STATE OF OHIO	)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
COUNTY OF MAHONING	) ss.	CASE NOS. 13-CR-633 14-MA-4
STATE OF OHIO		) \
Plaintiff		DEFENDANT'S
-vs-		TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
JAMES P. FERRARA		AND EXHIBITS ON APPEAL
Defendant		)

APPEARANCES: Atty. Dawn Cantalamessa Atty. Rebecca L. Doherty

On behalf of the State

Atty. Anthony P. Meranto Atty. Kristie Weibling

On behalf of the Defendant

BE IT REMEMBERED that at the trial of the above-entitled cause, in the Court of Common Pleas, Mahoning County, Ohio, beginning on the 18th day of November, 2013, and continuing thereafter, as hereinafter noted, before the Honorable R. Scott Krichbaum, and a Jury of 12 members, the above appearances having been made, the following proceedings were had:

#### I-N-D-E-X

WITNESSES:	PAGE:	
WILLIAM MARSH		
Direct Examination By Ms. Doherty	322	1
FRANK BOYLE		
Direct Examination By Ms. Cantalamessa	335	19
Cross Examination By Mr. Meranto	361	2
MICHAEL FINAMORE		
Direct Examination By Ms. Doherty	366	8
Cross Examination By Mr. Meranto	414	23
Redirect Examination By Ms. Doherty	468	1
Recross Examination By Mr. Meranto	472	20
Further Recross Exam By Mr. Meranto	476	2
DR. JOSEPH OHR		
Direct Examination By Ms. Cantalamessa	484	2
Cross Examination By Ms. Weibling	531	2
ANDREW CHAPPELL		
Direct Examination By Ms. Cantalamessa	533	19

Cross Examination By Mr. Meranto	551	4
Redirect Examination By Ms. Cantalamessa	554	2
Recross Examination By Mr. Meranto	555	2
ROBIN LADD		
Direct Examination By Ms. Doherty	557	16
Cross Examination By Mr. Meranto	587	2
Redirect Examination By Ms. Doherty	607	2
Recross Examination By Mr. Meranto	613	2
DEPUTY DEVIN FITZPATRICK		
Direct Examination By Ms. Doherty	635	23
Cross Examination By Mr. Meranto	640	6
Redirect Examination By Ms. Doherty	646	2
Recross Examination By Mr. Meranto	648	2
DETECTIVE PATRICK MONDORA		
Direct Examination By Ms. Doherty	650	14
Cross Examination By Mr. Meranto	670	3
Redirect Examination By Ms. Doherty	715	4
Recross Examination By Mr. Meranto	727	9
Further Redirect Exam By Ms. Doherty	733	2
Further Recross Exam By Mr. Meranto	734	2

## BRENDA GERARDI Direct Examination By Ms. Weibling 760 18 Cross Examination By Ms. Cantalamessa 773 2 Redirect Examination By Ms. Weibling 780 5 Recross Examination By Ms. Cantalamessa 782 2 Further Redirect Exam By Ms. Weibling 783 3 DETECTIVE PATRICK MONDORA Rebuttal Direct Examination By Ms. Doherty 809 8

#### I-N-D-E-XSTATE'S OPENING STATEMENT - Page 294 DEFENDANT'S OPENING STATEMENT - Page 316 STATE RESTS - Page 735 DEFENDANT RESTS - Page 784 STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT - Page 812 DEFENDANT'S CLOSING ARGUMENT - Page 831 STATE'S FINAL CLOSING ARGUMENT - Page 856 VERDICT - Page 919 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE - Page 925

# E-X-H-I-B-I-T-S STATE'S EXHIBITS IDENTIFIED

NUMBER	/DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED
1	Photograph	386 5
2	Photograph	386 5
4	Photograph	332 20
5	Photograph	386 5
6	Photograph	386 5
7	Photograph	357 2
8	Photograph	356 11
9	Photograph	386 5
10	Photograph	386 5
11	Photograph	386 5
12	Photograph	357 12
13	Photograph	386 5
14	Photograph	386 5
15	Photograph	386 5
22	Photograph	498 7
23	Photograph	498 7
24	Photograph	358 8
25	Photograph	498 7
26	Photograph	498 7
27	Photograph	498 7

28	Photograph	498	7	
29	Photograph	498	7	
30	Photograph	515	19	
31	Photograph	515	19	
32	Photograph	515	19	
33	Photograph	518	6	
34	Photograph	358	8	
35	Photograph	518	6	
36	Photograph	518	6	
37	Coroner's Report-Ben Marsh	491	22	
38	Coroner's Report-Marilyn Marsh	491	22	
39	Coroner's Report-Heather Marsh	491	22	
40	Bullets	524	7	
41A	Boot print	400	23	
41B	Boot print	400	23	
41C	Bullet Fragments	524	7	
41D	Bullet Fragments	524	7	
41E	Bullet Fragments	524	7	
41F	Bullet Fragments	524	7	
42	Photograph	359	11	
43A	Fingerprint cards	403	4	
43B	Fingerprint cards	403	4	
43C	Fingerprint cards	403	4	

