

Prosecutor arguing to jury against Lazor:

1591

1 THE REASON WHY I AM GOING TO BE SPENDING A GREAT DEAL OF TIME
2 IN DISCUSSING THAT NORTH AREA IS BECAUSE I THINK THIS CASE,
3 FOR THE MOST PART, CAN REALLY BE BOILED DOWN TO A VERY SIMPLE

4 ISSUE. MR. SCHROEDER AND I UNFORTUNATELY SPENT A LOT OF TIME
5 PERHAPS ON SOME SIDE AREAS IN THIS CASE, YOU OBVIOUSLY PICKED
6 UP, BUT WHAT IS THE CRITICAL AND ESSENTIAL ISSUE IN THIS CASE?
7 THAT ISSUE, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I BELIEVE IS THIS: DID MR.
8 ALLRED HAVE THE BB GUN? IF YOU SAY HE DID NOT, WE ARE TALKING
9 RESPONSIBILITY, WHETHER IT BE MURDER OF THE FIRST DEGREE,
10 SECOND DEGREE OR MANSLAUGHTER. IF YOU FIND THAT MR. ALLRED
11 DID HAVE A GUN, THEN PERHAPS WE ARE TALKING RESPONSIBILITY
12 AGAIN, BUT FOR THE MOST PART, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT JUSTIFIABLE
13 HOMICIDE, UNLAWFUL HOMICIDE -- EXCUSE ME -- LAWFUL HOMICIDE,
14 SO THAT IS THE CRITICAL ISSUE IN THIS CASE AS I PERCEIVE IT.

15
16 A MOTIVE AS IT RELATES TO MR. ALLRED? I AM GOING TO LIST
17 THESE FOR YOU AS I PERCEIVE THEM AS THEY CAME OUT DURING THE
18 COURSE OF HIS TESTIMONY. I THINK THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIVE,

19 B) OF
20 SE ED
21 MC OF
22 H) -E
23 E) -E

ADDED COMMENTARY
*PROSECUTOR ADMISSION TO JURY THAT LAZOR WOULD
BE INNOCENT -- BUT FOR THE DESTROYED FINGER-
PRINTS WHICH PROVED ALLRED HAD THE GUN*

24 PREVIOUS PROPERTY MANAGER AND HAD BEEN UP UNTIL THAT TIME THE
25 PROPERTY MANAGER OF 16935 ROBERTS ROAD.

26 THAT PARTICULAR FACT BEGAN TO UPSET THE DEFENDANT. HE'S
27 STARTING TO LOSE CONTROL OF ROBERTS ROAD BECAUSE TENANTS
28 COMING INTO THE PROPERTY THAT WERE BEING SELECTED

EXHIBIT
A
2 PAGES

Prosecutor arguing to jury against Lazor:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT THE PEOPLE DISCUSSED WITH YOU, THE UNLAWFULNESS. WAS THE KILLING UNLAWFUL? THAT IS, WAS IT UNLAWFUL AS OPPOSED TO BEING JUSTIFIABLE BECAUSE OF SELF-DEFENSE? THAT'S THE CRITICAL AREA IN THIS CASE: LAWFULNESS VERSUS UNLAWFULNESS OR, PUT ANOTHER WAY, WAS IT SELF-DEFENSE OR WAS IT NOT SELF-DEFENSE? AND WHAT THAT BOILS DOWN TO FACTUALLY, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, AS I INDICATED TO YOU YESTERDAY IS WAS THERE A BB GUN WITH MR. ALLRED OR WAS THERE A BB GUN NOT WITH MR. ALLRED BUT WITH THE DEFENDANT?



ISSUE IN YESTERDAY'S ARGUMENT. THE DEFENDANT CLAIMS THAT MR. ALLRED HAD A BB GUN BECAUSE OF CERTAIN THINGS. HE INDICATES TO YOU IN HIS TESTIMONY THAT THE KEY TO THE GARAGE DOOR

ADDED COMMENTARY
**PROSECUTOR ADMISSION TO JURY AGAIN,
THAT ACQUITTAL WAS WARRANTED (IF NOT
FOR STATE DESTROYING FINGERPRINTS AND
HIDING THAT FACT FROM THE JURY)**

IN THE LAW IS ABOUT NABLE K OR SPECULATION? I THINK THE ANSWER IS OBVIOUS. IT IS CALLING FOR PURE SPECULATION AND GUESSWORK, AND I AM GOING TO TELL YOU WHY IN A MOMENT IT IS PURE SPECULATION AND GUESSWORK. SO WHEN YOU COME TO GUESSWORK AND SPECULATION, REMEMBER, IT HAS NO PLACE IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.
TAKING THE DEFENDANT'S ARGUMENT, IT IS SPECULATION THAT MR. ALLRED WENT INTO THE PANTRY, REMOVED THE KEY, DISTURBED