

Q AGAIN, STAYING WITH THE LEFT BACK AREA AS IT RELATES TO MR. ALLRED, DID YOU DISCOVER ANOTHER ENTRANCE-TYPE WOUND BUT LOWER ON THE BACK? A I DID.

Q AND WOULD YOU INDICATE TO THE JURY, PLEASE, WHERE ON THE LOWER LEFT BACK THIS ENTRANCE WOUND WAS DISCOVERED?

A IT WAS LOCATED LOWER THAN THE WOUND THAT WE JUST DESCRIBED. IT WAS 4 INCHES TO THE LEFT OF THE MIDLINE AND 14 AND A HALF INCHES FROM THE TOP OF THE HEAD.

Q SO THIS WAS SOMEWHAT LOWER THAN THE FIRST LEFT BACK ENTRY WOUND; IS THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT.

ENTRANCE-TYPE WOUND?

A YES. THE SAME AS THE OTHER: .4 INCHES.

**ADDED COMMENTARY**  
*THIS BULLET IN FACT EXITED THE ATTACKER'S BACK; ENTERING HIS FRONT AS HE CHARGED AT LAZOR -- BUT THE JURY WAS NEVER TOLD THIS BY ANYONE. (SEE EXHIBIT S: BODY SHOT CHARTS).*

Q AND WHAT WAS THAT RIM OF ABRASION MEASUREMENT?

A .1 INCH.

**ADDED COMMENTARY**  
*THERE WAS NO SUCH "LEFT BACK ENTRY WOUND"; A LIE BASED ON WHERE THAT BULLET CAME TO REST (SEE #3 OF BODY SHOT CHARTS, EXHIBIT S).*

Q AND WHAT DID THE TRACK OF THAT ENTRY WOUND INDICATE

tabbler  
**EXHIBIT**  
**0**  
6 PAGES

Prosecutor arguing to jury against Lazor:

1507

1 ROAD. I AM SURE THE COURT HAS REVIEWED THOSE AND HAVE SEEN  
2 THOSE VERY PRECISE AREAS OF THE BODY THAT WERE MARKED; NOTABLY  
3 THE LEFT BACK AREA, THE TEMPLE AREA, REAR HEAD AREA.

4 THE FIFTH SHOT PERHAPS CAN BE BEST DESCRIBED AS AN  
5 ANOMALY.

6 I THINK WHAT'S ALSO SIGNIFICANT IS THE PLACEMENT OF THE  
7 SHOTS IRRESPECTIVE OF THE DIAGRAM AND, MORE PARTICULARLY, THE  
8 EXACTING MANNER OF THE THIRD SHOT, WHICH IS IN THE LOWER LEFT  
9 BACK, THE SHOT THAT WENT STRAIGHT THROUGH, PENETRATING THE  
10 BODY IN ITS ENTIRETY ON A PLANE HORIZONTAL WITH THE FLOOR.

11 YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE THAT WOULD CONCLUDE THE STATEMENTS  
12 OF THE PEOPLE AS TO THE HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FACTORS THAT THE

13 PEO

14 IN

15 PLA

16 TIM

17 TIM

18 .45

19 THE THROW DOWN GUN READIED IN CASE IT WAS NEEDED, A PRE-  
20 EXISTING SITUATION AS OPPOSED TO A MERE AFTERTHOUGHT

21

22 AND I BELIEVE AS IT RELATES TO THE NATURE, THE MANNER OF  
23 THE SHOOTING, I THINK IT'S EXACTING WHEN THE COURT CONSIDERS  
24 WHERE THE SHOTS WERE FIRED AND HIT THE DECEDENT IN  
25 RELATIONSHIP TO THE DIAGRAMS OF THE BODY AND, MORE  
26 PARTICULARLY, THE NUMBER OF SHOTS AND THE FACT THAT THREE OF  
27 THOSE SHOTS WERE IN THE REAR OF THE DECEDENT'S BODY.

28

ADDED COMMENTARY

SCHROEDER PLAYS ALONG, AGREEING IT'S TRUE, AS  
PROSECUTOR EMPHASIZES LIES TO THE JUDGE OF 3  
SHOTS "IN THE BACK," WHEN NO SHOTS EVER  
ENTERED ALLRED'S BACK. (SEE EXHIBIT S)

ST

OF

HE

A

IAD

Prosecutor arguing to jury against Lazor:

1606

1 THAN THE NUMBER OF SHOTS IS WHERE THE SHOTS WERE PLACED. WITH  
2 THE EXCEPTION OF WHAT WE HAVE TERMED THE FIFTH SHOT, ONE  
3 BETWEEN THE THUMB AND THE FOR

4 , THREE OF THOSE SHOTS ARE IN THE  
5 REAR OF THE BODY, ONE IN THE BACK OF THE HEAD AND TWO IN THE  
6 BACK. THE OTHER REMAINING SHOT IS THE ONE THAT ENTERS

7  
8 ABOVE DOWNWARD AT A .45 DEGREE ANGLE.