43D	Fingerprint cards	403	4
44	Ladd's Report	583	20
45	Chappell's Report	539	10
46	Photograph	408	15
47	Photograph	408	15
48	Photograph	408	15
50	Photograph	408	15
60	Diagram	380	13
61	Ferrara Palm Print	571	10
62	Ferrara Palm Print	571	10
63	BCI Submission Sheet	716	10
64	BCI Submission Sheet	721	11
65	Reward Offer	722	20
66	Binder of Detective Notes	726	5
67	Binder of Detective Notes	726	5
68	Binder of Detective Notes	726	5
70	List of Individuals	722	20
71	List of Individuals	722	20

#### DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS IDENTIFIED

NUMBER/	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFI	ED
0	Detective Notes - Nemeth	450	10
S	Notes from Ladd's Report	598	18
D	Narrative Supplement of Fitzpatric	ck 641	2
N	Detective Notes	678	4
F	List of Suspects	682	19
E	Suspect List of Prints Submitted	684	15
G	Letters to BCI	687	1
U	Police Reports	689	5
С	Article with Composite Sketch	690	20
R	List of People in House	695	6
I	Supplemental Reports	705	12
Т	BCI Submission Sheet	764	11
Р	BCI Evidence Submission Sheet	766	11
В	BCI Report 1/17/75	603	20
A	BCI Report 6/10/09	603	20
L	Suspect #50	704	12
М	Suspect #161 & #167	702	12

#### E-X-H-I-B-I-T-S

### STATE'S EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT	OFFER	OBJECT	RECEIVE	REFUSE	WITHDRAW
EXHIBIT  1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 22	736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7 736 7	743 18 743 18 744 5 744 21 744 21 745 4	743 14 743 14 743 14 743 14	744 2 744 13 745 4 747 16	WITHDRAW
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40	736 21 736 21	745 4 745 2 747 22 747 22	747 9 747 9 748 14 748 14 748 14	747 16 747 16	737 11
41A 41B 41C 41D 41E 41F 42	737 11	747 2	747 9		737 11 737 11 737 11 737 11 737 11 737 11

737 11 737 11 737 11 737 11 737 11 737 11 737 11 737 11 737 11
õ
741 5 741 5 5 2 741 21
741 21 741 21 741 21
742 18
(

# **DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS** OFFER OBJECT RECEIVE 785 21 786 10 788 21 785 21 788 21 789 23 **EXHIBIT** REFUSE WITHDRAW Ι 785 21 788 21 789 23 785 21 791 6 792 6 785 21 790 18 U R

1	THE COURT: I have a couple housekeeping
2	things I need to take care of before we
3	begin, so I just wanted to do that before we
4	get a jury down. There is no resolution of
5	this case; is that correct?
6	MS. DOHERTY: Correct.
7	MR. MERANTO: No, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Not correct?
9	MR. MERANTO: It is correct.
10	THE COURT: All right. The court
11	already ruled on the defendant's motion
12	regarding other acts of the defendant, his
13	prior record, that type of thing. Everyone's
14	aware of that; correct?
15	MS. DOHERTY: (Nodding head.)
16	MR. MERANTO: (Nodding head.)
17	THE COURT: Let the record show that
18	they all nodded their head yes, which I guess
19	means yes. Counts Four and Five have been
20	dismissed, the aggravated burglary and
21	aggravated robbery charge; correct?
22	MS. DOHERTY: Yes.
23	MR. MERANTO: Yes, Your Honor.
	II

THE COURT: Okay. The other day I was informed the defendant was acting inappropriately in the courtroom by way of reacting to what people were saying while they were testifying or what the lawyers were doing. I confess that I didn't notice that myself, but I was not — have a seat. But I was not in my ordinary mode because the issues were being tried to me, so I wasn't paying attention to that. The bailiff is to notice that, and if the defendant does not conduct himself appropriately, the court will take immediate and decisive action.

