yes. 18 deaths, and that, here in Las Vegas, don't you? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOIR: Yes. 19 PROSPEnVE JUROR CICILIANO: Yes. 19 MR. KEPHART: You did? 20 MR. KEPHART: Okay. Have you responded 20 PROSPECLIVE JUROR MOIR: Yes. 21 personally with the fire department to any type of homicide? 21 MR. KEPHART: Who was it, do you remember? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Yes, I have. 22 PROSPEC LWE JUROR MOIR: I could tell you if I 23 MR, KEPHART: Okay_ And you have met police 23 think about it. 24 officers through that response, haven't you? 24 MR. KEPHART: Okay. Was there anything about 111-38 111-40 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Yes. 1 that experience with the District Attorney's Office that you 2 MR. KEPHART: Okay. Do you recall the two 2 think may affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this 3 3 detectives, the two homicide detectives in this case, are Tom case? 4 Thowsen and Jim LaRochelle? Have you ever heard those 4 PROSPELLWE JUROR MOIR: No. 5 names before? 5 MR. KEPHART: Thank you, Ms. Moir. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: No, I haven't. 6 Your Honor, may we approach the bench again? 7 MR. KEPHART: Okay. When's the last time that you 7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 remember ever responding to a case involving a homicide? 8 MR. KEPHART: Okay, 9 PROSPEC I IVE JUROR CICILIANO: It's been 9 (Off-record bench conference at 11:26:41 until 11:29:09) 10 probably about seven or eight years. 10 MR. KEPHART: Judge, at this point then I'll pass for 11 MR, KEPHART: Oh, okay. Anything about your 11 the defense to question. 12 involvement in any one of those, in any one of -- in that 12 THE COURT: Very well. 13 homicide or any other one that would cause any concern with 13 From the discussion at the bench, the defense will 14 you being a juror on this case? 14 now initiate their voir dire. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: No. 15 MR. SCHIECK: Mr. Willson, I have some followup 16 MR. KEPHART: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ciciliano. 16 questions specifically for you before I get into my general 17 Ms, Moir, 17 questions. The State had asked you a number of questions 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOIR: Moir. Right. concerning the difficulty you had with the police in the past 18 19 MR. KEPHART: Okay. I had asked you before with 19 and that you might be a little bit distrustful of them. I'm sure 20 regards to you gave us some basic information about your 20 you can agree with us that this case is totally different from 21 husband, that you were a victim of a domestic violence case. 21 your case. Is that -22 You actually testified in that, is that correct? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Well, there's still 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOIR: He had a plea bargain 23 police officers involved_ 24 with the, what is it, court-appointed attorney for him_ 24 MR. SCHIECK: And it's just the fact that there's

NV v. LQBATO 9/13/06

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

police officers involved? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Well, detectives. One of my cases was with detectives, on my car. MR, SCHIECK: And I'm sorry, I didn't make a note. Which jurisdiction was it that was involved? PROSPECINE JUROR WILLSON: It was in California. It was the City of Tustin and the [unintelligible]. MR. SCHIECK: But it's a different police department than will be coming here to testify. Do you think you can — PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Not here [unintelligible], MR, SCHIECK: Right. But the officers that come in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

here will be different than the officers that you dealt with, PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Well — well, yes. MR. SCHIECK: Do you think that you could put aside any problems that you had with being wrongly accused and decide the case on the facts you actually hear here in court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: I can't answer that until I hear the facts.

MR. SCHIECK: Okay. Certainly, I would assume it's your intention to be fair to everybody if you're selected as a juror.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Correct,

111-42

MR SCHIECK: And that if you were on trial, you would want people on your jury that wanted to hear the evidence and judge the evidence before making up your mind? PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Yes.

MR. SCHIECK: And you understand that our system involves twelve jurors of a collection of different backgrounds, different viewpoints that form that collective jury to make a decision on guilt or innocence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Yes.

MR. SCHIECK: And that part of that includes people that have different points of view, a point of view such as yours perhaps. You understand how that could be important to our system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Yes.

MR. SCHIECK: And that the point of view that you have, that you have a little distrust for the testimony of a police officer is a point of view that should be included in the jury. Would you agree with that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Could you repeat that, please?

MR. SCHIECK: Would you agree that it's important to have someone on the jury that has a little distrust for the police, who doesn't necessarily believe just everything they say?

111-43

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Oh, I don't know how important it'd be if there was three or four of them that had the same opinion of the police, So, I mean, I don't know how you'd want to balance that out,

MR. SCHIECK: But, certainly, if you were on a trial you'd want — you'd want that present in your jury panel?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Somebody that could lean both ways?

MR. SCHIECK: Yes.

PROSPEC I NE JUROR WILLSON: Is that -- it'd be helpful.

MR. SCHIECK: And am I understanding that you lean both ways?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WILLSON: Yes.

MR. SCHIECK: But if the State comes in and proves their case to you, you'd have no problem returning a verdict of guilty?

THE COURT: I'm gonna -- I'm gonna impose an objection there because that's a hypothetical to commit to a verdict, That is my pet peeve.

MR SCHIECK: So I guess the bottom line question is are you the type of person that can be fair to both sides in this case, both the defense and the State?

PROSPECLIVE JUROR WILLSON: Depending on the

111-44

circumstances. I just -- I can't answer that yes or no because of what -- of what's happened to me in the past. And it's not just happened once, it's happened twice. So that's as honest as I can answer.

MR, SCHIECK: And then I had some specific questions for Mr. Estrada.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Yes.

MR. SCHIECK: You had talked about three forms of penalty. And at least from the defense standpoint it's a little premature to even talk about a sentencing when our position is our client is not guilty. But the law requires that we ask these questions of the jury in this type of a case. You understand that the legislature of Nevada sets forth possible punishments for the various crimes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Yes.

MR, SCHIECK: And they select a range of punishments that are available for a given defendant. In this case there are three possible punishments.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Yes,

MR. SCHIECK: None of them is necessarily right and -- or wrong, except on the facts of that particular case. Do you agree with that?

111-45

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Yes.

MR. SCHIECK: And that before you made a decision

Nt LOBATO 9/13/06

on a sentence you'd want to hear all of the facts that were evidence -presented? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Yeah. 3 PROSPELE IVE JUROR ESTRADA: Yeah, MR, SCHIECK: -- before you made that choice? MR. SCHIECK: And if the legislature and the law of 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Yeah, this is kind of the State of Nevada says that there are three possible 5 like premature, punishments, you should consider all three possible 6 MR. SCHIECK: Right, That's the point I was trying punishments? 7 to make, is we're — PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: That is right, But 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Yeah. I don't think I'm just capable of doing that 'cause I'm not the 9 MR, SCHIECK: -- perhaps getting the cart in front of one who, how can I say this, gave the life to the person so I the horse. 10 can't take it away, And I feel like I would be doing that if I 11 PROSPEC_WE JUROR ISOM: Well sentenced someone to prison, 12 MR. SCHIECK: From behind the horse. 13 MR. SCHIECK: All three sentences are going to PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Well prison. 14 MR. SCHIECK: Somewhere. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Yes. 15 PROSPEC five JUROR ISOM: Somewhere. MR, SCHIECK: One is just without the chance of 16 MR. SCHIECK: Well, do -- I mean, could you parole. 17 consider all three possible punishments? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Exactly. PROSPEGi iVE JUROR ISOM: I wouldn't want to. I 18 MR, SCH1ECK: And the other two, after a long time, 19 wouldn't want to lay that heavy of a sentence on somebody. you get a chance for parole, Are you saying that under no set But I would have to _ I'd have to try to make some kind of call 20 of circumstances would you be able to consider the last choice 21 as to whether the person is remorseful which would be life without parole? 22 MR. SCHIECK: So — PROSPEC_WE JUROR ESTRADA: I would consider 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: -- or not. all three of them, but it's just my mind. 24 MR. SCHIECK: I mean, there is factors you want to 111-46 111-48 MR. SCHIECK: Depends on what the evidence was? take into account — PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESTRADA: Yeah, 2 PROSPEC LIVE JUROR ISOM: Yeah. 3 MR. SCHIECK: And, Mr, Snowden. MR. SCHIECK: -- to make that call? MS, ZALKIN: Isom. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: And I don't have any MR, SCHIECK: Isom. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. We're of that information right now. we had asked you some questions or the State had asked you MR, SCHIECK: You'd be better able to say after you 6 some questions about punishment also, 7 had the information? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Yeah. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Well, I guess so. MR. SCHIECK: And you have heard, obviously, the 9 MR, SCHIECK: Okay, Thank you, questions I asICed Mr. Estrada,, 10 Your Honor, can we approach? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Yes. I think people 11 THE COURT: Yes. change over a period of time, possibly. I don't know whether 12 MR. SCHIECK: Thank you, they will or not. And for me to sentence somebody without a 13 (Off-record bench conference at 11:37:33 until 11:39:44) chance of parole, it would be like me saying you're never MR, KEPHART: If I may, Your Honor, Thank you, 14 gonna change and I have the right to make that call, And I 15 You three kind of are on the hot seat, don't think I do, you see. 16 So, Mr. Willson, I don't mean to pick on you or MR, SCHIECK: So under — 17 anything, but do you remember when I was talking to the jury PROSPECIIVE JUROR ISOM: On the other hand, and I — 18 the victim is kind of without hope at this time — 19 THE COURT: Mr, Isom. MR. SCHIECK: Right. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Yes. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: -- too, so it's a hard MR. KEPHART: Mr. Isom, Okay. 21 call on that one. I believe that people do change over a period 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: That's cool,

111-49

and I -- and I said in a situation where it comes to a point

MR. KEPHART: Mr. Isom, I was talking to the jury

MR, SCHIECK: But you'd want to hear all the

1 2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

of time.

23

24

<u>NV V. LQBATQ</u> 9/13/06

where maybe you're called upon to actually make the decision 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: I wouldn't want to. I 2 as to what the sentence is — 2 don't think so. 3 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Right. MR. KEPHART: Okay. 4 4 MR, KEPHART: -- I asked, I said does anyone think PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: If I have — 5 5 it would be unfair --MR. KEPHART: That's — 6 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Mm-hmm, PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: If I have to make a 7 7 MR. KEPHART: -- if you tell us out here that you call right now — 8 can do it and then you go back into chambers and you bring, I 8 MR, KEPHART: Mm-hmm. 9 9 mean, you — when we first started talking to you — PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: -- that's it. 10 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Right, MR, KEPHART: Okay, Well, unfortunately, you do. 11 MR. !KEPHART: — you indicated that — 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: That's — 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: I really didn't want — 12 MR, KEPHART: You have to make a call right now. 13 well, then I wavered a little bit. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Well, that's my answer 14 MR. KEPHART: Okay, Right, 14 then that I couldn't consider it. 15 PROSPECI_1VE JUROR ISOM: Yeah. 15 MR. KEPHART: Okay. 16 MR. KEPHART: Wanting to do it, we know that 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Yeah, 17 17 nobody -- I mean, I don't think anybody here doesn't believe MR. KEPHART: And don't get me wrong, Mr, Isom. 18 that this is a very awesome responsibility that's put on you. 18 I think it's very fair that you're saying I want to know all the 19 PROSPEMVE JUROR ISOM: Yeah, it is, 19 facts before I do that, 20 20 MR, KEPHART: But the position is is that we're PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Yeah. 21 21 trying to get fair jurors for both sides and — MR. KEPHART: But the thing is is the question is are 22 PROSPECLIVE JUROR ISOM: Right, 22 you in such a state of mind with your feelings about the 23 MR,, KEPHART: And I see you as someone that has 23 punishment that you do not want to, that you do not believe indicated that you could not consider life without because you you could ever sentence somebody to life without knowing 111-50 111-52 think that it takes all their hope away. that he would never, he or she, would never get out of prison? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: True. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: I couldn't do it. I 3 MR, KEPHART: And then when Mr. Schieck was 3 don't think I could. 4 talking to you, you seemed to kind of waver with that, MR, KEPHART: Okay. Would you like anything else, 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Well — 5 Judge? I mean, Mr. Schieck may want to ask him. I don't 6 MR. KEPHART: And right now, it's unfortunate, you 6 know. 7 don't get to know all the facts, Any more, Dave? 8 8 PROSPEU_WE JUROR ISOM: True, MR. SCHIECK: No, Your Honor, 9 MR. KEPHART: And — 9 THE COURT: Very well. 10 PROPECIIVE JUROR ISOM: That's it, 10 At this time, the Court is going to thank and excuse 11 MR. KEPHART: And I would be the first one to tell 11 for cause Juror Badge Number 205, Gregory Willson, Badge 12 you there's -- I mean, you know from reading the papers and 12 Number 237, Gregory Isom, and Juror Badge Number 254, 13 stuff there's oftentimes where the State's asking for certain 13 Emigdio Estrada. penalties and they don't get that. 14 Would you three gentlemen please report back to 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Right, 15 the Office of the Jury Commissioner. 16 MR, KEPHART: Because maybe the jury doesn't see 16 We will then be moving three additional potential 17 that we -- it's warranted. And that's a possibility. But — 17 jurors from group two up into group one. 346, Anush 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Right. 18 Benham, 350, Lacey Valdez, and 355, Joan McCormick. 19 MR, KEPHART: But I want to -- I want to know for 19 The bailiff will put the list back on the easel. 20 sure and the Court wants to know for sure that if you were 20 Anush Benham, would you please go through that 21 called upon in that situation, could you, seriously, could you 21 exercise 22 consider life without? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: My name is Anush 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ISOM: Could I consider it? Benham. I'm currently between jobs,, I'm married, no 23 24 MR, KEPHART: Meaning -children. My husband is on disability. I've been in Clark 24