9 WHAT'S OF PARTICULAR INTEREST IS THE LEFT LOWER BACK

10 SHOT. THE

11 SHOT

12 MR. ALLRED  
13 PARTICULAR  
14 HORIZONTAL

ADDED COMMENTARY

*ALL OF THIS WAS 100% FABRICATED, PROVEN FALSE  
BY EVIDENCE THE JURY NEVER SAW. DR. OZOA TESTI-  
FIED EXACTLY OPPOSITE OF THIS, BUT THAT WAS  
OBSCURED BY BOTH ATTORNEYS EMPHASIZING THIS*

15  
16 HIM. DR. OZOA TESTIFIED WITHOUT CONTRADICTION THERE IS ONLY  
17 ONE WAY A SHOT LIKE THAT CAN TAKE PLACE. MR. ALLRED HAD TO  
18 HAVE HAD HIS BACK TO THE DEFENDANT IN ORDER FOR THAT SHOT TO  
19 TAKE PLACE.

20 BE STANDING WITH HIS BACK IN SUCH A MANNER THAT  
21 THE BULLET WOULD BE ABLE TO PASS THROUGH SO IT WOULD STAY

22  
23 DOWN. WE ALSO KNOW THAT IF MR. ALLRED WERE LYING DOWN ON THE  
24 GROUND, SINCE THERE IS NO ANGLE, HE WOULD HAVE TO BE LYING  
25 DOWN ON HIS FACE AND ON HIS STOMACH AND THE GUN WOULD HAVE TO  
26 BE POSITIONED OVER THE BACK IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THAT ANGLE  
27 GOING STRAIGHT THROUGH THE BODY, NO ANGLE, STAYING HORIZONTAL  
28 TO THE GROUND.

1           WHAT IS PARTICULARLY INTERESTING, ASSUMING MR. ALLRED  
2 WERE TO BE STANDING, IS THE EXACT PLACEMENT OF THAT PARTICULAR  
3 SHOT, THAT LEFT LOWER BACK SHOT. YOU WILL HAVE THE  
4 PHOTOGRAPHS. YOU WILL NOTICE THAT THE SHOT CAME OUT JUST A  
5 LITTLE BIT BELOW THE HEART, AND I BELIEVE IT WAS ABOUT 14 AND  
6 1/2 INCHES BELOW THE TOP OF THE HEAD. WHAT THAT INDICATES TO  
7 ME, BASED UPON THE REST OF THE EVIDENCE, IS THAT MR. ALLRED  
8 WAS NOT STANDING WITH HIS BACK TO THE DEFENDANT. AND YOU SAY  
9 WHY? WELL, THERE WERE ONLY TWO SHOTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,  
10 THAT ACTUALLY PIERCED THROUGH MR. ALLRED'S BODY: THE LOWER  
11 BACK SHOT THAT I HAVE BEEN REFERRING TO AND THE ONE THAT WENT  
12 THROUGH THE WEB OF THE RIGHT HAND. OF THOSE TWO SHOTS, WE

13 RECOVERED  
14 SHOULD BE  
15 TESTIFIED  
16 WHAT'  
17 BULLET OR  
18 THE BULLET

ADDED COMMENTARY

*12 FALSE REFERENCES TO "SHOT IN THE BACK" (ON PAGES 1606, 1607, 1695) -- WHILE HIDING HIS OWN AGENTS' EVIDENCE WHICH PROVES HE FABRICATED THIS WHOLE STORY, THAT THESE ALLEGED "FACTS" ARE A PHYSICAL IMPOSSIBILITY. (SEE NEXT PAGES)*

19 CAMPOS TESTIFYING TO THAT MEASUREMENT. IN THE CASE OF THE  
20 CABINET DOOR, THAT BULLET WAS 12 INCHES OR 1 FOOT ABOVE THE  
21 FLOOR. WHAT DOES THAT INDICATE AS IT RELATES TO THAT THIRD  
22 SHOT IN THE BACK? IN ORDER TO HAVE A BULLET, LADIES AND  
23 GENTLEMEN, EITHER 8 INCHES OR 12 INCHES OFF THE FLOOR,  
24 MR. ALLRED HAD TO BE AT LEAST ON HIS KNEES WITH HIS BACK TO  
25 THE DEFENDANT.