I'm not saying that he did or he did not. I am not in any way trying to cause anybody a problem. I'm trying to avoid a problem. So if indeed anything like that did occur, please be aware, Mr. Ferrara, your constitutional rights are going to be protected by this court. I'm going to do everything I can possibly do to make sure that you get a fair trial as you're entitled, but I won't stand for anyone to be acting

1	inappropriately in this courtroom. Is the
	inappropriately in this courtroom. Is the
2	defendant's name pronounced Ferrara?
3	<b>THE DEFENDANT:</b> Yes, sir.
4	THE COURT: This is not a case that
5	involves DNA; correct?
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Correct, Your Honor.
7	MR. MERANTO: There's DNA evidence.
8	MS. CANTALAMESSA: There's a lack of DNA
9	evidence.
10	MR. MERANTO: Which is kind of a big
11	deal, so Ms. Gerardi will be down here to
12	testify.
13	THE COURT: Well, there was an attempt
14	to classify DNA?
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right.
16	THE COURT: All right. I think that's
17	all I have, unless you folks have anything
18	else.
19	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, may we
20	ask for permission to have Detective Mondora
21	sit at counsel table with us throughout
22	THE COURT: Yes, you're welcome to do
23	that, but I would urge you in the future

1 when -- I don't know what the other judges 2 do, but you do need to ask permission to do 3 that. Please don't presume that things like 4 that are going to happen. You need him there 5 because he's the detective that got this 6 thing going? 7 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Correct, Your Honor. 8 **THE COURT:** What's your feeling on that? MR. MERANTO: 9 I have no objection. 10 fact, I think it assists the entire process a 11 lot of times. 12 THE COURT: All right. Yes, permission 13 granted. 14 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, we're 15 also going to ask for permission to use the 16 Elmo, the projector during our case. 17 THE COURT: The what? 18 MS. CANTALAMESSA: The Elmo. It's a projector. It projects evidence onto a 19 20 screen, pictures. We find it makes the case 21 go a lot faster. 22 THE COURT: Well, that's nice if indeed 23 it is admitted into evidence, but you're not

What if there's --

going to show anything to a jury if it's not admitted into evidence. You can use whatever you like, show whatever you like if it's evidence. I'm not going to have you showing things to a jury that's not admitted into evidence.

THE COURT: Everybody's got this thing about standing up. Why are you standing up when I'm talking with her?

MS. CANTALAMESSA:

MS. DOHERTY: Because I was going to add something.

THE COURT: I'm speaking with Attorney
Cantalamessa. This is not group
participation. There's two lawyers on every
side. I want everybody to understand, when
somebody's up that's doing whatever you're
doing in the case, that's who's involved, not
this — it isn't group participation. So
whoever you choose to speak, you do whatever
you're supposed to do, but we're not having a
town hall meeting. This is a trial.

So please proceed. I'm sorry. We were

interrupted.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, I was going to say, what if there's no objection from the defense on a particular piece of evidence that they want to ask questions of that witness and think the display of that piece of evidence is also helpful in their testimony?

THE COURT: Yeah, if you're agreeing that it's evidence that's admissible to exhibit to the jury, that's fine. I'm not going to have you showing pictures of things that I may not allow into evidence.

That's — that ain't gonna happen. You can use that, certainly, and if you have some agreement that a particular piece of evidence is not going to be objected to, and you're going to offer into evidence, I have no problem with that.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can we approach you if we know ahead of time on that piece of evidence?

THE COURT: Sure. Sure. That would be

1 the way to do that. 2 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else from 4 the state? 5 MS. CANTALAMESSA: I don't think so. 6 The defense filed a -- well, I don't know if 7 it was a motion, a notice of intent to use a 8 jury instruction this morning, but I think we 9 can address that later. 10 THE COURT: Yes. They filed a proposed 11 jury instruction this morning. That's good 12 that they file things; the earlier the 13 better. But we're not going to discuss that 14 at this point. 15 MS. CANTALAMESSA: That's what we were 16 hoping, we would discuss it later, Your 17 Honor. 18 Okay. What about you? THE COURT: 19 you have -- does the defense have anything 20 you wish to bring to the attention of the 21 court before we begin? 22 MR. MERANTO: Not at this time, Your 23 Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. It's the intention of the court to conduct voir dire as the statute sets forth. That the court shall conduct voir dire to determine whether or not jurors can sit as fair and impartial jurors and shall allow reasonable examination of the jurors by the parties to the case. So it's my intention to completely voir dire the jury and then allow probably a half an hour a side. I don't know that I'll allow — that that will be any different.

It depends on how this goes on whether or not we need to individually voir dire jurors regarding any publicity. There was a story in the Vindicator this morning, and that may have informed jurors of this case. People are coming in. So we'll get to those issues.

I'm going to ask those issues as we discussed the other day, or get into that little bit with the jurors, and if it's necessary, we'll individually voir dire those people. I'm not sure if we'll do it in the

1 courtroom or chambers. I prefer to do it in 2 chambers while everyone's here. I don't 3 anticipate it being lengthy. But we'll make 4 that call as it develops. So we'll take a 5 couple minutes. Do we have a jury yet? 6 MR. JACKSON: Yes, Your Honor, they are 7 all here. **THE COURT:** All right. Everybody ready 8 9 to go then? 10 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor. 11 MR. MERANTO: Yes, sir. 12 MS. DOHERTY: Yes. 13 **THE COURT:** Do you have something? 14 MS. DOHERTY: No. If we're going to 15 take a brief break, can I use the restroom? 16 THE COURT: Yeah. Take a couple minutes 17 to do that, and we'll start in about five 18 minutes. 19 (WHEREUPON, a brief recess was had, 20 after which the proceedings continued as 21 follows, in the presence of the prospective 22 jurors:) 23 Good morning, ladies and THE COURT:

gentlemen.

PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Good

3 morning.

THE COURT: I'm Judge Krichbaum. This is Courtroom No. 3 in the Court of Common Pleas of Mahoning County, Ohio. You are the prospective jurors summonsed here to decide the issues of a criminal case about to begin here. And the first thing I'd like to do is thank you for your willingness to be here.

Service as a juror is one of the most important and valuable civic duties which you can perform. Trial by jury is a precious right that each of us possess as citizens of the United States of America. Preservation of this right is strengthened by your willingness to appear here and participate as jurors.

We know that each of you may be making some sort of sacrifice to be here. You may rather be somewhere else. You may have talked to your friends about how do I get out of jury duty, had a little conversation about

what it's like, and maybe you'd like to do
it, you just don't know if you have the time.
Well, we can't have a system of justice
unless you participate. We can't try cases
without you participating. So even though
it's something you may not want to do, may
not be on your top three this is what I want
to do in my lifetime, your bucket list, it is
something that you're required to do as a
citizen of the United States to preserve this
right.

So again I'd like to thank you for your public spirited activity for reporting and being here today. As I say that — and I don't mean this in any way unpleasantly. I just mean it so that you understand that you have an obligation to serve as a juror, and that is a matter of law.

In fact, the Ohio Revised Code 2313.29 says that no person whose name is drawn and who is notified to attend a term of court shall fail to attend at the time specified from day to day, and that no person whose

name is drawn and who's notified shall fail to attend and serve as a juror. So that's your obligation, and because of that, it's my obligation, too, to require you to serve.

So you may want out. You probably won't get out. You're going to serve if you can possibly do so, and you should serve if you can possibly do so. It is your opportunity to meaningfully participate in our system of justice.

It's not something that you can take lightly. It's not something that you should avoid. It's something you should welcome.

As I indicated, this case involves charges of criminal conduct, and you are to decide the factual issues of the case. Each of the parties is entitled to jurors who approach this case with open minds and who agree to keep their minds open until the final verdict is reached. So jurors must be as free as humanly possible from either bias or prejudice or sympathy, and you must not be influenced by any preconceived ideas either

as to the law or as to the facts.

When I say that, I always offer the editorial on I don't — again, I don't mean to offend anybody, but there — I've learned that there are a lot of Judge Judy fans in the world. And Judge Judy's not — she's a real judge, and all those things are sincere and all of that, but it's a television show is what it is. They pay her \$45 million a year to do that, and the people who appear sign an agreement that the law doesn't count. It's just what she decides is okay.

Well, I suppose all of the judges that I know are envious of Judge Judy, because that would be a nice position to be in. The law really does count. This is not a television show. We are bound by the law. The judge is and you are bound by the law and by the rules, and those are going to be followed. So this may be different.

The only reason I mention that is not to say anything ill about Judge Judy. It's -- it is not what you see on television. It

isn't -- certainly isn't any less important
what we do. It's just done a little
differently than what you've seen or what's
been exhibited, either in that show or in the
movies that are produced about courtroom
proceedings and that type of thing.

The court informs you that there is no information about this court that counts until you come into the courtroom. You will receive the facts of this case from the witness stand. People who come in and testify will give you the facts of this case. And the court will give you the law.

The law as you know it or you perceive it may not be the law that I will give you. The law I will give you is the State of Ohio. I don't get to make it up. I have to look it up, and then I have to deliver it to you. That law is the law that you must follow in deciding the case. You will apply the instructions of law that I give to you to the facts of the case in order to render your verdict.

So has anyone here ever served on a jury before? Will you raise your hands?

PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JURORS: (Indica
ting.)

THE COURT: Just a couple. Well, jury service then is strange to some of you, and of course an explanation of what we do is appropriate. Everyone who participates in a lawsuit, in a trial, must do so in accordance with established rules. And that applies to me; it applies to the lawyers; it applies to the witnesses; and it applies to you, the ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

The lawyers will present the evidence to you through the questioning of witnesses who are called to testify, and that has to be done according to rules of evidence. Rules of evidence is a volume about that thick, and it tells us all what evidence is and how evidence is or is not to be admitted, whether it's proper or improper. And the lawyers interpret those rules the same as I do.

You'll hear throughout the course of the

22

23

trial objections or challenges to the evidence. I'm supposed to decide those things. That's all based upon the rules of evidence and the law as we know it. So from time to time the court may sustain an objection to certain evidence. sustaining of an objection means it's my opinion that that's improper evidence, and it will not be admitted. The lawyers will not argue that in front of you. They're not allowed to make speeches to you about what I should do and why I should do it a certain They're permitted to say objection, and then I'm required to rule, and they're required to abide by that ruling.