NV v. LQBATO 9/13/06

County for ten years, and we moved here from Chicago. And works part-time as a assistant manager of a store I'm a high school graduate.) [unintelligible]. I've been in Clark County for nineteen years, THE COURT: The last job that you had, what was 3 moved from Chicago. I have a high school education, a couple it? 4 of college courses. And I haven't been in the military, 5 PROSPEC_WE JUROR BENHAM: It was credit 5 THE COURT: Thank you. administration manager. 6 Ms. Benham, did you listen to the Court's questions 7 THE COURT: For what kind of a business? 7 of the first group yesterday? S PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Lumber, PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Yes. а 9 THE COURT: Lumber. Okay, Thank you. 9 THE COURT: Were there any of my questions that 10 you would have answered? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: My name is Lacey 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: No. Valdez, I work part-time in a private school and also stay 12 12 THE COURT: Ms, Valdez, did you listen to the home and home school one of my four children half the day. 13 13 Court's questions of the first group yesterday? 14 My husband, he's a self-employed construction contractor. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes. I've been in Clark County approximately thirty-seven years. 15 15 THE COURT: Are there any of my questions that High school education, no military. 16 16 you would have answered? 17 THE COURT: Where did you live before moving 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: No, 18 here? 18 THE COURT: Ms. McCormick, did you listen to my 19 PROSPEthVE JUROR VALDEZ: I was actually 19 questions of the first group yesterday? 20 brought here the week I was born, but I stayed thirty-six years 20 PROSPELLIVE JUROR McCORMICK: Yes. 'cause as a teenager I moved to different states for a little 21 21 THE COURT: Are there any of the Court's questions while but came right back, 22 22 that you would have answered? 23 THE COURT: So you came here as an infant? 23 PROSPECIWE JUROR McCORMICK: No. PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yeah, 24 24 THE COURT: Okay. The State may question these 111-54 111-56 THE COURT: Okay. And you said that you work three new potential part-time at a private school? 2 2 MR. KEPHART: Okay. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes. 3 THE COURT: jurors in --THE COURT: What do you do? 4 MR, KEPHART: Thanks. 5 PROSPELLWE JUROR VALDEZ: I'm an aide, a 5 THE COURT: -- group one. student ai der 6 6 MR. KEPHART: Thanks, Judge. 7 THE COURT: With what age group? You kind of had an opportunity to hear me talking 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: From kindergarten 8 today. Did you hear me asking questions and saw some -- all to twelfth grade. 9 9 three of you, all three of you have children. I'm sorry, No. 10 THEtOURT: With both boys and girls? 10 You aid you had no children. PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes, 11 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: I don't have any. 12 THE COURT: Okay, Thank you. 12 MR. KEPHART: And the two that have children, Ms. 13 355. 13 Valdez and Ms. McCormick, have you ever had any situation PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCORMICK: My name is 14 14 with either one of your children, I mean, talked to them or Joan McCormick, I'm retired. 15 15 witness anything that dealt with methamphetamine at all? THE COURT: From what? 16 16 PROSPECI_WE JUROR VALDEZ: No. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCORMICK: Well, when the 17 MR. KEPHART: Okay. 18 Desert Inn closed, I retired from there and I worked part-time 18 THE COURT: The record shall reflect that after that. 19 19 MR. KEPHART: I'm sorry. 20 THE COURT: What did you do at the Desert Inn? 20 THE COURT: -- Ms. Valdez said no and Ms. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCORMICK: Change booth. 21 McCormick shook her head to the negative from side to side. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. KEPHART: Thank you, Judge. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCORMICK: I'm married. I 23 And, Ms, Valdez, you said that you work as an aide have three children. My husband is retired and he just -- he 24 for kindergarten to twelfth grade. III-57

NV v. LQBATO 9/13/06

PROSPECLIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes,
MR. KEPHART: What about in your profession; have
you had any dealings with individuals that you suspected or
you knew was involved with methamphetamine in school?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: No, not in the
school.
MR. KEPHART: Okay, Someplace else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: My best friend's sister-in-law had quite a long draw with it. I kind of went through with her. But she's the only -- the closest person to me I've ever really had, you know, acquaintance with that was into that,

MR, KEPHART: You say a long draw. How long? PROSPELLIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Probably about three years,

MR, KEPHART: Okay. And what did you do personally to assist in helping that person?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: I didn't do anything. I just kind of cour led my friend who was her sister-in-law that was trying to deal with her. And she has since recovered so everything came to an end but —

MR, KEPHART: Did you ever meet her personally? PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes.

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Did you ever see her when

111-58

-- for the actions, specifically the death penalty that just went through my mind.

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Well, since you've been here listening, you've heard what the position is of the State with regards to the punishments, at least -- at least as to the three punishments that she can face, that it's not a capital case and so death penalty is not an issue. And you heard us questioning individuals about those three punishments. Do you have any opinion as to whether or not if you were chose as a juror that you could sit in judgment and impose those type of sentences?

PROSPEL.fiVE JUROR BENHAM: The only one I would have a problem with is with a death penalty and that's a non-issue so —

MR. KEPHART: Okay. So you could consider all three of them?

PROPEL_JIVE JUROR BENHAM: Yes.

MR. KEPHART: Okay, How about you, Ms, Valdez? Do you have any issues with the three punishments that I outlined are available here?

PROSPECIIVE JUROR VALDEZ: No.

MR. KEPHART: You could consider all three of

23 them?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes.

111-60

she was under the influence of methamphetamine?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Probably, She was pretty spunky anyway so it was hard to tell. That was her nature. But I can't say for sure that I saw her under it,

MR. KEPHART: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: I just saw the big effects from it.

MR, KEPHART: Well --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Not necessarily when she's under it. Like the losing of the weight, you know, the body deterioration and the mind deterioration.

MR. KEPHART: When you say mind, what do you mean?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: The lack of accountability for her actions.

MR, KEPHART: Thank you.

Now when you first heard that we were involved in a murder trial and the defense then, you know, introduced themselves and the defendant and you saw who was being charged with murder here, what'd you guys think of? What went through your head? Anything specific?

I'm gonna pick on you, Ms, Benham.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: That's fine, I thought of what the consequences may be, punishment for the

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Ms. McCormick. Mrs. McCormick.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCORMICK: Yes, I could. MR. KEPHART: You could consider all three of

them?

PROSPEUIVE JUROR McCORMICK: Yes, I guess I could with the evidence, But such a young girl and which —

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Well, you know, that leads me into this question. Yesterday I asked everybody as a group, I asked them about the fact that, you know, they heard basically some of the evidence of what — of what —

MR. SCHIECK: I'm gonna object, Your Honor. We haven't heard any evidence yet.

MR, KEPHART: I'm sorry. I've --

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KEPHART: That's fine, Judge. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Mr. Kephart will rephrase.

MR. KEPHART: You heard basically what the State has indicated from what may be shown or what would be shown in trial with regards to the type of injury that Mr. Bailey had received and the fact that he's dead. And you also, in conjunction with the defendant here being a young age, you'll hear she's eighteen years old at the time.

And you just said, Ms. McCormick, you just said,

v, LQBATO 9/13/06

well, you know, I consider that, but she's young and --PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: I'm sorry. 1 PROSPEL LIVE JUROR McCORMICK: Yeah. 2 2 THE COURT: I was having a hard time hearing her 3 MR KEPHART: Do you have any particular opinion 3 as well. 4 about that in light of the fact that we're charging a young lady 4 PROSPECI_WE JUROR BENHAM: I'm sorry. At the here, a young girl, or whatever it may, for killing Mr. Bailey in 5 time, ten years ago, the town was really growing and it was the way that he did -- that she did? just a move for us from Chicago, where prices were rising, to 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCORMICK: I don't have an 7 Las Vegas where at that time things were more affordable, opinion 'cause I don't know the facts yet. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. 9 MR. KEPHART: Okay. Okay. You've — 9 MR. KEPHART: And, Ms. Benham, you had indicated PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCORMICK: I consider it 10 10 also that your brother was arrested for drug possession in serious, very serious. Illinois. 11 11 12 MR. KEPHART: You don't have any opinion that it's 12 PROSPEL LIVE JUROR BENHAM: Yes. impossible that somebody like the defendant here could 13 13 MR. KEPHART: What kind of drugs? commit that type of crime, do you, just because of her age? 14 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: I believe it was PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCORMICK: No, I think the 15 15 meth [unintelligible], heroin, cocaine, marijuana. He has a circumstances can [unintelligible], 16 history of that, which is resolved now, but he did have a 16 17 MR. KEPHART: What's that, ma'am? 17 history. PROSPEL! WE JUROR McCORMICK: I think you'd 18 18 MR. KEPHART: Okay. And that's all [unintelligible]. 19 have to know the ..cTrumstances, PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Yes. 19 20 MR. KEPHART: Okay. But what I'm saying is you 20 MR. KEPHART: Has he been convicted? Is he -don't have a preconceived idea that somebody eighteen years 21 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: No, old and female could not kill somebody? 22 MR. KEPHART: Is he a convicted felon for the 22 23 PROSPEL LIVE JUROR McCORMICK: No. 23 possession -24 MR. KEPHART: Okay. Either one of you three heard 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: No, he isn't. 111-62 111-64 of the town Panaca? MR- KEPHART: — of drugs or anything? Okay. Is 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: I've heard of it, he an older brother or younger brother? never been there. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Older, 4 MR. KEPHART: Never been there. Okay. 4 MR. KEPHART: How much older? 5 THE COURT: That was Ms. Valdez. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEN HAM: Twelve years. PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCORMICK: No. 6 6 MR. KEPHART: Do you associate with him still? 7 MR, KEPHART: Yeah, Ms. Valdez said she heard of 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: I'm sorry? it but never been there, Judge, Okay. 8 MR. KEPHART: Do you still associate with him? THE COURT: The record shall so reflect. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Yes. He actually 10 MR kEPHART: And the other two said no. 10 lives with me. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: No. 11 MR. KEPHART: Oh, okay. Here in Las Vegas now? 12 THE COURT: The record shall so reflect. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Yes. 13 MR. KEPHART: Ms, Benham, I — when we were 13 MR. KEPHART: Okay. All right, What does he do 14 going through this, what she puts up on the easel here, one of 14 for work? 15 the questions is how long have you been in our -- as a resident 15 PROSPEL IIVE JUROR BENHAM; He's ill, actually here in our county. How long have you been here? 16 16 from using, PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEN HAM: Ten years, 17 MR. KEPHART: Disabled? 18 MR. KEPHART: Ten years. And what brought you 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEN HAM: Yeah. here? Was it work? 19 MR. KEPHART: Okay. You said your husband's 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: It was the -- at the 20 disabled as well. time the town was growing in leaps an bounds and everything 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Yes, 22 was just open, too. So it was pretty, you know --22 MR. KEPHART: What — COURT RECORDER: I can't hear. I'm sorry. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: He was a THE COURT: I -24 journeyman butcher when meat was still up on the hooks. So

8

9

11

17

19

21

23

24

'IV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

a

caught on.

his back deteriorated,
MR, KEPHART: From picking meat up on the hooks

PROSPEC_iVE JUROR BENHAM: Yeah.

MR. KEPHART: Okay,

PROSPECIEWE JUROR BENHAM: In the cold, in and out of the freezer, And he has blood clots,

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Had you ever — you said that the most recent one, I guess, you were talking about with your brother or the last time that he was in -- has he been arrested for possession of drugs?

PROSPEILWE JUROR BENHAM: Yes.

MR, KEPHART: And did you know about it when he got arrested?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Yes,

MR. KEPHART: Okay, Were you living in Illinois at that time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Yes,

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Did you have any kind of contact with the law enforcement agencies that arrested him? PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: No, except to bail him out,

MR. KEPHART: Okay. And did he go through a -- being charged and go to trial or anything like that or --

111-66

PROSPECI WE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes,

MR. KEPHART: Okay. And he was pretty upset about what happened?

PROSPECIWE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes.

MR. KEPHART: It shook him up?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes.

MR. KEPHART: Oh. And you said that they weren't able to catch anybody. Do you know the extent of what the police did to try to find somebody?

PROSPECIWE JUROR VALDEZ: I really don't know too much information other than he has a detective friend or somebody at his church that said that he, as a friend, would make sure it got pursued because usually cases like that are kind of washed away because of the bigger, worser crimes out there, and but hadn't heard of any tracking of these men being done,

MR. KEPHART: Okay. How long ago did it happen? PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: I would say three to four weeks ago. About four weeks ago.

MR. KEPHART: Oh, it's just recently? PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yeah.

MR. KEPHART: Oh, okay, Have you personally ever had any type of contact with the police that they needed to do some work for you or anything?

111-68

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: No.

MR, KEPHART: He never even got charged?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: Well, he did get

charged, I — maybe I wasn't there in court.

MR. KEPHART: Okay,

PROSPECIWE JUROR BENHAM: Yeah, he did get charged.

MR. KEPHART: Is there anything about that situation and your contact with the law enforcement back in Chicago that would give you some concern about being here, being fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: No, MR. KEPHART: Okay. Thanks, Ms. Benham, Ms. Valdez, you indicated that your nephew was a victim of a robbery here in Las Vegas and that nobody was

PROSPECI WE JUROR VALDEZ: Correct.

MR. KEPHART: So I'm to take it that he's never been to court or anything to testify about somebody or point somebody out and say that --

PROSPEILWE JUROR VALDEZ: Right,

MR. KEPHART: -- person did this, Okay. After it occurred, did you have any contact with him, did you talk to him, did he talk to you about what occurred or anything?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes. About two weeks ago my daughter --

MR. KEPHART: Two weeks.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yeah. Maybe less, about a week and a half ago, my daughter who's thirteen was driving or riding in a friend's car.

MR. KEPHART: Mm-hmm.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: And they were hit and run, and I had to be there to file a report.

MR. KEPHART: Did they catch anybody in that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: I actually knew the
person because they got the information. My daughter wrote
down the license plate and make and model of the vehicle.
They happened to be one of my neighbors.

MR. KEPHART: Okay. What did you do? Did you take -- did you go over and confront your neighbors yourself or did you call the police and have them come out and —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: I gave the information to my friend who was driving the vehicle, who gave the information to the policemen. And we're just letting the policemen take matters into their own hands.

MR, KEPHART: Has the police, do you know, if you know, contacted them or done any followup or done anything with regards to the hit and run?

111-69

NV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: I know for sure they went by the house one time, but I don't know if they've made their way back there. They advised my friend to go to the insurance companyr

MR, KEPHART: Okay Is there anything with regards to what happened to your nephew or what happened to your daughter in the recent weeks that you think would cause some concerns with you being able to be fair sitting here as a juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Well, my opinion on that is I understand that's what our society in Las Vegas is like, you know, with different crimes, that we really can't expect the police to take care of all these minor details anymore with what they do have on their hands. So I just, you know, have an understanding of that and that there are bigger and better issues out there for them. So —

MR, KEPHART: Okay, Thank you, Ms, Valdez. Judge, at this time, I will -- I will pass the panel for

THE COURT: Okay, MR KEPHART: Okay.

cause,

THE COURT: We're gonna be taking our lunch recess and resuming at 1:15. And at that time, Mr. Schieck will resume his questioning.

111-70

have to be here, too. So that had to get referred to her dad, and on we go.

We are proceeding forward with the voir dire by Mr. Schieck at this time,

MR, SCHIECK: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm going to be asking you some general questions of the entire group, to which if you respond you can raise your hand and we'll follow up on those areas, After I have concluded on the general areas of inquiry that I'm going to make, then Ms. Greenberger and Ms. Zalkin will ask individual questions concerning items that came up in previous questioning over the course of the last two days on items that they've been noting as we went through the process.