26 LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT THE LEFT UPPER BACK. THAT'S THE ONE  
27 THAT WAS SLIGHTLY ABOVE BY 4 OR 5 INCHES THE LOWER LEFT BACK  
28

Prosecutor arguing to jury against Lazor:

1695

1 I TOUCHED ON IT AT SOME LENGTH IN MY CLOSING ARGUMENT. WHAT I  
2 AM GOING TO BE DISCUSSING, HOWEVER, IS MR. SCHROEDER'S  
3 EXPLANATION OF THE ORDER OF THE SHOTS. MR. SCHROEDER QUITE  
4 CORRECTLY CALLED IT HIS THEORY AND THE WAY MR. SCHROEDER  
5 PRESENTED HIS THEORY IS A PRESENTATION OF WHAT HE THINKS  
6 POSSIBLY HAPPENED; NOT WHAT DID HAPPEN BUT WHAT POSSIBLY  
7 HAPPENED, WHAT HE SPECULATES TO HAVE HAPPENED. I DON'T  
8 BEL

9 YOU

ADDED COMMENTARY

*HAMMERING MORE EMPHASIS OF 'SHOT IN THE BACK'-  
LIES TO THE JURY, BECAUSE HE KNEW SCHROEDER  
WOULD NOT OBJECT, AND WOULD CONTINUE HELPING  
COVER UP THE FRAUD. (SEE NEXT PAGE; JURY WAS  
KEPT FROM KNOWING IT)*

10 FIV

11 WEF

12 REC  
13 SHO  
14 ARE ALSO SAFE IN SAYING AS FAR AS THE MANNER OF DEATH, THE  
15 MANNER OF THE SHOOTING AS TO WHERE THE SHOTS WERE PLACED, BUT  
16 TO SPECULATE, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, AS TO THE ORDER SIMPLY

17  
18  
19 AND AGAIN, I REMIND YOU WHEN YOU CONSIDER THE MANNER OF  
20 DEATH, I WANT YOU TO PAY PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO THE THREE  
21 SHOTS IN THE REAR OF THE BODY, THE REAR HEAD AND THE TWO IN  
22 THE BACK. AND OUT OF THOSE THREE, I WANT YOU TO PAY  
23 PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO THE LOWER LEFT BACK SHOT. THE REASON  
24 WHY THE LOWER LEFT BACK SHOT IS VERY IMPORTANT IS THAT  
25 PARTICULAR SHOT WAS FIRED VERY EXACTING AND IT WENT STRAIGHT  
26 THROUGH AT NO ANGLE. THAT'S THE ONE THAT EXITED THROUGH THE  
27 BODY HORIZONTAL TO THE FLOOR, WENT STRAIGHT THROUGH, DIDN'T  
28 COME DOWN, UP, WHATEVER, STRAIGHT THROUGH. IT WENT THROUGH

0-5

LOCATION OF  
SHOOTER HERE,  
INSIDE HIS  
BEDROOM:

(TRAJECTORIES  
SHOW FIRING  
FROM NORMAL  
TORSO HEIGHT)

PHOTO TAKEN AFTER CRIME  
SCENE ALTERING: OVEN-RANGE,  
REFRIGERATOR (DOOR), FLOOR-  
ING, ETC. WERE NOT THERE  
AT TIME OF SHOOTING

PROSECUTION PHOTO OF BULLET TRAJECTORIES:

SHOWING THE BULLET PATHS AS DETERMINED BY THE STATE'S EXPERT. THEY ARE CLOSE ENOUGH TO TRUE TO PROVE THE PROSECUTOR KNEW HE FABRICATED THE "SHOT IN THE BACK" PRESENTATION AND ARGUMENTS. THEY PROVE THAT MR. LAZOR FIRED HIS GUN FROM PRECISELY WHERE HE CLAIMS. FOR THE PROSECUTOR'S "SHOT IN THE BACK" THEORY TO BE VALID, THERE WOULD HAVE HAD TO BE A BULLET IN THE FLOOR AT A PREDOMINANTLY VERTICAL ANGLE. THERE WAS NO BULLET HOLE IN THE FLOOR AT ALL -- AS THE PROSECUTOR WELL KNEW. BUT THE JURY WAS NOT TOLD ABOUT ANY OF THIS