Well, you're not to speculate as to what maybe I should've done, or hey, I'd really like to hear that evidence. You have to respect the fact that that's the ruling of the court, and that's the way that it is. If indeed the witness gives an answer that I strike or instruct you to disregard, we're going to ask you to disregard that evidence,

to treat it as though you never heard it because it is improper evidence. Of course, the court may overrule an objection, and that means that what the lawyer is trying to get in evidence will be admitted.

So during this case I am the judge of the law, and the lawyers and the jury are to abide by the law as given by me. But you, ladies and gentlemen, are also judges. You will be the sole judges of the facts and the credibility or believability of the witnesses, and the weight or the value to give to the evidence that is presented to you. It is your sworn duty to accept the law as it is given to you, and not to apply your own conception of what you think the law is or what you think the law should be.

So when we talk about evidence, I should define that for you. Evidence is all of the testimony received from the witnesses who testify. It includes any exhibits that you may have submitted to you. An exhibit is a piece of physical evidence. This gavel, if

2.1

it was introduced as appropriate evidence in the case, would be an exhibit. And that may go back to the jury room with you for inspection. That's also evidence that you may consider.

Evidence may be direct evidence or circumstantial evidence or both.

Direct evidence is the testimony given by a witness who has seen or heard or smelled or felt or somehow perceived the things concerning which he or she testifies.

Circumstantial evidence is different.

Circumstantial evidence is the proof of facts or circumstances by direct evidence from which you may then reasonably infer other related or connected facts which naturally and logically follow, according to common experience of mankind. Now, that's the legal definition of circumstantial evidence, and it's kind of simple.

Tonight we're expecting snow. Snow tonight, folks. So if you go to bed at 8:00 because you want to be completely rested and

20

2.1

22

23

ready for your day in court here tomorrow, and there's a fresh blanket of snow across your backyard when you go to bed, and you wake up at 7:00 a.m. so you can be here no later than 8:15 to start, and you notice that there are rabbit tracks across the yard, nobody saw that rabbit track -- that rabbit cross the yard. Nobody heard it. felt it. But there is evidence that a rabbit crossed the yard after you went to bed, before you woke up in the morning. Ιt doesn't mean you can tell the color of the rabbit, the sex of the rabbit, but you could logically and reasonably conclude a rabbit crossed my yard last night. So that's circumstantial evidence.

The direct evidence is the rabbit tracks, and you figuring out a couple other things from the direct evidence is circumstantial evidence. The use of that evidence is, of course, up to you, and the use of that evidence is subject to the burden of proof.

Burden of proof in a criminal case is solely upon the State of Ohio, the prosecution, to prove each and every element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt. You can get to that proof by either direct or by circumstantial evidence or by a combination of the two.

In a criminal case the State of Ohio brings the charges, and the defendant has no burden upon him. The sole burden of proof is upon the State of Ohio.

In that regard, the defendant is not required to testify. It is his constitutional right not to testify, and you're instructed -- I don't know what's going to happen, whether he is or not, but you're instructed that because of that being a constitutional right, that you may not consider that for any purpose. You're to afford him that constitutional right.

So after we select a jury, the trial will begin. And the jury selection is what's called voir dire. We'll get into the

description of that in just a moment.

But after we select a jury, the lawyers will provide you with opening statements.

Opening statements are like the prelude to a book. What you're allowed to do when you open up a book in a book store, you get to read what the book's about and hopefully get enough interest that hopefully you'll buy it. It's not the whole story, otherwise they'd ruin the book and you'd never buy it. It's an introduction. It's an explanation of what the lawyers think the evidence is in the case so that you're tuned in to what the case is all about.

After the opening statements are presented to you, the State of Ohio will be called upon to present its case, and they'll do so by calling witnesses to testify and presenting whatever exhibits they may have for submission to the jury. The witnesses called by the state may be cross examined by the defense. The defendant has a right to confront the witnesses against him, and

that's done by the questioning of witnesses on cross examination. That is appropriate and encouraged, and that's how we try cases. That's what's supposed to be done.

When the state has completed its evidence the defendant may but is not required to present any evidence. If the defendant chooses to present witnesses, then the State of Ohio has the opportunity to confront those witnesses, to challenge them during cross examination.

When all of that is completed and the parties rest their case, then the lawyers and I would meet and discuss the instructions of law. After it is agreed upon what the instructions of law should be, then closing arguments will be given to you. Each side will have the opportunity to address you like they did in opening statement, but instead of just telling you what the case is about, they're going to tell you why they feel the case should be decided their way, and they're going to argue that. They're going to try

and convince you to see it their way. It's a debate type of a thing, and it will help you decide the factual issues of the case.