And let me start here, and that has to do with the fact that in a first degree murder case the jury, by statute, gets to select the sentence should the defendant be convicted of the crime. And because of that, when we ask questions during voir dire, we have to ask about potential penalties at the beginning of the case before you've heard any evidence in the case. That does not mean and can't be taken as any evidence that the defendant is guilty of the crime.

Does anybody have a problem with that concept? The fact that we ask those questions is not evidence of any

111-72

During the lunch recess you're admonished not to talk or converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, on any subject connected with this trial, 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,

CouA's in recess 'tit 1:15, (Court recessed at 12:03:01 until 13:35:33)□ (Prospective jurors are present)

THE BAILIFF: Department II is back in session. Please be seated.

THE COURT: The record shall reflect we're resuming trial in State versus Lobato under Case Number C177394, in the presence of Ms. Lobato, her three counsel, the two prosecuting attorneys, and ladies and gentlemen of the potential panel.

We received a note which will be marked as Court's Number 4. Court and counsel have reviewed it in chambers. I just got a phone call from my daughter from her school that she's had a sore throat for a couple days, now her stomach is hurting her and she's got a headache and, you know what, I

type of culpability in the case. It's just a fact that we have to do by statute. Does anybody have a problem with that?

Does anybody have a problem with the presumption of innocence that, as Ms. Lobato sits here today, that you all must presume that she's innocent of the charges? Even though we're asking about life without parole and life with parole and a sentence of years, does anybody have a problem with that concept? That it's extremely possible in any case that the defendant is found not guilty, and in which case there wouldn't be a penalty hearing and all these questions we've asked would have been for nothing, Anybody have a problem with the fact that we're taking a few minutes to discuss this?

Seeing no hands to any of those questions, I'll move on.

THE COURT: The record shall so reflect,

MR. SCHIECK: Mr. Kephart had asked about the three possible punishments this morning, and that's the first time the entire panel had heard that that may be a possibility for you to decide in this case. And now you've had over the lunch hour to think about it. Has anyone changed their position concerning their ability to sit and deliberate a penalty in a case of first degree murder? Has anyone changed their —

THE COURT: The record shall reflect no response, MR SCHIECK: Thank you, Your Honor.

111-73

<u>IV v. LQBATO</u> 9/13/06

Has anyone changed their position that they could consider all three possible forms of punishment should that come to pass?

Seeing no hands, I will move on,

Is it okay if I note no hands, Your Honor, and then just move on without bothering you?

THE COURT: That works.

MR. SCHIECK: Thank you, Your Honor,

THE COURT: You're welcome,

MR, SCHIECK: As a component of any case that involves murder there, by necessity, is going to be a deceased person involved in the case, And part of the investigation of a death case is going to include the fact that there will be photographs of a deceased person that will be displayed for the jury in order for the State to be able to prove cause and manner of death, which are elements of every homicide case. That said, you're going to need to be able to look at some rather unpleasant photographs in this case of a deceased person,

Is there anyone that thinks looking at those type of photographs is gonna cause them a concern or inhibit their ability to be fair and impartial in the case?

Okay. And I'm gonna try the best I can on names and numbers,

111-74

what the facts are or what has been proven to you, even though it may be unpleasant?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANDERSON: I can probably be a juror but need counseling afterwards probably.

MR. SCHIECK: We don't want to force anyone into a position where they're gonna need counseling afterwards, And I can assure you, well, I'm fairly confident that I can assure you that no one is going to be trying to force you to look at — more than you need to look at in order to make the decision. And you will have the testimony of some doctors to help you in that regard, what their opinion is of what you're looking at. Do you think, though, that you'd be able to look at that and be fair to both sides in deciding the case?

PROSPECT.WE JUROR ANDERSON: I could be fair to

MR, SCHIECK: And -- PROSPEC,i_WE JUROR ANDERSON: I'm just

ondril Good par of

still be impartial. It's just it'd really be difficult to look at it.

MR. SCHIECK: Okay. And a part of the case does

involve a dismemberment, and so that's another factor that's perhaps unusual. Anything about that that takes it to even a higher level for you?

PROSPEct_WE JUROR ANDERSON: Well, I mean, its

111-76

 ${\tt PROSPEC_WE\ JUROR\ ANDERSON:\ That's\ okay,\ My}$

name is

MR, SCHIECK: But I would guess that you're Tai. PROSPECLWE JUROR ANDERSON: Tai.

MR, SCHIECK: Tai Anderson.

PROSPECLIVE JUROR ANDERSON: Yes. I don't know being impartial, so I don't think I'd have a problem with being impartial, but I would have a hard time looking at the photographs, I can't watch scary movies. I don't deal well with the graphics.

MR, SCHIECK: Okay, And it's likely that that's a very normal reaction that everyone has,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANDERSON: I'm already having nightmares, as we speak, and I don't even know anything about the case and I'm already having some uncomfort -- I'm, you know, being uncomfortable with it.

MR. SCHIECK: As part of this case, the jury's gonna have to decide the cause of death and the manner of death and the instrumentality used to cause that death, as well as some other factors that go into that. That's gonna require that you judge the testimony of some expert witnesses that are gonna display to you photographs of a deceased person with wounds to his body and quite a bit of blood. Are you gonna be able to look at those and do the job as a juror and decide

the same thing. I'm just uncomfortable with it.

MR, SCHIECK: Okay. Anyone else that has the same concerns about looking at -- Courtney Delgado, Okay. And that's Badge Number 213. You've raised your hand. What are you feeling right now?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: Just the same way. I have a weak stomach,

MR. SCHIECK: Okay. I mean, so we -- could we have concerns that you may become ill or this is just -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: No. It's just

discomforting.

MR. SCHIECK: Well, it's not nice for anybody to look at unpleasant photographs. I'm just —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: Yeah.

MR. SCHIECK: Do you think you'd be able to put that aside and decide the facts in the way that I've previously discussed?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: Yes.

MR. SCHIECK: Okay. It's just a concern you have in the case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: Yeah.

MR. SCHIECK: But you think you can do the job for

us?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: I think so.

111-77

NV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

MR, SCHIECK: Okay, And next to you would be Karen Giardina.

PROSPEC.1 WE JUROR GIARDINA: Giardina,
MR. Badge 215, What are you thinking right now?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: I also have a hard time with graphics. I don't watch anything where there is blood and gore. I stay away from those kind of things because they're too -- just the imaginary is just caught in my mind. It doesn't go away easily for me. And so I just have concerns about that part of it, just seeing things. The rest of it, I don't have a problem with. I do know that having to listen to descriptions of someone having a severe injury with a lot of blood, I got very faint one time. So that's my only concern.

MR. SCHIECK: You get faint here or is this a previous occasion that —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: Just a mother telling me what happened to her child. It was very [unintelligible] forfliis child and I-- and I got faint listening to it.

MR. SCHIECK: Now when you see things in the movies or on TV that are graphic, you understand that those are actors and it's probably ketchup, or whatever, they use.

PROSPELLIVE JUROR GIARDINA: I don't watch

which we all agree is a television show that's created for the purpose of selling advertising time but also has some component of reality to it. Anybody that is going to be thinking about what's on — what was shown on TV as opposed to what the witnesses come in here and tell you about, their science and their collection of evidence? In other words, no one is gonna be second guessing and say, well, on CSI the guy would have been able to do something even greater than can be expected and hold the State to that burden. Anybody gonna have that problem?

On the other hand, are you going to be able to accept the testimony of someone that has expertise in a certain area, let's say a fingerprint examiner, and accept his testimony as to what his findings are and accept that as evidence in the case? Anybody have a problem with that? For instance, if -- some people just don't believe in DNA, that there's -- it's impossible that you're going to be able to take a drop of blood or a hair follicle or other pieces of human anatomy and determine who it came from just by running it through this testing procedure. A lot of people at the very beginning were very skeptical about that and it's sort of become more accepted now. Anybody have a problem with DNA evidence and the fact that DNA evidence is gonna be presented in this case? And you'd be willing —

111-80

111-78

those things at all, I do not choose to watch those things,

MR. SCHIECK: But here what you're gonna be seeing is gonna be actual photographs.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: I realize that, MR. SCHIECK: You think you're gonna be able to put that aside and judge the case on the evidence that's presented to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: Yes, that doesn't -- I have no problem with the decision. I'm only worried about how much I c⁹ry with me in my mind after I've seen it and for how many days it stays in my mind.

MR. SCHIECK: Do you think you'll be thinking about that as opposed to looking at the evidence that's presented in the case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: No.

MR. SCHIECK: You think you'll be able to do the job as a juror then?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: Absolutely.

MR. SCHIECK: Anybody in the front row that has concerns other than have been expressed?

How about out in the -- in the audience?

No additional hands, Your Honor,

Now we heard some questioning about the TV show CSI and some of the procedures that they depict on that show,

THE COURT: The record shall reflect that no response was made to this question, nor to the prior question.

MR_ SCHIECK: Thank you, Your Honor,

Anybody have a problem with that? The answer

was no.

Then, likewise, if an expert comes in and says there was no DNA that could be tested, that's a factor you'd like to

was no DNA that could be tested, that's a factor you'd like to know in the case?

Is there anyone here that doesn't want to see all of

Is there anyone here that doesn't want to see all of the physical evidence that exists in the case before making a decision or wants to base their decision on what the physical evidence is in the case? Is there anyone that doesn't agree with that concept?

THE COURT: The record shall reflect no response. MR. SCHIECK: Thank you, Your Honor,

Is there anyone that has a problem with individuals that testify as expert witnesses, that for some reason they're not to be trusted? Has anyone ever had a bad experience with an expert or an expert witness in a case or in your everyday lives?

THE COURT: The record shall reflect no response to that last series of questions.

MR, SCHIECK: Now, as we have previously told you in our introduction, you're gonna hear about towns such as

NV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

Pioche, Nevada, Panaca, Nevada and Caliente, Nevada, which size now as it was thirty-five years ago. It was pretty small are in a fairly close proximity to each other in Lincoln County, 2 then. up north here of Las Vegas, In addition to Panaca, is there 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Yeah, it's still small. anyone that's familiar with the towns of Pioche or Caliente? 4 MR. SCHIECK: Anyone else with those three towns? We're gonna start at the beginning. Mr, — PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: 229, Suzanne Racel. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Arieno. 196, I've It's the same thing as before, camping and fishing. And I've driven like up into Ely, but that's -- I took the 318. I didn't been to Eagle Valley,, I think it's in Caliente, take the 93/95 up. 8 MR, SCHIECK: Mm-hmm. 9 MR. SCHIECK: So you took --9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: And we've been up to PROSPECIWE JUROR ARIENO: Well, I bypassed Cave Lake and such up in Ely, And I've been to student 10 them. council stuff years ago up in Ely. I have lived here so long. 11 12 MR. SCHIECK: You took --But it's mainly, you know, camping and recreational. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: But I did see them 13 MR. SCHIECK: Okay. When you'd go up there, on the map. 14 you'd stay on the main road? 14 15 MR. SCHIECK: You took the Sunnyside cutoff 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: Right, through Lund? 16 MR. SCHIECK: Any impression of any of those PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Correct. 17 towns? MR. SCHIECK: Not because you wanted to avoid 18 PROSPEC IIVE JUROR RACEL: Pretty. It's cooler those towns; just 'ause it's shorter? 19 than here, PROSPEC Live JUROR ARIENO: It's faster,, Right. 20 MR. SCHIECK: Okay, Every place is cooler than MR, SCHIECK: Okay. What were you going to Ely 21 here. for? 22 For the record, everybody nodded at that, Your PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Camping. 23 Honor. MR. SCHIECK: Anyone else next? And you're Mr. — 24 Next is? 111-84 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Sharpe, 1 PROSPEIriVE JUROR BARES: 221, Pam Belles. MR. SCHIECK: Sharpe, 2 MR, SCHIECK: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Yes. We used to 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BARES: A friend of my take that way to go deer hunting. husband and I has a small home in Pioche, and we stayed up MR. SCHIECK: Okay. Up through Pioche and — 5 there about four years ago for two nights. It's just a little one-PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Yes. horse town. I'd have no -- I don't want to go back, MR. SCI-IIECK: -- north of there, Did you ever stop MR. SCHIECK: Any reason why you don't want to in any of those three towns? go back other than it's --PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Yes. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: It's just a little one-MR, tCHIECK: Any impressions of — well, which 10 horse town, with a barn and a restaurant, and that's about all I towns did you stop in? 11 saw. PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Pioche. 12 MR. SCHIECK: Not much to do there? MR, SCHIECK: Pioche? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: Nothing there, PROSPECIIVE JUROR SHARPE: Mm-hmm. 14 They're like -MR. SCHIECK: Any --15 MR. SCHIECK: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Just mostly to gas 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: And it was cold. up and get a bite to eat and stuff like that, 17 very, MR, SCHIECK: Really no other dealings with any of 18 MR. SCHIECK: Must be wintertime, the residents there at Pioche? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: Yeah.

10

11

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ROUGH DRAFT JURY TRIAL - DAY 3

20

21

22

23

24

towns.

MR. SCHIECK: Anyone else?

Ciciliano, I've been there numerous times. I do a lot of

hunting. I've been through both -- all those little, you know,

111-85

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: 220, Tom

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: No.

gonna give away my age. About thirty-five years ago.

MR. SCHIECK: Okay. How long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Oh, God, You're

MR. SCHIECK: Pioche is probably about the same

<u>\IV v. LOBATO.</u> 9/13/06

MR. SCHIECK: Well, just going through to go PROSPECIIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: From Tonopah. hunting? 3 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Right. Well, we MR, SCHIECK: Tonopah. Okay. That's right. Okay. used to have a family reunion in Caliente because I have a lot Tonopah these days is a pretty small town, too. 5 of family in Ely. And so they'd meet halfway, PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRIS I 1NE MILLER: It was MR, SCHIECK: Okay,, 6 small when I lived there and I heard it's getting smaller. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICIUANO: When I was a MR. SCHIECK: In Tonopah everybody pretty much 8 knew what everybody else was doing that lived there? kid. 9 MR, SCHIECK: In fact you said you were originally 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Exactly. 10 MR. SCHIECK: Okay. You knew who came and who 10 from Ely? 11 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Yes. I was born went and -12 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: I'm there, 13 13 MR. SCHIECK: Okay. How long did you live up in sorry? 14 14 Ely? MR. SCHIECK: You knew who was coming to town 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: I was 15 and who was leaving town, and things like that? 16 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: For the transported right here — 17 17 MR. SCHIECK: Oh, okay. So most part, yeah. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILTANO: -- as an infant. 18 MR. SCHIECK: Did you go to high school there? 19 And so — PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: I did 20 20 MR. SCHIECK: You still not. 21 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: -- I've been here. MR, SCHIECK: How long did you live in Tonopah? 22 22 MR. SCHIECK: You still got family up in there? PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: I lived 23 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Yes. there from 1981 through 1987. 24 24 MR. SCHIECK: I mean, in some ways Ely's a pretty MR. SCHIECK: And your father was D.A. up there, is 111-86 III-88 small town, too. that ---2 2 PROSPEC11VE JUROR CICILIANO: It is. PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Yes, he 3 MR. SCHIECK: Although it's much bigger than the is. 4 other three, it's still a small-town atmosphere. MR. SCHIECK: Okay. What — 5 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICIUANO: Yes. PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Yes, he 6 MR. SCHIECK: Everybody seems to know everybody 6 was. 7 else's business, what's going on in town? 7 MR. SCHIECK: What was his name, is his name? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CICILIANO: Probably so. I've PROSPEL. Tive Juror Chrisne MILLER: Peter 9 -- I haven't lived there so I don't know. I don't really, you 9 10 know, pay attention to that end of it. 10 MR. SCHIECK: Peter Knight? 11 MR. SCHIECK: Anyone else? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Yes. 12 PROSPELIIVE JUROR CHRISIINE MILLER: 244, 12 MR. SCHIECK: Okay. He's retired now? 13 Christine Miller, 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Just 14 MR. SCHIECK: Mm-hmm. 14 retired. 15 PROSPEINE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Just 15 MR. SCHIECK: And was he based in Tonopah? 16 16 basically when I was younger, I lived up in the northern part PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: 17 of the state, so just kind of traveling around in the car with my 17 Tonopah. And then he just transferred to Pah rump the last 18 dad but nothing of significance. I've been through each of 18 couple years. 19 these towns, Ely, Panaca, but nothing of significance that I 19 MR. SCHIECK: Have you ever worked for an 20 20 remembered. attorney that principally practiced criminal law? 21 MR. SCHIECK: Were you the juror from Zephyr 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Yes. 22 22 Cove? MR. SCHIECK: And who was --23 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRIS T INE MILLER: No. PROSPEL I 1VE JUROR CHRIS I 1NE MILLER: Stew 24 24 MR. SCHIECK: No. 111-89

NV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

MR, SCHIECK: Stew Bell.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRIS LiNE MILLER: When

he was in private practice,

MR, SCHIECK: Okay. Now Stew Bell became our district attorney and became the head prosecutor for Clark County.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRIS LINE MILLER: Mm-hmm.

MR, SCHIECK: That's kind of a switch of hats, wouldn't you say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Mm-hmm.

MR, SCHIECK: How did that make you feel?

THE COURT: The record shall reflect that both times that she said "Mm-hmm" —

PROSPECT_NE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes.

THE COURT: -- she nodded her head up and down. PROSPEffIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: How did it make me feel to switch sides?

MR, SCHIECK: Yes.

111-90

PROSPEC I IVE JUROR CHRIST_INF MILLER: That's a biased question. I think he's a good judge,

MR. SCHIECK: Anything about those experiences that would affect your ability to be fair to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: I think there could be. I think I could try to be fair and impartial. I honestly know how I think but —

MR. SCHIECK: Okay, And you -- how you think is basically from the prosecution side?

 $\label{eq:prospective} \mbox{PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER:} \\ \mbox{Absolutely.}$

MR, SCHIECK: And there's nothing wrong with that, I mean. Certainly, I mean, your father was a prosecutor for many years. If you were on trial, would you want someone in your frame of mind to sit on their jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: I don't know. I'm torn about that. I would want, obviously, yes, I would want somebody fair and impartial. Do I necessarily think I would want me? I question that in the sense that with my knowledge of the law and my experience, I somewhat have preconceived interests.

MR, SCHIECK: Preconceived notions as to the guilt of the defendant?

111-92

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: It made for a lot of argumentative dinner discussions sometimes. I don't know, I -- honestly, I prefer the prosecution side from my own experience,

MR, SCHIECK: What were the argumentative discussions about?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRIS LINE MILLER: Oh, Mainly just I was learning, I should say, and so I would ask questions. More in a learning capacity and —

MR. SCHIECK: Ask questions of your father who — PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRIST_INE MILLER: Yeah.

MR. SCHIECK: — was a prosecutor?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Yeah.

Exactly. So —

MR. SCHIECK: And when you were working for Stew Bell when he was defending cases, what type of work did you do? Were you a paralegal then?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: No, I was just actually starting in the business and I was just a secretary at that time, And I worked for him only for about six months. It was right before he ran for district attorney and became a judge. So it was —

MR. SCHIECK: How do you feel about him becoming a judge?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Possibly, MR, SCHIECK: So you're really not coming in with a totally clean slate, so to speak?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER:

Potentially,

MR. SCHIECK: Which, I mean, it concerns you enough that you bring it up,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Absolutely.

MR. SCHIECK: You think you can be fair and impartial is what I'm understanding,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: I can try. Absolutely.

MR. SCHIECK: But you can't assure us that the fact that you tend toward the prosecution isn't gonna put an undue burden on us?

PROSPEC_iVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: All I can

MR. SCHIECK: Well, we need — we kind of need to know whether or not you're gonna be able to do it, though.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHRISTINE MILLER: Yes.

MR, SCHIECK: Anyone else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERT MILLER: Deer hunting twenty, thirty years ago.

111-93

NV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

MR. SCHIECK: And that's it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERT MILLER: Yeah.

COURT RECORDER: What's your number, sir?

PROSPEC_T_IVE JUROR ROBERT MILLER: 247,

MR SCHIECK: I notice you've been up and down during the course of the proceedings. Is your back bothering you or —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERT MILLER: No. I've got a bad knee and I asked to be moved to where I had more leg room, but they told me it's impossible to do that. So —

MR. SCHIECK: Okay. The jury box actually has more room. Do you think if you were in the jury box where there is more leg room that would alleviate your knee problem?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERT MILLER: I guess.

MR. SCHIECK: We just don't want to -PROSPEL_LiVE JUROR ROBERT MILLER: It felt
better during lunch when I could extend it_ But here, this has
got a wall in front of you and you can't put your leg out.

MR. SCHIECK: Here in the jury box, let's see if we've got room for you to stretch out. That will be better for you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERT MILLER: Oh, good.

111-94

to do with it. I have never been there. I really don't even know where it is.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}\xspace,\ensuremath{\mathsf{SCHIECK}}\xspace$. Anything about the fact that your father might have worked there —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMNEY: In-law.

MR. SCHIECK: Father-in-law might have worked there.

PROSPEC, I IVE JUROR ROMNEY: Nothing. I don't - know this much about my father-in-law. That's why I'm not even sure if that's the place,

MR. SCHIECK: Thank you for bringing that to our attention,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMNEY: Well, just in case.

I don't — MR. SCHIECK: Okay, And you're?

PROSPEC.T NE JUROR GLYNN: I'm Lori Glynn, 274,

MR. SCHIECK: Mm-hmm.

PROSPEC_I IVE JUROR GLYNN: My grandmother was

twenty years ago. She lived in Pioche most of her life. When she passed, we buried her there. My mother grew up there.

MR. SCHIECK: Did you spend much time up there? PROSPEC..TIVE JUROR GLYNN: Just going to visit grandma, you know, when I was little.

111-96

MR. SCHIECK: Okay.

THE COURT: Counsel, approach.

(Off-record bench conference at 13:59:45 until 14:00:28)

MR, SCHIECK: There were some other hands with people familiar. Go ahead and say your name and your badge number,

PROSPECT_NE JUROR ROMNEY: 268, Lesa Romney. MR. SCHIECK: Mm-hmm.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMNEY: Well, I'm not really for sure, but I 'think it's -- Pioche is a mining town,

MR. SCHIECK: It was for --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMNEY: About sixty years ago. Okay. I think my father-in-law must have lived there or something,

MR. SCHIECK: Pioche was a mining town back toward the turn of the century.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMNEY: Oh. Well --MR. SCHIECK: But it continued to mine for a while

and then went downhill_
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMNEY: Well, I don't know.
Something about that rang bells when you said Pioche. I don't

know enough about it to really -- but I think he must have -- MR. SCHIECK: Did you ever —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMNEY: -- had something

MR. SCHIECK: Form any opinions about small-town Nevada?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: Just a little town. Like she said, a one-horse town. There ain't much to do there when you're a kid.

MR, SCHIECK: Anyone else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: 328.

MR, SCHIECK: Mr. Osborn.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Correct. I spent one night in Caliente, and that was enough.

MR. SCHIECK: Not much to do in Caliente either?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: Not a whole lot,
MR, SCHIECK: Anything about that experience that

would affect you in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: No.

MR. SCHIECK: Okay. There wasn't anything negative about the experience. It's just —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OSBORN: No.

MR. SCHIECK: Let me just sort of broaden the question a little bit, without going too far. We've talked about small towns in Lincoln County, Nevada. Is there anybody that grew up and lived most of their lives or a good portion of their life in a small town in another state, a one-horse town in someplace else?

111-95

\11/ v. LQBATO 9/13/06

Okay. In the back.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: 239, Jane!
Torgerson, I lived in a very small town in Minnesota.
Everybody knew my business. From the time I left for college and until the time we still come back, they still say we won't make it Vegas and we'll come home. So I know exactly what small towns are like,

MR, SCHIECK: You can't drive down the street without somebody knowing and —

PROSPECT_WE JUROR TORGERSON: Which is nice, It's nice to be able to wave to somebody you know. But, yeah, everybody knows who you are,

MR. SCHIECK: How big was that town in Minnesota?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: 3400. I have no idea how big Pioche is, though. I don't know how small it is. But —

MR. SCHIECK: That may be the population of the entire county.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Okay, Well, then no, it wouldn't be that small. But when they talk that way, I know that that's -- what it's like to live in a small town, MR, SCHIECK: Anyone else?

Ms. Glynn.

and Mountain Pass and —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: And Cima and Kelso and, you know —

MR. SCHIECK: So you all got to know everybody. I mean, you knew pretty much everybody that lives in the -- in the area?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: In that area.

MR. SCHIECK: Okay, Anything about that experience you think would affect you in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: No.

MR. SCHIECK: Anybody else?

Okay. Go ahead,

PROSPECINE JUROR BISHOP: 340, Vickie Bishop, A small town called Hyrum, Georgia, probably a population of 2200, the whole time, my entire life 'til I moved here. The same thing, everybody knows everybody, one high school, one theater, one Wal-Mart.

MR. SCHIECK: You had a Wal-Mart.
PROSPEC FIVE JUROR BISHOP: That's about it.

MR. SCHIECK: There's no Wal-Mart in —
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BISHOP: So wherever you
go, you run into somebody you know.
MR. SCHIECK: Anybody else? No? Okay. Thank

III-100

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: Yes, I've lived in a town called Mountain Pass, California.

MR. SCHIECK: 145 on the way to California? PROSPECT_WE JUROR GLYNN: This side of Baker, about 35 miles. There was 350 people who lived there,

MR. SCH1ECK: Did you --

PROSPEC.:T_WE JUROR GLYNN: I lived there for twenty-one years, the first twenty-one years of my life.

MR. SCHIECK: So you went to high school there or -

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: I went to high school in Baker, California.

MR. SCHIECK: So they bused you to high school? PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: Yes,

MR, SCHIECK: So Baker was sort of a collecting point for all the outlying communities?

PROSPEC:TiVE JUROR GLYNN: Yeah, for the high school. But we had a grade school in Mountain Pass and that was where you went to junior high, too. It was K through eighth.

MR. SCHIECK: Is there just one high school there in Baker?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLYNN: There was then. MR. SCHIECK: Yeah, So everybody from Yermo

you,

MS. GREENBERGER: There's one in the front row. THE COURT: We have one more hand up in the

back row.

MR. SCHIECK: Oh, I'm —
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: 215, Karen

Giardina.

MR. SCHIECK: I'm sorry I missed you.

PROSPEC_T_WE JUROR GIARDINA: I didn't -- I mean, I lived in Zephyr Cove, I'm the one you were talking about.

MR. SCHIECK: Okay.

PROSPEC I WE JUROR GIARDINA: However, I

upidarkalii usteksii i

me watch what you do because everybody will know what you're doing, And I taught in -- I taught in that area for twelve years.

MR. SCHIECK: So you'd come down from Zephyr

Cove —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: Exactly,

MR. SCHIECK: -- to teach every day? PROSPECT WE JUROR GIARDINA: Yes.

MR. SCHIECK: Every day that the road wasn't —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: At [unintelligible]

which was primarily Genoa which is even smaller.

III-101

\IN/ v. LOBATO 9/13/06

MR. SCHIECK: And did you find that to be true, that everybody did know what you were up to when you were in town?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: Not myself so much because I went back to where I lived and that was kind of a comfort_ But, yes, I was always very careful when I was teaching what I said and did, and such Being a teacher also, you're always on the platform anyway.

MR_ SCHIECK: Did I miss anybody else? Okay, great,

As you can probably tell from some of the questions that have already been asked, you're gonna hear about the use of methamphetamine in this case. Various individuals involved in the case used methamphetamine, including the defendant. Is there anything about that that's going to prevent you from being fair and impartial in judging the evidence that actually is presented here in court? Anybody have a problem with that, acknowledging

THE COURT: The record shall reflect no response.

MR. SCHIECK: Thank you, Your Honor,

We're certainly not condoning the use but saying is

that gonna affect your ability to judge the case based on the evidence?

THE COURT: Again, no response,

111-102

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. SCHIECK: Thank you very much, That's all the general questions. And now Ms. Greenberger is gonna follow up with some specific followup questions. Thank you very much,

MS. GREENBERGER: Good afternoon.

Ms. Anderson, you raised your hand first, I guess, when you responded to my co-counsel asking if anything you've experienced has been taken out of context, Can you give us an example?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANDERSON: I'm sure plenty. I was a teacher for three years, so there is lots of times when if I said something to a student, then they went to home and I'd get a phone call. Things like, you know, I need you to bring your permission brought back or, you know, some consequence, you know, you might miss recess or something of the sort until you get it brought back, And they go home and say that they'll be kicked out of school or something, something like that, or —

MS. GREENBERGER: So how did it make you feel when those types of things happened?

PROSPEL_JIVE JUROR ANDERSON: Well, obviously,

really coming from. You don't want anybody

111-104

MR, SCHIECK: You're also going to hear evidence that Ms. Lobato was not leading a perfect lifestyle for a period of time in her life., Is that going to affect your ability to judge the case fairly, to judge the evidence that's presented to you fairly?

And, again, no response.

Has anyone ever been wrongfully accused of doing something they didn't do here on the panel?

THE COURT: We've had a couple of folks give us some informatron along those lines, so this question should be just as to what has not already been disclosed previously.

MR. SCHIECK: That's correct, Your Honor, Thank you,

Anyone? Okay.