Only when all of that is done will I give you the law of the case unless there are bits of law I give you during the course of the trial. But the complete instruction of law is given at the end of the case, and so that should impress upon you the importance of keeping an open mind throughout the trial. You won't even know the law that applies to this case until the very end.

And then probably the most important part of your function is to then retire to the jury room. You'll be locked in there. I tell people they get locked in, because once I had a juror who once we locked the door disclosed to us that she was claustrophobic and couldn't be locked in a room. In 38 years of being involved in this very system, I've never experienced anything like that. But you'll be locked in a room, sequestered, 12 jurors, and your duty is to decide this

case.

20

21

22

23

You will have to unanimously agree that the defendant is quilty or that the defendant is not guilty. All 12 people have to agree. And so you have to discuss the case, take it apart, do whatever it takes to try and reach a unanimous verdict, if you can possibly do If you don't do that, we don't have a verdict, and we have to start all over again. So it's important to understand that the discussion amongst the jurors is very It's a big part of it. And it is important. your solemn duty. Once that is completed you will render verdicts. You'll come back into the courtroom, and different maybe from what you see on TV, the jury doesn't stand and say, the defendant's quilty or not quilty. The verdict form is passed from the jury to the bailiff, and I will announce your verdict here in open court.

It's also possible that you may be polled. A jury is polled normally no matter what happens in a case, just to make sure

that that's your verdict. We'll have a verdict form with all of your signatures, and I'll say, Juror No. 1, is this your verdict? And you say yes or no. That's what polling the jury is. It's not a big deal. It's just a confirmation of what you agreed upon in open court for the record.

The court instructs you that at no time are you to discuss or consider the subject of punishment. That has nothing to do with whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. What the punishment is had nothing to do with anything as far as the jury is concerned because you're not involved in that process. If the defendant is found guilty, then the duty to decide the punishment is placed upon the judge, not upon the jury. But please keep that in mind.

In every criminal case, there are certain basic tenets that apply, and of course they apply in this case as they do in every case, criminal case in the entire United States of America. First, the

2.1

defendant is presumed to be innocent of any wrongdoing unless or until the state establishes his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. So the defendant must be found not guilty unless the state produces evidence which convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of every essential element of the offense or offenses charged in the indictment.

Has everyone heard the term proof beyond a reasonable doubt? Is there anyone who's not heard that? I presume everyone has.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is the burden of proof that the state must meet in this case. Reasonable doubt is present when, after you have considered and compared carefully, considered and compared all of the evidence, you cannot say you are firmly convinced of the truth of the charge.

Reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason and common sense. Reasonable doubt is not mere possible doubt, because everything relating to human affairs or depending upon moral evidence is open to some possible or

2.1

imaginary doubt. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof of such character that an ordinary person would be willing to rely and act upon it in the most important of his or her own affairs. That's the legal definition of reasonable doubt. That's the burden that you must hold the state to.

So in this court -- this is a Court of Common Pleas. It is the highest trial division court in our entire system of justice. We have lower courts, municipal courts, and county courts that decide lower level criminal cases called misdemeanors, and lower level civil cases that involve a smaller -- I don't want to say a meager amount of money, but an amount of money that is legally small.

So this court handles cases of unlimited criminal jurisdiction. We handle felony cases. And we also handle civil cases of unlimited jurisdiction.

I actually was the judge that decided the Simon DeBartolo merger case when

DeBartolo sold to Simon, and the employees of DeBartolo were entitled to compensation, contractual compensation for the demise of the DeBartolo franchise. So that was about a one billion dollar case. That was not tried to a jury. It was tried to me.

We do the most serious cases that there are. The only courts above the Court of Common Pleas are appellate courts, and they don't try cases. They don't have juries. They don't rule on objections. They review what trial courts do.

So this is the Court of Common Pleas, and in this court a criminal case begins with the filing of an indictment. An indictment is a piece of paper that is delivered to the defendant to inform him that he has been charged with a particular criminal offense or offenses. The fact that an indictment was filed in this case may not be considered by you for any other purpose.

When the defendant received that piece of paper informing him that the state charged

him with a criminal offense, he came into court with his lawyer and entered a plea of not guilty. That is a denial of the charge or charges against him, and puts into issue all of the essential elements of those offenses. So this is the indictment. See? It's a piece of paper. It was delivered to the defendant, and again he came in and pled not guilty.

So as I read this to you, I want you to bear in mind that the defendant is presumed innocent, and that he has pled not guilty.

There are charges that have been made against this defendant.

Ryan, sit down. He's got it. I don't want a distraction for the jury when somebody comes into the courtroom.

All right. We've got to tune back in to what I was saying. So in the indictment the state alleges certain offenses against the defendant. And in Count One, the state alleges that on or about December 14th, 1974, in Mahoning County, Ohio, James P. Ferrara

did purposely cause the death of Benjamin
Marsh while the said James P. Ferrara was
committing or attempting to commit, or in
fleeing immediately after committing or
attempting to commit aggravated robbery and
aggravated burglary.