THE COURT: The record shall reflect no response.

MR. SCHIECK: Has anyone ever had something they've said taken out of context?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think everybody has.

MR, SCHIECK: For the record, I --

THE COURT: The record shall reflect multiple hands

raised.

MR, SCHIECK: I would assume that's under a variety of situations, more than one occasion. I think I have pretty much unanimous nods to that, Your Honor,

misunderstanding what your intentions are. I'm sure there was plenty, plenty of times when -- I tend to be very outspoken and I talk a lot, so it's very easy for people who aren't shy to be misinterpreted more often just by the number of times you speak, And I guess that it feels -- it doesn't feel good, obviously, when somebody assumes that you're different than you really are or what you're intending on.

MS. GREENBERGER: What year do you teach?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANDERSON: I just resigned;
but I taught fourth grade for two years and I taught third
grade. So I'm in sales now.

MS. GREENBERGER: It almost sounds like a game we all might have played in kindergarten, like the game Operator or Telephone where you start on one side of the room and tell someone something, and then by the time it gets to the other side it's something else, Is that —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANDERSON: Sure,, I mean, when you're talking to children they interpret things differently than an adult would, anyhow, so yeah,

MS. GREENBERGER: We're gonna alternate so -- MS. DIGIACOMO: Your Honor, can we approach? THE COURT: Yes-

(Off-record bench conference at 14:12:36 until 14:13:17)

MS. ZALKIN: I had a question for Mr. -- I'm gonna

111-105

NV v. LQBATO 9/13/06

mispronounce the last name, starts with a D-O-B.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOBYNE: Dobyne.
MS, ZALKIN: Yes, Mr Dobyne, What's your jury number, please?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOBYNE: 252.
MS, ZALKIN: And is that your book that's in front of
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOBYNE: Yes, it is,
MS. ZALKIN: I'm familiar with that author and I'm just wondering, well, first, are you an avid reader?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOBYNE: I try to be.
MS. ZALKIN: Okay, And those books are -- I guess

you could kind of say they're mysteries, is that -- in a sense, legal thrillers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOBYNE: Yeah, in a sense.

That's a gift from my mother, gotta read it,

MS. ZALKIN: And are you the type of reader that likes to try to figure out the ending of a book as you're getting into it or do you Are just kind of let the story unfold?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOBYNE: hike to live in the moment of a book,

MS. ZALKIN: And so what does that mean?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOBYNE: Go through the story and then, you know, see where their — where their

111-106

want to see a scrip in hand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: I try to get the cops involved in that,

MS, ZALKIN: Okay.

MS, GREENBERGER: Mr. La Chance, PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Yes.

MS. GREENBERGER: You are Juror Number? PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: 199,

MS. GREENBERGER: 199, Where were you born

and raised?

PROSPELJIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Born in North Carolina and moved when I was a baby to Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut and California,

MS. GREENBERGER: So you've lived in many places?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Yes.

MS, GREENBERGER: Are you a CSI fan?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: I like the show.

I rarely get to [unintelligible].

MS. GREENBERGER: The prosecution has alluded to the fact that it's entertainment. However, you realize we're in a court of law so what's presented here is not entertaining, obviously. And in terms of evaluating physical evidence, when you'll hear evidence about hair, fingerprints, saliva, DNA, are

III-10B

conclusion takes us,

MS. ZALKIN: Thank you.

There were a number of you who indicated living in small towns. We'll just throw the question out. Do you think it's -- do you think that gossip is as much -- is more rampant in small towns than among social circles in larger towns? Just give a show of hands for yes.

So for the record, one, two, three, four, five, six yeses.

Anydne who doesn't think that's true, will you please raise your hand?

One, two, three, four, five for the record. And okay. I have a question for Ms. Torgerson, And you're Number 239, I think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Mm-hmm, MS. ZALKIN: You mentioned seeing some individuals that you believed under the influence in the course of your work as a pharmacist?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Yes, ma'am.
MS. ZALKIN: Has anyone ever tried to come in and
try to convince you that a prescription had been renewed, for
example?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Many times. MS. ZALKIN: And did you believe them or did you

you going to analyze that and scrutinize that evidence as the — and the science behind it? Are you gonna have any problem with that?

PROSPECi1VE JUROR LA CHANCE: No,

MS. GREENBERGER: Have you heard of any recent cases in the media where statements have been made, recent media high-profile, and physical evidence has exonerated the crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Yes,

MS, GREENBERGER: What case would that be? PROSPEC_IIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: The Jon Benet.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Yeah.

MS, GREENBERGER: And in that case, tell me what you learned about it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Just the fact that they had the DNA evidence and because the person who was claiming to have been involved did not match, that he was cleared.

MS. GREENBERGER: Did you feel like the right decision was made in that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: Yes.

MS, GREENBERGER: Did you feel like the physical evidence spoke volumes?

111-109

NV v. LQBATO 9/13/06

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LA CHANCE: I think it was MS. GREENBERGER: Do you know what kind of 2 drugs that involved? 2 significant 3 3 MS, GREENBERGER: Mr, Sharpe, good afternoon, PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: I believe it was 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Good afternoon. heroin. 4 5 5 MS, GREENBERGER: Just so we're dear, is it your MS, GREENBERGER: Was the perpetrator ever son-in-law that's a homicide officer with Metro? 6 apprehended? 7 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Yes, PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Yes, 8 8 MS, GREENBERGER: And your brother-in-law is MS. GREENBERGER: Where was this occur? 9 Richard Wright? PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: It was here in Las PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Correct, 10 10 Vegas, 11 11 MS. GREENBERGER: So for those of the jury that MS. GREENBERGER: Ms. Mies, 12 12 don't know, Richard Wright is a criminal defense attorney in PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: Yes, 13 13 MS. GREENBERGER: Good afternoon, You're Juror town, 14 14 PROSPEL I 1VE JUROR SHARPE: Yes, Number 221? 15 PROSPEC.i IVE JUROR BAILES: Yes. 15 MS, GREENBERGER: Do you have the opportunity 16 MS, GREENBERGER: Regarding your personal to interact with your brother-in-law and son-in-law at the same 16 17 time? 17 experience with methamphetamine addiction through your 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: No, 18 family, can you tell us if you observed how methamphetamine 19 affected, for example, your son's reliability? 19 MS, GRrET\IBERGER: Do you have a bias for either 20 20 side in terms of prosecution versus criminal defense just based PROSPECTIVE JUROR BARES: He did not take 21 21 on the family that you have that are both in those fields? responsibility for his actions, extreme weight loss, 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: No. 22 argumentative, many, many traffic tickets. 23 23 MS, GREENBERGER: So you heard — MS. GREENBERGER: Did you find him to be more or 24 THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't hear a response. 24 less dependable during that time period? III-110 111-112 PROSPECI 1VE JUROR SHARPE: No 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: More or less what, 2 THE COURT: Thank you, 2 please? 3 3 PROSPEL I 1VE JUROR SHARPE: You're welcome, MS, GREENBERGER: Dependable. 4 MS, GREENBERGER: You heard the Judge PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: No, not dependable 4 instructing that the charges against my client are mere 5 at all, 6 allegations? MS. GREENBERGER: Not dependable? 6 7 7 PROSPECIWE JUROR SHARPE: Correct, PRO5PECI1VE JUROR BAILES: No. Not when he's 8 8 under the influence, MS, GREENBERGER: And in this country, as we've 9 9 been talking about, there's a presumption of innocence. MS. GREENBERGER: What about reliable? 10 10 PROSPEC.I.WE JUROR SHARPE: Correct PROSPECTIVE JUROR BARES: Well, no, 11 MS, GREENBERGER: And if you heard all of the 11 MS,, GREENBERGER: Not reliable? 12 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: No, Goes along with evidence in this case and you were convinced that the 13 prosecution had not met their burden — 13 dependent, 14 THE COURT: I'm gonna impose an objection here, 14 MS. GREENBERGER: Is it fair to say that if he told 15 15 that's calling for him to predict a verdict based upon a you something you might take his statements with a grain of 16 hypothetical, 16 salt? 17 MS. GREENBERGER: Would you have any hesitancy 17 PROSPEL LIVE JUROR BARES: Well, normally, yeah, 18 MS. GREENBERGER: During that time period? 18 acquitting an individual if you found no evidence? 19 PROSPECTWE JUROR BALES: Yeah, during that 19 THE COURT: That's the flip of the same question. time period. 20 Counsel, approach, 20 (Off-record bench conference at 14:20:41 until 14:21:15) 21 MS, GREENBERGER: Why is that? 21 22 PROSPEC I NE JUROR BARES: You wouldn't believe 22 MS, GREENBERGER: Mr. Sharpe, you said in 1977 23 your cousin was killed over a drug deal? 23 what he said. He was -PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHARPE: Yes, 24 24 MS. GREENBERGER: You couldn't believe him?

NV v. LOBATO

9/13/06

PROSPELINE JUROR BARES: No.

MS, GREENBERGER: Prior to his meth addiction, did he have those attributes or was he different?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: He did quite well. As a matter of fact, he spent five years in the military and he excelled. Arid then when he came home, he ran into some old friends and then the problem began,

MS, GREENBERGER: So a lot of the problem might have been with the people that he was hanging out with?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BAILES: It was. Yes, it was.

MS. GREENBERGER: Ms. Torgerson,
PROSPECLNE JUROR TORGERSON: Mm-hmm.

MG CREENDERGER W. I. J. N. J. A.

MS. GREENBERGER: You're Juror Number? PROSPECt NE JUROR TORGERSON: 239.

MS, GREENBERGER: And you have also had some experience with methamphetamine addiction.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Yes.

MS, GREENBERGER: With regard to my previous questions, what has your experience been with regard to those type areas?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Of course, it was back in Minnesota and it was my brother, but it was very devastating to my parents with the same type of thing. He lost a lot of weight. He quit working. They didn't want to

111-114

want to get into any discussions with anybody. But just, you know, he would tell my parents things that his wife would say weren't true. But so as far as I know, not much that he said was true.

MS. GREENBERGER: What about paranoia; have you seen that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: I think it's strange that he'd stay in a barn for three days.

MS, GREENBERGER: A barn, not a bar?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Yeah, He'd be in a barn.

MS. GREENBERGER: B-A-R-N?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Yeah. You know, when we were in pharmacy school, you know, they trained us a lot about illegal drug use. And he just did a lot of that kind of thing. I don't know if I'd call it paranoid but, you know, he'd sit and tear things apart because he'd be so wide awake that he would do that for two or three days in a row, and then he'd crash really hard and sleep for two days. I've seen that. I mean, I've seen him do that in the short time that I was home but —

MS. GREENBERGER: And what is that called, if you know, based on your training, like a binge?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Well, I don't

111-116

really believe, meaning they, my parents, didn't really want to believe that it was him that -- so they would, you know, excuse everything he did. But it just -- it completely changed his life. He turned into a different person,

MS, GREENBERGER: And in terms of his dependability, reliability, how was that affected?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Dependent on anybody else? Probably not, 'cause he would stay in his barn for days, very unreliable, you know, he quit working and --

MS. GREENBERGER: And would you say during that time period information he told you, you might have to sometimes take with a grain of salt?

PROSPEC:FIVE JUROR TORGERSON: You couldn't believe anything he said,

MS. GREENBERGER: Why is that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Because he wouldn't tell the truth. Because every time I'd ask him if he was using, he would tell me no.

MS, GREENBERGER: Did he often tell you inconsistent stories?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Well, I would only go home for holidays so that would be the only time I could hit him up for it. But he would stay away from me. So but he just -- he just really put himself aside and didn't really

know, but all I know is they crash. You know, and he would crash. He would come over to our house. Like he wouldn't show up for Thanksgiving dinner and he'd show up on Friday and he'd sleep until Sunday, just right on the ground in my parents' house, And that's just not what people do on a normal —

MS, GREENBERGER: Right,
PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: -- basis.
MS. GREENBERGER: And you also -- I know that

you mentioned that coming from a small town gossip ran rampant. Is that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Right,,
MS, GREENBERGER: Can you give us some
examples or expand on that a little?

PROSPELi_iVE JUROR TORGERSON: Well, people would tell me that Jed was using, you know, and I would tell my parents that. They wouldn't listen. I mean, that's probably the thing that was most prevalent,

MS. GREENBERGER: And —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: But my brother was always somebody that was in trouble, so then I was always the little sister of the druggie, you know, and so I always had to live and make my own -- make my own person out of myself because I was always judged to be Jed's sister.

111-117

9/13/06 Vv. LOBATO

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

20

21

22

23

MS. GREENBERGER: Did everyone in your town -was it so small that everyone was aware of what everyone else was doing? Is that —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Always,

MS. GREENBERGER: Always?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Yeah, It made you behave,

> MS. GREENBERGER: Thank you for sharing with us. PROSPECTIVE JUROR TORGERSON: Yeah.

MS, GREENBERGER: Ms. Valdez, Juror 350. Hi. PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Hi.

MS. GREENBERGER: Good afternoon. So you are a student aide?

PROSPEL, I WE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes.

MS. GREENBERGER: And that's for K through 12?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes.

MS. GREENBERGER: Have you experienced the game Operator or Telephone?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes.

MS. GREENBERGER: Can you explain to us how you know that goes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Well, being that it's a private school, it's much, much smaller than a public school so that goes on, yeah, where a student will say something

111-118

using meth, then they're just not responsible anymore, they don't take care of -- they don't have a conviction anymore regarding the things that they do and —

MS, GREENBERGER: Would you feel comfortable relying on something they told you that was perhaps critical? Would you weigh in their meth use and how would you weigh

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: If I was given with evidence, you know, if they said something critical and there was substantial evidence of what they were saying regarding -

- you mean regarding a person or regarding —

MS, GREENBERGER: give you — PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: -- [unintelligible],

MS. GREENBERGER: Ill give you an example.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Okay.

MS, GREENBERGER: You left your car in your friend's driveway,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Mm-hmm.

MS, GREENBERGER: You got — went out to the movies with your friend, walked out of the theater, came back and the car had a dent in it.

PROSPEC 11 VE JUROR VALDEZ: Mm-hmm.

MS. GREENBERGER: Your best friend's sister was home. You had left the keys on the counter inadvertently.

111-120

about another student, it will get carried back to the student it was spoken of and, you know, their heart's broken and it wasn't quite true. And it goes on all the time.

MS, GREENBERGER: So is it fair to say that tales get exaggerated?

PROSPEL I1VE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes,

MS. GREENBERGER: Is that a common occurrence? PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes.

MS. GREENBERGER: And you had an experience with meth use also, a friend of a friend.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Mm-hmm.

MS. GREENBERGER: Did you experience the same thing the other two jurors we've spoken to did in terms of your best friend's sister and her dependability, reliability'? Was that a similar occurrence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes.

MS. GREENBERGER: Can you explain it a little bit, what you observed?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Just knowing people before they got on that, they just, you know, level-headed, making right decisions, you know, going about daily responsibilities. And once I've noticed, 'cause I also forgot to mention that my nephew through marriage also is still a meth addict, basically, but once -- I've seen that once they start

She told you I didn't drive it, I've been here watching television. She had on a pink, fuzzy sweater. When you went home that night, pink, fuzzy sweater got on your clothes.

That's my example. How would you weigh that in?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: I would lean towards being lied to [unintelligible].

MS. GREENBERGER.: The pink, fuzzy hairs may speak louder to you than words, her words?

PROSPELLIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Yes, [unintelligible]. MS, GREENBERGER: Just one more question for you, Ms, Valdez, You mentioned a question that -- or an answer that the police in this area are now overloaded. I don't know that much about Las Vegas. But do you have a sense because of that that sometimes the police have to take

shortcuts or can't pursue full investigations because there is so much going on in Vegas?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: Well, my personal thought would be that not that they would take shortcuts but they would pick and choose what they're going to investigate. I feel like once they investigate it, they would be -- investigate to the fullest. But I think that there is kind of a — well, that they know their limits on what they investigate now and due to the volume of crime in our city.

MS. GREENBERGER: Thank you.

111-119

<u>IV ^y. LOBATO</u> 9/13/06

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Y y. I

1 2
3 M
4 5
6 yc
7 te
8 be
9 yc
11 pl
12 13 m
14 15 to
16 be
17 to
18 wl
19 20 in
21 22

23

24

3

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

case,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VALDEZ: You're welcome,
MS. ZALKIN: Okay, Ms. McKeever or Mrs.

McKeever, in the jury box. You're 238?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR McKEEVER: Yes, ma'am.
MS_ ZALKIN: I don't think we've heard much from
you so I just wanted to ask you, generally, on a scale of one to
ten, do you feel that crime is a problem in Las Vegas, one
being — well, rather, are you concerned with it, one being
you're not concerned at all, ten being you're so concerned that
you don't even want to leave the house? Where would you
place yourself on that spectrum?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR McKEEVER: I would guess maybe a five. I wouldn't be afraid to go out,

MS. ZALKIN: Do you feel that there are parts of town that you'd be more likely to not be concerned about being in, you know, at night, or whatever, than other parts of town or does your — does your number five kind of reflect the whole picture of Las Vegas?

PROSPECI_IVE JUROR McKEEVER: Well, since I live in Boulder City, I'm pretty comfortable there.

MS. ZALKIN: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR McKEEVER: But there are probably parts of Las Vegas that I know are more dangerous in my opinion at night than other parts of Las Vegas,

111-122

testifying, were you concerned that the judge or, you know, the trier of fact would not believe you —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR EVERAKES: No_

MS. ZALKIN: — in a claim? You weren't. So were you nervous just by virtue of being up there and —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR EVERAKES: Yes.

MS. ZALKIN: You were, And would — do you think that that's a common feeling to have, being nervous when you're speaking in front of strangers, basically?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR EVERAKES: Yes.

MS, ZALKIN: Okay. Thank you.

Then, Mr. — Number 322. Is it Vergot?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VERGOT: Yes.

MS, ZALKIN: Okay. And it's the same question to you. You had testified in a small claims, is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VERGOT: No. It was for — between the Blue Man Group and the Local 720, And it's — and it was basically explaining what my job was,

MS. ZALKIN: Okay,

PROSPEC.I WE JUROR VERGOT: So -

MS. ZALKIN: So you weren't a contested witness

then?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR VERGOT: No.

MS. ZALKIN: Okay, Well, I'd like to hear more

111-124

MS, ZALKIN: And do you feel that in your opinion are there enough police officers on the streets to kind of handle the level of crime that the city faces or do you think that there are more, that there are too many and that we should focus on prevention more, or what are your thoughts on that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR McKEEVER: I guess I feel like it's adequate. I've heard talk of needing more police officers on the street, probably true in some areas. But not being in law enforcement, I'm not sure how that would work.

MS, ZALKIN: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR McKEEVER: You're welcome, MS. ZALKIN: I had a question. There are two jurors

in this audience section that happen to be next to each other.

Mr Everakes, we can start with you first.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR EVERAKES: Yes. 327.

MS. ZALKIN: Yes, thank you. You previously — you gave testimony in, I think it was, a small claims case or maybe more than one. Is that correct?

PROPELLIVE JUROR EVERAKES: In a small claims

MS. ZALKIN: In small claims?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR EVERAKES: Yes.

MS, ZALKIN: And were you, when you were

about your traveling troop experience but I think I'll probably get in trouble if I get into that,

PROPELIWE JUROR VERGOT: Sure,

MS. ZALKIN: Let me see, And how about, Mrs., Benham, I'll put the question to you that I asked about the level of crime in Las Vegas on a scale of one to ten, one, non-issue, ten, big concern of yours. Where would you place yourself?

PROSPEC,NE JUROR BENHAM: I would probably say six just because from the time I got here ten years ago, if you watch the news, it was a small segment. Now it's a lot bigger than that.

MS. ZALKIN: And do you feel that there are enough police officers or that we need more or that we should focus on, you know, other —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BENHAM: We could probably always use more police officers. Anytime I've had an issue where I've had to call, if I saw a car accident or something, they were pretty quick to [unintelligible] and so —

MS. ZALKIN: Okay, Okay, Thank you.

The Court's —

THE COURT: She was 346?

 $MS.\ ZALKIN:\ 346,\ Thank\ you,\ Your\ Honor_$

The Court's indulgence,

111-125

111-123

ROUGH DRAFT JURY TRIAL - DAY 3

,11/ v. LOBATO 9/13/06

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: Douglas County, THE COURT: Yes, 1 MS, GREENBERGER: Douglas County, Where's that 2 (Pause in the proceedings) 2 MS, GREENBERGER: Ms. Delgado. about? 3 PROSPEU_WE JUROR DELGADO: Yes. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: In Gardnerville. MS. GREENBERGER: What impressions did that case 5 MS. GREENBERGER: Good afternoon. leave on your mind with regard to our criminal justice system? MR, KEPHART: Judge, may we approach again? PROSPECIIVE JUROR GIARDINA: I felt being on 7 THE COURT: Yes, 7 (Off-record bench conference at 14:39:08 until 14:40:14) the jury we did the job. We did a fair job of listening to all the-8 8 MS. GREENBERGER: And where were you born and 9 evidence, and we discussed it very well. I feel that we came 9 to the right decision. raised? 10 10 MS. GREENBERGER: Thank you, 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: North Augusta, 11 Ms. Racer. South Carolina. 12 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: Yes. 13 MS, GREENBERGER: Was that a small or a large 13 MS, GREENBERGER: You also served on a criminal town? 14 14 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: It's about 15 jury? PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: Right, 16 16 medium. MS. GREENBERGER: Medium. If you heard 17 MS, GREENBERGER: What kind of case was that? 17 evidence about someone's promiscuity, could that impact you 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: A burglary. 18 one way or the other in terms of judging their character? How 19 MS. GREENBERGER: And where was that? 19 would that affect you if you heard evidence of promiscuity? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: Here in Las Vegas. 20 Would you lean more toward their quilt or innocence? 21 21 MS. GREENBERGER: The same question that I MR. KEPHART: Your Honor, I'm gonna object. 22 posed to Ms. Giardina. What impressions did you have after 22 23 She's asking them to possibly comment on what they may find 23 that? with regards to what the evidence would be, 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: Of? III-126 111-128 THE COURT: The Court sustains the objection. It's 1 MS. GREENBERGER: Of our system. 1 not a proper voir dire question. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: Of our system? It's MS. GREENBERGER: You've heard some of my 3 fair and it does what it needs to do -3 questions to the other jurors about physical evidence. Are you MS. GREENBERGER: And — 4 4 familiar with the Jon Benet Ramsey case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR RACEL: -- to bring about the 5 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: A little bit. 6 right, you know, decisions as far as, you know, in that case, is 6 7 MS, GREENBERGER: How did you feel about Mr. 7 to bring the evidence up and bring the person to the proper Carr, the man accused of the crime, being freed when the 8 8 verdict as to what we all discussed and what happened, physical evidence cleared him? 9 MS. GREENBERGER: In that case, were you able to 9 PR*ECTIVE JUROR DELGADO: I felt it was right keep an open mind until all of the evidence was presented? 10 10 because of his physical evidence on that particular case. PROSPELL_IVE JUROR RACEL: Right. 11 11 MS, GREENBERGER: Thank you. MS. GREENBERGER: Thank you. 12 12 13 13 Ms. Giardina, good afternoon. You served on a Ms. Moir. criminal jury? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOIR: Yes, 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: Yes. 15 MS, GREENBERGER: Good afternoon. 15 MS. GREENBERGER: What type of case was that? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOIR: Good afternoon. 16 17 PROSPEC, WE JUROR GIARDINA: Lewd and 17 MS. GREENBERGER: Your ex-husband had lascivious behavior of a minor under the age of fourteen. 18 methamphetamine issues. You've heard the questions I've 18 MS. GREENBERGER: All right. How long was that 19 19 posed to some of the other jurors with experience with 20 methamphetamine. Did you experience the same phenomena 20 trial? PROSPECTIVE JUROR GIARDINA: Three and a half in terms of his reliability, dependability? 21 21 PROSPEC!'VE JUROR MOIR: Not really 'cause I 22 weeks. 22 MS. GREENBERGER: And that was in Douglas City, 23 23 caught him using once and that was when I asked him to 24 24 Nevada? 111-129 111-127

∜V v LOBATO 9/13/06

22 l

leave the home.

MS, GREENBERGER: Thank you.

Mr. Arieno,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Yes

MS, GREENBERGER: You had maybe talked about this a little bit, about a new business that you're starting,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Yes.

MS, GREENBERGER: How is this trial gonna impact this business?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: Oh, it's gonna crush my business. I -- everything's Monday through Friday, from 9:00 to 5:00. I do what I have to do.

MS, GREENBERGER: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ARIENO: You're welcome,

MS, GREENBERGER: Thank you,

THE COURT: Will counsel approach?

(Off-record bench conference at 14:46:12 until 14:51:08)

THE COURT: Counsel wishes to make a record on challenges outside the presence of the jury, so we will be doing that at a future point in time. But other than that, the parties are passing the group and we will be moving into the peremptory challenge phase.

There are some of you who we will not be getting to for the purposes of this trial which are the end of the second

111-130

group. The Court's going to read your badge numbers and names at this time. Then you may exit through the rear doors and report back to the Jury Services Offices. We thank you for your time and your effort and commitment to your community here these last few days.

Those persons being thanked and excused at this time are as follows:

Ellen Wall, 359, Thomas Dorsey, 388, Donelle Pope, 392. David Smith, 404, Freddie Macklin, 405, Marcus Barber, 408, Juanna Jordan, 411, Robert Wayerski, 418, Willie Craft, 422, and Dayna Angelo, 424.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we move into the peremptory challenge phase, it will take counsel a few minutes to confer with each other and review their notes and confer with their clients, And I am gonna take us off the record in a moment. If you've brought some reading material with you or something that you can do quietly in your seat, you may do so, but I'm gonna ask you please to not start talking because you start talking and then the noise level starts escalating, as more and more of you talk, and then they can't get their job done, So --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANDERSON: Would this be an appropriate time to use the restroom if we needed to?

THE COURT: Unfortunately, the attorneys find it

beneficial to be able to look at you and look at your number and your name in order to make their decision. So I was gonna let you go out of the room, but it's not gonna work. There's too many of you and we've gone through too many people in this particular trial. So when we get done with this, we will be taking an afternoon stretch break, though, Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANDERSON: That's fine,
THE COURT: All right. You're okay for now?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANDERSON: I'm -- I was a
teacher. We don't always get to go for five hours.

THE COURT: The record shall reflect that that was Tai Anderson, 198.

Okay. I'm gonna take us off the record, (Off record at 14:54:50 until 15:32:00) COURT RECORDER: On the record.

THE COURT: Okay, The peremptory challenge sheet will be marked as Court's Number 5.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are a number of you who are gonna be thanked and excused at this time by way of the peremptory challenge process. We thank you so much for all your time and your efforts and your service to your community these last few days with regard to this jury selection process.

As your badge number and name is read, after I

111-132

read the list for the whole group, then you may exit through the rear door. You will need to report back to the Office of the Jury Services,

Those of you being thanked and excused through the peremptory challenge process are as follows:

209, Gary Wilcox, 213, Courtney Delgado, 215, Karen Giardina, 217, Joann Totaro, 221, Pamela Bailes, 229, Suzanne Racel, 238, Carol McKeever, 244, Christine Miller, 247, Robert Miller, 265, Wendy Real, 268, Lesa Romney, 274, Lori Glynn, 275, Sara Skilbred, 277, Eva Eastburn, 278, Elisa Miguel, 327, Marshall Everakes, 328, Robert Osborn, and 340, Vickie Bishop.

Thank you, You may all exit at this time.

(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: Those of you who remain will constitute the jury for the purposes of this trial. I'm going to give you a ten-minute stretch break at this time. In ten minutes please be in the hallway. The bailiff will be reseating you when you return into the seats that you will occupy throughout the remainder of the trial.

During this 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

111-133

<u>V v. LOBATO</u> 9/13/06

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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 ten minutes.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Court recessed at 15:35:19 until 15:52:38)☐ (Prospective Jurors are not present)

THE BAILIFF: All rise, please.

Department II is back in session, Please be seated.

THE COURT: The record shall reflect we're convened outside the presence of the jury at the request of counsel in State versus Lobato under Case Number C177394.

MR. KEPHART: Judge, I had asked for -- that we'd have this. I had an opportunity during the break to view a portion of -- I believe they're gonna present a PowerPoint for their opening. We haven't been provided any portion of that so we don't know what it is except for I did see a portion of it up on the screen when they were testing the screen. And it's my position that the PowerPoint is argument, and this is not the time for argument, This is opening statements. And I think it's improper. And I only saw one line, the very first line, and with that one line I could feel comfortable in arguing to the Court now that it is argument. And it's not appropriate.

111434

just supportive of the -- of the words that she's going to use as she's making her argument, which is that the evidence in this case would show that Kirstin Blaise Lobato was wrongfully accused of murder when she was eighteen years oldr It's also gonna talk about the fact that she's gonna be presenting an alibi defense and what that alibi defense is It's also gonna talk about the evidence that exist -- excludes her as the person that committed this crime. All of those things are based solely on the evidence that we intend to introduce either during our case in chief or during the cross-examination of the State's witnesses. The fact that the word "wrongfully accused" appears on the first line is only supportive of the argument and statements Ms. Greenberger plans to make that indicate that the evidence will show she was wrongfully accused, And that is not argument. That is what we submit the evidence will show. And it's never been my experience that we needed to pre-show our PowerPoint presentation to the district attorney.