In Count Two, the state alleges that on or about December 14th, 1974, in Mahoning County, Ohio, James P. Ferrara did purposely cause the death of Marilyn Marsh while the said James P. Ferrara was committing or attempting to commit, or in fleeing immediately after committing or attempting to commit aggravated robbery and aggravated burglary.

In Count Three the state alleges that on or about December 14th, 1974, in Mahoning County, Ohio, James P. Ferrara did purposely cause the death of Heather Marsh, while the said James P. Ferrara was committing or attempting to commit, or in fleeing immediately after committing or attempting to commit aggravated robbery and aggravated

burglary.

Those are the offenses that the state has charged against this defendant which he has denied. So has anyone here heard or read or seen anything about this case? Will you raise your hand?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: (Indicating.)

THE COURT: Several of you. There has been media coverage about this case. It is alleged to have occurred in 1974. It hasn't been on my docket that long. It was recently charged against the defendant. In fact, it was charged this year in 2013. So I don't want — the first thing I want is for everyone here, you are specifically instructed by the court that you are not to discuss with anyone, including your fellow jurors, anything that you may have heard or that you think you know about this case.

Is there anyone here who ever served -- or who is a potential witness in this case?

Any of you? No one.

So any information that you may have is

5

4

67

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

from some media source most likely. And we'll get into that a little bit when we talk a little bit further. So you can't talk to anybody at all about anything that you may have heard or learned or read or saw about the case until we conduct inquiry of you concerning that now.

All right. So now I'm going to do the introductions. I always introduce my bailiff first. His name is Ryan Martino. He's standing to acknowledge the introduction. is the right hand man to the court. He'll be your right hand man also. He's the liaison between the court and the jury. He will answer any questions he's authorized to He'll see to your needs. conduct you to and from the jury room. there are any issues at all that you have, you need to approach him out of the hearing of other jurors, and he'll forward whatever information there is to me, and I'll take care of it.

He has been with me for how long, Ryan?

1 Six years?

THE BAILIFF: Seven years.

THE COURT: I, too, served as a bailiff.

I used to be a bailiff for that fellow, Judge
Clyde W. Osborne, and, in fact, sat right
where Ryan is sitting and served Judge
Osborne when I was a student at Akron
University.

But the lady who's just appeared in the doorway there, somehow she knows when to show up. It's kind of uncanny. I don't know what it is. Her name is Cheryl Ference. She's my secretary, assistant, and she's the same as Ryan. They're here to serve you, to accommodate you, and to see to your needs.

If you can't find Ryan, which is a problem I have all the time, maybe you can find Cheryl and approach her. And she likewise is here to serve you, take care of you, help you in any way she can. She won't be in the courtroom during these proceedings. She's out in the outer office tending to the other 403 cases that I have pending.

While I'm doing this, this is the only case I'm going to be involved in, but she's trying to keep the dogs off regarding all those other cases. Please feel free to call upon either of them if you need anything at all in the case.

The court reporter in this case is
Chastity Feezle. She's taking a record of
everything that is being said here. It is
her duty to do that and take a complete and
accurate record. Pay no attention to that
man behind the curtain; okay?

Do you want me to wait for you, Ryan? He knows where to go.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Can I ask a
question?

THE COURT: No. Please be seated.

See, when I worked for Judge Osborne, whenever he was talking to a jury like I'm talking to you, they locked the door so that you wouldn't be disturbed or interrupted and that you understand the very solemn importance of these instructions. Please

forgive the interruption.

The court reporter is required to take a complete and accurate record of whatever occurs here in the courtroom. So they like when I'm the one that's talking because I talk so slow, and I talk loud enough for people to hear me.

It drives me out of my mind because of the solemnity of the court proceeding that a lot of people don't do that. That they talk -- they're talking like this when somebody's talking to them or -- I don't know what it is, but if indeed you're called forward, you're going to be asked to speak. That's what voir dire is, to see and to speak. So it's very, very important that you talk loud and clear enough for everybody in this room to hear you so she can take a record, so everybody can hear you, and that type of thing.

And we realize that you may not ordinarily do that. We just urge you to try and make sure that you do that. If you

don't, we're going to have to ask you to repeat what you're saying, and I'd rather not have you have to do that.

So a record -- I might as well tell you right now, you know a record is being taken of these proceedings. You're never going to see this record. We're not going to repeat things for you. We're not going to take the record and give it to you in the jury room. You have to pay attention to what's going on the whole time. We're not going to help you in that regard. That's your duty.

And the record won't be provided to you.

That record is produced so that a proper record of these proceedings is made. It's not for use by the jury. All right?

The State of Ohio in this case is represented by two of its prosecuting attorneys. Attorney Dawn Cantalamessa.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Good morning.

THE COURT: And Attorney Becky Doherty.