THE COURT: No. We didn't used to have PowerPoint presentations,

MR. SCHIECK: That's true. But, you know, that's no different from us asking to see Mr. Kephart's notes of what he intends to say. I can assure this Court that Ms. Greenberger, in discussing with me and in preparing her PowerPoint presentation, is basing it on what the evidence will show and

111436

It's not proper for the opening statements, And I'm gonna object, be objecting to it. I am objecting. And I'd hate to do it when they're presenting it in front of the jury.

THE COURT: What was the line?

MR, KEPHART: Your Honor, it starts out, it says, "Kirstin Blaise Lobato," and then the first line says -- I don't have it in front of me but I seem to remember it saying, "18-year-old female wrongfully accused of murder." And I didn't see anything further from there, but I believe that that's argument and rt's not appropriate.

MR SCHIECK: Actually, it's Ms, Greenberger's PowerPoint presentation. But at the same time we're —

THE COURT: The defendant is present and —

MR. SCHIECK: That's fine. I can -- I can argue it, Your Honor.

 $\label{eq:THE COURT:} \mbox{$-$ two of her counsel are present. Ms.}$ Greenberger is absent,

MR. SCHIECK: I -- she's here.

THE COURT: Oh, she just --

MR. SCHIECK: I —

THE COURT: She just came in.

MS, GREENBERGER: Sorryr

MR. SCHIECK: I have -- I have seen her PowerPoint presentation, and what is on the PowerPoint presentation is

those were the — will be the words that she will premise every point in her PowerPoint argument. And I'm speaking for her even though it's her argument because she didn't hear the argument before, But I don't think she takes exception with what I've said on the basis that I've seen the argument, as has Ms. Zalkin,

THE COURT: Mr. Kephart's raised an objection to your PowerPoint presentation because he indicated that the very first line up says, "Wrongfully accused," which he believes is argument for summation or closing argument rather than for opening statement purposes. So Mr. Schieck was explaining the context in which you intend to use your PowerPoint presentation.

MS. GREENBERGER: And I have -- I have ran it by my local counsel multiple times and, you know, reviewed it with him to make sure it comported with all of the requirements,

MR. KEPHART: Your Honor, I appreciate Mr. Schieck's words in saying that, premising this that we intend to prove this or our evidence intends to prove that. That's not what the PowerPoint says. It starts out with the very first premise, which is argument. And with it up on the board and sitting like that, and I didn't see any more, I don't know what else is on there, and I'd venture to say if they're consistent

111-135

N v. I...Q[3AT° 9/1 3/06

with that, then I'm gonna be asking the Court, during their PowerPoint, I'm gonna be objecting. And that's why I'm making my objection now, just because I did see that

5

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And Mr. Schieck talks about wanting to see my notes, I've never asked for their notes, but I certainly expect that if I argue in my opening statement that he'd be objecting to it. And they're well aware of what we intend to present evidence-wise because they've had an opportunity to see it from one trial before. And so I just think it's inappropriate and I felt comfortable making my objection now because I don't want to have to be doing it in front of the jury. As a matter of fact, they talk that he's never had to have this happen before. My very last trial, it happened with our expert and it happened with our PowerPoint presentation, The Court ordered ours to be presented to Mr. Wilson/Wolfson [unintelligible]. So I know it wasn't here. I'm just saying that that seems to be the trend now And I wasn't aware that a PowerPoint presentation was being made for their opening. I knew there was one for their expert because they provided me with the photographs that they intend to use with that PowerPoint, and but I wasn't aware of this one until I came in and saw them setting it up and then I saw the first word on there. And then she quickly took it off, like I wasn't supposed to see it.

111-138

will,

2

3

4

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

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: You're welcome.

Counsel had at sidebar mentioned that they may wish to make a argument on the -- on the record about challenges for cause. Did you need to do that now?

MR. KEPHART: Well, Your Honor, I think because there was none made that are on the record, I know the Court noted and it's part of the record that certain individuals were passed for cause or were excused for cause. I am my concern is is that the defense may have some concern later that they didn't have an opportunity to address that, And, I mean, certainly, this is their opportunity now. We made our claim as to certain ones when I was questioning, and I know that they've made a request on a couple of them. I think it's probably appropriate that we probably need to make a record as to it,

THE COURT: I always take us -- I always take us off the record at sidebar because I've found that with this system, otherwise, the microphone projects and the jury and people in the audience can hear the discussion at the bench, So —

MR, KEPHART: Okay,

THE COURT: Counsel's aware that if they wish to put anything on the record later, they're free to do that,

111-140

MS, GREENBERGER: I wanted —

MR, KEPHART: And so —

MS GREENBERGER: I wanted to —

MR, KEPHART: So I'm —

MS, GREENBERGER: -- see [unintelligible].

THE COURT: And I'm talking, Ms, -- so I just think it's inappropriate I'm lodging my objection now. I — maybe the Court needs to view it to determine whether or not it is appropriate.

THE COURT: I think that if it is presented along with the argument that or the statement that Mr. Schieck set forth, that that's the context in which it's going to be presented, then it would be appropriate for the opening statement. If the defense is going to say this is what the witnesses will be testifying and this is what the evidence will show, then it would be appropriate. So the Court will overrule the objection and caution Ms. Greenberger to not put it up until the proper context has been put forth before the jury.

MS, GREENBERGER: Okay, I assure the Court I will comply,

THE COURT: And of course, Mr. Kephart, if you feel that there is something objectionable, then you may raise your objection.

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. I

MR, KEPHART: Okay. I'll do that then, Judge, just so we keep -- okay.

THE COURT: Did --

MR,, KEPHART: We challenged —

THE COURT: Did Mr, —

MR, KEPHART: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. Go ahead,

MR,, KEPHART: We had challenged Juror Number, well, the last two numbers was 05, Gregory Willson.

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, could -- I don't know if we're recording now, but we will not use the jurors' name if we are.

MR. KEPHART: But --

MR, SCHIECK: The Court TV was -- I don't know if we wanted to put the actual jurors' names on the record if it's being broadcast. But —

MR, KEPHART: I can just go with the number if you prefer.

THE COURT: Maybe we can, we can use number and first name,

MR,, KEPHART: That's fine, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Gregory, Number 205. The State had challenged him for cause because he had indicated

<u>1V v. LOBATO</u> 9/13/06

that he didn't feel that he could be fair to the State in light of two incidents that occurred with him involving the police departments in different cities that he lived in. He indicated that he couldn't set it aside, that it would cause him to -- he felt that he'd have doubt about the State's case because of those two incidences.

just move on to the next one

THE COURT: He was excused for cause.

MR, !KEPHART: Yes. Want me to just go through

them all?

MS, DiGIACOMO: Yeah,

MR. KEPHART: Okay. Number 216, Wendell.

MS, DiGIACOMO: Oh, no, that's -- that was

yesterday.

MR, KEPHART: Oh, I know. I know. We haven't put it on the record, though,

That he was the individual that indicated that because of his background in law enforcement that he felt that he would be giving more weight to the -- a police officer's testimony than anyone else's testimony, felt that he couldn't do it otherwise and that he understood that he didn't think it'd be fair to the defense in that case, He was challenged for cause.

THE COURT: And he was excused for cause.

111-142

newspaper, She was aware of the facts of this case from reading it in the news,, She had formed an opinion. Based on her background and her employment, she felt that she had formed an opinion, would not be impartial and could not set aside what other information she had learned from the press. She was -- she was excused for cause.

THE COURT: Okay,

MR, KEPHART: Juror Number 231, first name of Karl. He had -- he had indicated that based on -- now this was a challenge by the State. He indicated that based on his current situation here in the community with regards to his — some financial issues, some issues involving his children and his wife, that he could not and he would not pay attention to what was occurring during the trial. He felt that based on his concerns and our concerns that he would not be able to pay attention to the trial, The State challenged him for cause. He was excused for cause,

THE COURT: He also indicated he suspected that the defendant was involved —

MR, KEPHART: Oh,

THE COURT: -- in the commission of the offense,

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Correct.

Number 237, first name of Gregory. He indicated that he could not consider the forms of punishment that are

111-144

MR, KEPHART: Okay. Let's see. Where's that list?
I remember that Juror Number 218, Curtis is his first name, had been challenged for cause, I mean, had been excused for cause as well, but I -- some of these are cause that —

THE COURT: He is the one who indicated that he had prior knowledge through newspapers,

MR. KEPHART: Okay. That's right,

THE COURT: And had read an R.J, article and his wife had surfed the Internet and found additional information about the case, and that he had formed an opinion on the case due to that prior knowledge.

MR, KEPHART: Okay.

THE COURT: So he was excused for cause.

MR, KEPHART: Thanks, Judge.

Number 219. His first name was Howard, He is a current police officer with the Clark County School District. He indicated, as well, that he would be giving more weight to the testimony of an officer than any other. He felt that he could not be impartial in light of the fact that if an officer testified in his -- and he was excused for cause.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KEPHART: Number 223, first name was Rowena. She indicated that she worked for the local

available, He said he would not impose a -- or consider life without the possibility of parole. And the State challenged him for cause, He was excused for cause,

THE COURT: Okay.

MR, KEPHART: Juror Number 252 -- or, I'm sorry, 250. Yeah, 254. I'm sorry. His first name is Emigdio. He indicated that he -- he is a twenty-year-old man. He indicated that for religious reasons and for other reasons he felt that he could not or would not consider the punishments, all forms of punishment and life without the possibility of parole. The State challenged him for cause. He was released for cause,

257, first name is Wayne. He indicated that because of his background that he would give -- be more likely to give more credibility to police officers. He said he would keep an open mind, The defense challenged him for cause, and he was released for cause,

THE COURT: He indicated that the scales were not balanced,

MR. KEPHART: Right.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KEPHART: Number 259, first name of Michael. He indicated that based on a current situation in his life that his attention to the case would be a -- thought that he wouldn't be able to give his attention to the trial, as well as he

111-145

4V v. LOBATO 9/13/06

also said that he had formed an opinion based on our opening in reference to the charges, that she may be guilty just based on that. He was challenged for cause and he was released for cause.

THE COURT: Right,

MR. KEPHART: 347. Number 347, first name of Iredell. I -- the Court's indulgence, Your Honor. Oh. She had indicated that she had formed an opinion based on what she knew from the press, that she felt that the defendant had not - had done this but had not done it by herself. She believed that she had help. She indicated that she could not put that aside in her deliberation. So based on that, she was challenged for cause and excused for cause,

THE COURT: I think that was a defense — MR. KEPHART: Judge, quite honestly, I don't —

THE COURT: motion,

MR, KEPHART: I don't remember who challenged her, That's our --

THE COURT: I don't remember there being much argument about that. I think —

MR, KEPHART: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- that both sides —

MR. KEPHART: Judge, maybe I need to —

THE COURT: -- felt that she was appropriate to be

111-146

his co-counsel can address the Court otherwise, But I thought maybe with regards to them there was some consensus.

I think that there was one or two more that the defense challenged and I think they probably need to make a record if they want to.

MS. DiGIACOMO: We did, too. We also challenged these two.

THE COURT: I think at the very end that it was Ms. - Miller.

MR. KEPHART: Okay.

THE COURT: We should probably not use her first name now that we -- now that I've said her last name.

There's a lot of Ms. Millers in the world, though. She was 244,

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, I believe that the only challenge that we made that the Court denied that we would wish to put on the record has to do with that last one we were talking about, the individual that was -- tended to side with the prosecution. I think that the overall answers that she gave gave a pretty clear impression that the defense was starting from a couple of steps behind because of the history with hefather being a prosecuting attorney for years. I realize that her last answer kind of shot a hole in some of our arguments but I still believe, overall, her answers were such that the Court should have granted her challenge,

111-148

excused for cause with the information that she had provided,

MR, KEPHART: Certainly, if I've misspoken at all there, I think there's one more and I'll finish it, and then I need -- I want to make a record with regards to these challenges.

The last one is Number 412, first name of Telly. And --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR, KEPHART: I can't remember this one. I can't remember why. The Court's indulgence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: He's the one that I had make the phone call because his mom had lupus.

MR. KEPHART: Oh, that's right.

THE COURT: To see if she could —

MR. KEPHART: That's right.

THE COURT: — stay home alone. And for medical reasons she could not, So I excused him for cause.

MR, KEPHART: Okay, So I think maybe for the record that that will be read as an excused versus being challenged for cause. 'Cause with regards to the ones that have been challenged, I know that the Court had us approach the bench and we spoke on all of them, I think that in regards to the ones that had been left, at least there was some consensus with most of them. And, certainly, Mr. Schieck or

THE COURT: Okay,

MR. SCHIECK: The next one we really wanted to address, the other issue we would like to just put on the record is there were two jurors that were challenged --

THE COURT: Before we go there, I want to make .a record on 244. She had in the initial questioning indicated that she would try to be impartial, but then she was pushed to and told that we need to know and we need to know now. And she said, yes, I would impartial, I can be impartial, I would be impartial. So that's why the Court overruled that,

MR, SCHIECK: The other item has to do with the two challenges for cause that were made to the jurors that would not consider life without the possibility of parole. That relates back to the issue concerning the State being allowed to take the sentencing to the jury to begin with, We feel that both of those jurors were good jurors and we would have liked to have kept but were unable to do so because they had to decide the sentencing question and, therefore, disqualified because they wouldn't consider life without the possibility of parole. I believe that was Juror Number 237, I believe, and Juror Number 254,

THE COURT: That's correct, Those were those two jurors that did have that difficulty with life without the possibility of parole. 254, though, had indicated that due to

111-149

NV v. LOBATO 9/13/06

2

3

5

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

his religion he could not judge. And so I wasn't sure if he would even be able to make a determination on the guilt or innocence phase. But that was explored more in depth with regard to the penalty phase.

MR, SCHIECK: Correct. That's all the record we needed to make. Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, Then I will step down and have the bailiff bring in the jury and seat them, I have a few opening remarks to go through with them, and then we'll get to the openings.

We'll go off the record,

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Court recessed at 16:16:08 until 16:32:45)

(Jurors are present)

THE BAILIFF: All rise.

Department II is back in session. Please be seated,

THE COURT: The record shall reflect that we are resumed now in the presence of the jury and proceeding forward in the trial of State versus Lobato under Case Number C177394. The defendant is present, together with her three counsel, the two prosecuting attorneys are present, and the ladies and gentlemen of the jury have been reseated by the bailiff into the seats that they will be occupying throughout the remainder of the trial.

Ladies and gentlemen, now that the jury selection

1II-150

and turn it over to the bailiff, who will provide it to the Court

What I'm gonna cover with you now is just kind of an introduction to the case, It's not a substitute for the instructions on the law. The Court will be providing you the instructions on the law at the close of all of the evidence and before you retire to consider your verdict.

As you are aware, this is a criminal case, It was commenced by the State and brought against the defendant, Kirstin Blaise Lobato. The case is based on a charging document which the clerk will be reading to you shortly, and then she will be advising you as to the pleas to the charges that have been entered by the defendant.

Would counsel please approach?

(Off-record bench conference at 16:36:00 until 16:36:53)

THE CLERK: "DISTRICT COURT, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.

"THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, versus KIRSTIN BLAISE LOBATO, Defendant

"Case Number C177394.

"INFORMATION.

"STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF CLARK,

"District Attorney within and for the County of Clark, State of Nevada, in the name and by the authority of the State of Nevada, informs the Court:

111-152

process has been completed, it's necessary that you be placed under the oath for jury service. Would you all please stand and raise your right hands to be sworn by the clerk?

JURORS ARE SWORN

THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated,
THE COURT: Sometimes things just don't roll on
quite as swiftly as one might have thought. I believed that we
were going to be going into the opening statements today, but
it appears that we will not be getting there, that we will be
doing that tomorrow at 1:00 p.m.

The Court has some opening remarks for the ladies and gentlemen of the jury at this time.

In past trials, upon occasion, once we have gotten underway, something has come to light which was not disclosed during the jury voir dire process, which the juror did not realize was pertinent to the case. It may be that a witness comes into the courtroom and when you see that witness's face you recognize them as someone that you knew but you didn't know their last name perhaps. And so when the list of witnesses was given, you didn't realize that you were familiar with one of the witnesses and so that did not get previously disclosed. Should anything along those lines happen during the process of this trial, please do a written report of it, put your badge number and your name at the bottom of the report

"That KIRS_IN BLASE LOBATO, the Defendant above named, having committed the crimes of MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (OPEN MURDER) and SEXUAL PENETRATION OF A DEAD HUMAN BODY, on or about the 8th day of July, 2001, 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 I - MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (OPEN MURDER) did then and there wilfully, 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 cutting the said DURAN BAILEY, with a deadly weapon, to-wit: a knife.

COUNT II - SEXUAL PENETRATION OF A DEAD HUMAN BODY did then and there wilfully, 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."

District Attorney, signed by Eric G. Jorgenson, Chief Deputy District Attorney.

111-153

NV v. LQBATO, 9/13/06

To which the defendant has entered a plea of not guilty,

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Clerk,

Ladies and gentlemen, you should distinctly understand that this document or information just read by the clerk is simply a document that sets forth an accusation and it is not, in any sense, evidence of the mere allegations which it contains.

As you have been advised by the clerk, the defendant has pled not guilty to the charges in that information. The State, therefore, has the burden of proving each of the essential elements of the charges in the information beyond a reasonable doubt As the defendant sits here now, she is not guilty.

The purpose of this trial is to determine whether or not the State will meet its burden. It is your primary responsibility as jurors to find and to determine the facts. You are the sole judges of the facts. You are to determine the facts from the test ony that you will hear from the witness stand and from the other items of evidence, including the exhibits that will be introduced in court It will be up to you to determine what inferences you feel may be properly drawn from the evidence admitted at trial,

During the trial, the parties may sometimes present

111-154

will be produced at trial.

After the opening statements, then the State will introduce their evidence in support of the State's information, and this is called the State's case in chief. After the State presents its evidence, it will rest its case in chief,

At that time, the defendant may present evidence but is not obligated to do so. If the defendant elects to do so, that would constitute the defendant's case in chief.

If the defendant elects to present evidence, after the defendant rests its case in chief, then the State may present rebuttal evidence.

If the State presents rebuttal evidence, the defendant may present surrebuttal evidence but, again, is not obligated to do so.

After the close of all of the evidence, the Court will be instructing you on the applicable law. You must not be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law given to you by the Court for, regardless of any opinion that 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 to you by the Court.

After you have been given the instructions on the law, each side will have the opportunity to present to you a closing argument in support of their case. What the lawyers

111-156

objections to some of the testimony or other evidence. It is the duty of a lawyer to object to any evidence which he or she believes may not be properly offered_ And you should not in any way be prejudiced against a lawyer who makes objections on behalf of the party that he or she represents.

At time, the Court may sustain objections or direct that you disregard certain testimony or exhibits. You must not consider any evidence to which an objection has been sustained by the Court, nor any evidence which the Court orders to be sericken.

Anything that you may see or hear outside the courtroom is not evidence and must also be disregarded by you.

Please remember that the statements, arguments and opinions of the lawyers are not evidence in this case. However, if the lawyers stipulate to the existence of a fact, then you must accept their stipulation as evidence and regard that fact as proved.

The trial will be proceeding in the following order:

Both sides will be given the opportunity to make an opening statement to your What the lawyers will tell you in their opening statements is not evidence. The opening statements simply serve the purpose of giving an introduction to the evidence which the party making the statement believes

will tell you during their closing arguments is not evidence, just as what they will tell you in their opening statements is not evidence.

The closing arguments are designed to present to you the contentions of the parties as to what the evidence admitted at trial has shown, and what reasonable inferences may be drawn by you from that evidence.

No statement, ruling, remark or comment which I make during the course of this trial would be intended to indicate to you my opinion as to how you should decide this case, nor intended to influence you in any way in your determination of the facts.

At times, I may ask questions of witnesses and, if I do so, it's for the purpose of bringing out matters which I feel need to be brought out or done to clarify the tape-recording or the record and not done in any way to indicate my opinion about the facts, nor to indicate my opinion as to the weight that I feel you should give to the testimony of the witness.

I may find it necessary to admonish the lawyers during the trial and, if I do so, you should not show any prejudice against that lawyer or the lawyer's client because the Court found it necessary to admonish the lawyer.

Until the time that the case is submitted to you, you must not discuss it with anyone. You may not discuss it, not

9/13/06 NV v LOBATQ

even with your fellow jurors. Once it has been submitted to you, then you must discuss it only in the jury deliberate room with your fellow jurors, It's important that you keep an open mind and that you not decide any issue in this case until the entire case has been submitted to you under the instructions on the law from the Court.

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

24

If during the trial you should find that you're having difficulty hearing a witness, please raise your hand to draw our attention to that so that we can adjust the microphone or adjust the position of the witness, whatever is necessary, for it is most important that you do fully hear all of the testimony.

Also, if during the trial you should have a need to utilize the restroom facilities or should you feel ill and need to take a break, please raise your hand so that we can accommodate those needs for you as well

During the trial you will notice that the Court will be taking notes of the various witnesses' testimony. You're not to draw any inference from that action. The Court is required to prepare for oral a iment of counsel and, for that reason, will be taking notes.

Please understand that at the close of the case the jury will not have a transcript to consult. However, the bailiff will furnish you with notepads and pencils. You may take notes throughout the trial if you find that helpful. Any notes

10

2

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to ask written questions of any of the witnesses called to testify in trials in this state. You are not encouraged to ask large numbers of questions because that's the primary responsibility of the five lawyers that are here on this trial,

When a witness is called to the stand, the lawyer that calls that witness to the stand will conduct the initial questioning which is called the direct examination of the witness. After that direct examination is completed, the witness will be passed to the opposing side. The opposing counsel will then question that witness and that is called the cross-examination. After the cross-examination is completed, the witness will be passed back to the original lawyer that called that witness to the stand for followup questioning and that is called redirect examination, then passed back to opposing counsel for recross examination, and back and forth and back and forth until the lawyers have exhausted all of their questions.

Once the lawyers have exhausted all of their questions, if at that time there are additional questions that you would like to ask the witness, you may then seek permission to ask that witness a written question. Should you desire to ask a question, please raise your hand to draw our attention to that fact. Then you will need to write your question out on one of your notepad papers and put your

111-160

that you take during the trial, you may take with you back into the jury deliberation room.

111-158

Again, let me remind you that until the case is submitted to you, please do not talk to each other about it and do not talk about anyone who has anything to do with it until the end of the case when you go into the jury deliberation room to decide on your verdict. Not talking with anyone else about it does include your family members, friends and your employers. You may tell them, however, that you have been selected and Au have been seated to serve as a juror in a criminal case, but you cannot tell them anything further about it until after you are discharged from your jury service.

Please do not let anyone walk up to you or try to talk to you about the case or try to talk to you about anyone who has anything to do with the case. And should that occur, please do a written report of it immediately with your name and badge number and turn it over to the bailiff.

Please do not read any news stories or articles or listen to any radio or television reports about the case or about anyone who has anything to do with it until after you are discharged from your jury service.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you are aware, a trial is a search for the truth using the rules of law. For this reason, the Nevada Supreme Court has provided the opportunity for jurors

badge number and your name at the bottom of the question. The question should be written as if you are asking the question directly to the witness on the stand. You cannot pose questions to the Court, nor can you pose questions to anybody at the plaintiff's table or at the defendant's table. You can only question a witness.

Once you have written down your question and put your badge number and signature below, then the bailiff will pick it up to you and bring it up here to the bench, to the Court, At that time, the Court will confer at sidebar with counsel to determine if the question would result in an unfair trial, or if it's legally improper or if it is a question that may properly be asked. No adverse inference should be drawn if the Court does not allow a particular question. If the Court determines that the question may properly be asked, then the Court will ask it, No emphasis should be based on the answer to the question merely because the question came from a juror. If the Court asks the question and then the witness gives their answer, after that, the attorneys for both sides will be given the opportunity to do any followup questioning that they feel would be appropriate.

That concludes the opening remarks by the Court. We will be taking our evening recess, resuming tomorrow at 1:00 pm. At 1:00 p.m., please be in the hallway,

111-159

NV v. <u>LOBATO</u> <u>9/13/06</u>

1

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ones —

The bailiff will meet you there to return you to your seats in the courtroom, and we will proceed forward with the openings at that time.

During the recess, you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves, nor with anyone else, on any subject connected with this 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.

You all have a good evening, and we'll see you at 1:00 p.m. The jury may exit,

(Jurors recessed at 16:50:44)

THE COURT: We have the issue on the Davis —

MR, SCHIECK: Oh, yeah.

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

THE COURT: The Jeremy Davis transcript.

MS. DiGrAtOMO: And, also, if you have an idea of when we'll start on Friday. We're having some witness issues, so I'm trying to get an idea, if you had a morning calendar.

THE COURT: I do, I've got a 9:30 hearing and I was hoping we'd be done at 10:30.

MS. DiGIACOMO: Because we have a witness flying

111-162

MR. KEPHART: I did Jeremy Davis, I —

MS. DiGIACOMO: No, I think I did, All right. I don't remember

MR. SCHIECK: No. It was -- it was you.

MS. DiGIACOMO: It was me? Yeah_ Well, it's been a few years.

MR. KEPHART: Well, that was your witness,
(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: Okay, I just kind of wanted to read the context of the question, get a feel for the testimony. What is the objection by the defense?

MR. SCHIECK: I'm not sure which one the State agreed to and which ones they want redacted,

MS. DiGIACOMO: Well, it —

THE COURT: The only one that they're not agreeing to is page 135, line 14,

MS, DiGIACOMO: No, no, no, Page -- no, no.

That's that -- I'm sorry, Your Honor, That's the first one. And the answer was no so the State's not gonna argue with that one. And then the other one —

THE COURT: Well, I don't need to know about the

MS. DiGIACOMO: Oh, the one that we're — THE COURT: — you've agreed with.

111-164

out at 2:55 [unintelligible] getting him on tomorrow but [unintelligible].

THE COURT: It sounded like from prior discussion that a -- that counsel was in agreement on a couple of revisions but there was one outstanding that the Court needed to rule on. Is that correct?

MS, DiGIACOMO: That's correct. Two of them, we're not gonna fight about But they wanted line -- or page 135, a question on line 14, They want that redacted.

THE tOURT: Page 135, line 14,

MS. DiGIACOMO: It's a question and answer.

MR. SCHIECK: It's a question by the prosecutor,

believe it was Mr, Kephart.

MS. DiGIACOMO: I'm sorry?

MR. SCHIECK: This was, oh, you — Ms. DiGiacomo was asking questions, right? Is that --

MR. 'KEPHART: Yes, that was.

MS DiGIACOMO: No. It was Mr, —

MR. SCHIECK: Or that's a prosecution question.

MR. KEPHART: It's mine.

MS. DIGIACOMO: It's a prosecution question. I

think it was Mr, Kephart.

MR. KEPHART: I did,

MS DiGIACOMO: I'm not sure

MS. DiGIACOMO: I'm sorry, Page 136, line 20, (Pause in the proceedings)

MR. SCHIECK: Are you guys then agreeing to 137, to take that one out?

MS. DiGIACOMO: Was that another one where the answer was no by the witness?

MR, SCHIECK: Yes. Yes,

MS. DiGIACOMO: Then that's fine_

MR, SCHIECK: And, actually, there was a followup to that one on 137. There was two questions that he said no to,

MS. DiGIACOMO: Yeah, and that's fine.

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, given -- and the main objection that we had was the prosecutor referring to statements that were made outside of court to them. He admitted making that statement on 136, so we'll withdraw the objection as to the one on 136.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCHIECK: And we'll agree to redact the ones on 135 and 137.

THE COURT: That he answered --

MS. DiGIACOMO: That's fine.

THE COURT: -- no to.

MR, KEPHART: That's fine

111-165

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22 23

NV v. LOBATD THE COURT: And those will -- those will be redacted Okay, MS. DiGIACOMO: Okay, Thank you. THE COURT: Then there's no disagreement, MS. DiGIACOMO: No, THE COURT: That made it easy for me. Thank you. Anything else that we need to make of record? MS. DiGIACOMO: No. But other than Friday, you think 10:30? THE COURT: Right. MS, DIGIACOMO: Okay. MR. KEPHART: That's it, right? MS. DIGIACOMO: Yeah. MR. KEPHART: That's all. THE COURT: And then we'll see everybody at 1:00 o'clock and go off the record 'til then, (COURT ADJOURNED AT 16:57:04 AND CONTINUED THE FOLLOWING DAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2006)

1117166

<u>CERTIFICATION</u>

I (WE) CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A "ROUGH DRAFT" 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□ nwtranscriptcOmsn.com

FEDE' LLY c2 RTIFIED MF NAGER/OWNER

Lin Dunbar TRANSCRIBER

111-168

* * * * * *

AFFIRMATION☐ Pursuant to NRS 239B4O30

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding Transcript filed in District Court, Case No. C177394 does not contain the social security number of any person,

* * * * *

Lin Dunbar Transcriber 4/29/07 Date