MS. DOHERTY: Good morning.

**THE COURT:** Seated with them is

Attorney -- or I'm sorry, Pat Mondora from the Mahoning County Sheriff's office. He's the investigating officer in this case, and has been granted permission by the court to sit at counsel table and assist the lawyers during the course of the trial.

The defendant in this case is represented by Attorney Anthony Meranto.

MR. MERANTO: Good morning, everybody.

THE COURT: And Attorney Kristie Weibling.

MS. WEIBLING: Good morning.

THE COURT: And the defendant is James P. Ferrara. So is there anyone here who knows any of those persons just introduced?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: (Indicating.)

THE COURT: Okay. Just one or two of you. When you're called forward, I'm going to ask you if you answered yes to any of the questions that we've had. And please remind us of that when you're called forward, and we'll discuss it if indeed you're called forward. If you're not called forward it's

silly for us to discuss it with you now. We're not going to waste everybody's time to do something we don't need to do.

The courtroom is a traditional courtroom. This building was constructed in 1908. So it's got a great deal of majesty and grandeur to it. The area that you are seated in is the spectator area. People are free to come and go and be seated there and watch the proceedings. They're not permitted to be disruptive in this court. If they are, I do bad things to them. They're not supposed to do that. They're not allowed to eat lunch or drink pop or anything at all like that. They're permitted to come in and observe.

Likewise, they're not permitted to react to anything that the parties do like you see on TV when the crowd is like the audience, you know, at a play where they approve or disapprove. And they're just not allowed to do that at all. And you need to understand that applies when you render your verdict,

they're not going to clap or cheer or jump or shout or do anything at all. It's kind of undramatic, actually, because I don't let them do anything when you render a verdict.

They're to respect what you do, but they're free to come and go as they like if they follow the rules. And that will happen throughout the course of the trial.

This area here to my right is the jury box. There are 12 seats there, and the first 12 of you are going to be called up to this jury box, and the initial questioning will take place that way.

The seat next to me is the witness chair. Witnesses will be brought to the podium to be sworn, and then they'll walk up here to the witness chair, close to the court reporter so she can hear and understand everything, and close to you ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

The judge is seated in the highest position of authority because the judge is the highest position and in authority in the

trial. Below me is the bailiff's seat, and he is to see to order in the courtroom and to see to your needs as they may develop during the course of the case.

The railing in front of him is called the bar. When you hear Mahoning County Bar Association or Ohio State Bar Association, that's what we're referring to. That is the bar. It's the area between the court and the lawyers. So this is my courtroom, the entire courtroom.

This area where I'm seated, the bench, is unapproachable. That's a bar to their approach. And so their area is beyond that where they're free to move about. Some judges don't let you do that. But that area is for the lawyers to move about and do what they do in a case, and they're free to do that. When they wish to go beyond that, when they want to come and talk to me, they have to ask to approach the bench or to approach the witness, because that's an area they're not free to move.

The State of Ohio, the prosecutor, and the plaintiff in a civil case, sit at this table closest to the jury traditionally where they're seated now. The defense traditionally in a criminal or in a civil case sits at that table. And most of the courtrooms are set up pretty much this way.

The bench on the side here normally is occupied by what we call friends of the court. So if one of my sons were to come home from Columbus and want to visit, they may come in and sit there to watch, or another judge or lawyers come in and sit there, and sometimes a member of the media may come and sit there. They move in and out. Usually that won't interrupt you in any way.

During the proceedings the court requires the lawyers to stand when they object. It requires them to address witnesses by a title. Mr. or Mrs., not Susie or Billy or Jimmy. It's a formal proceedings, and we like to conduct with that

appropriate decorum.

As I indicated, ladies and gentlemen, it is your duty to serve. It is my duty to impose that upon you. So this is not anything personal. This is something legal that all of us are doing here. And please understand that your job is just as important as my job in this case, and just as important as the jobs of the prosecutors and the defense lawyers in this case. It's a very special thing that we ask of you.

As prospective jurors you're going to be placed under oath, and counsel and I will question you to determine your ability to be fair and impartial in this particular case. The questions that are asked of you are not designed to pry into your personal affairs, even though you may think we are prying into your personal affairs. But they are to discover if you have any knowledge of this case or any preconceived ideas about the law or about the facts which you are unable to lay aside, or if you had any personal

experiences that make it impossible for you to serve in this case because you may favor one party or another. Questions are necessary to assure each party a fair jury.

Is there anyone here who does not take an oath?

(WHEREUPON, the prospective jurors were administered the oath or affirmation at 9:19 a.m., November 18, 2013, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may be seated. Certainly you're qualified to serve as a juror or you wouldn't have made it this far, but this is the fine tuning to determine whether or not you can do this particular job. It's very much like a job interview. Even though you may not have applied for this job, we're going to interview you to see if you can do the job. And it's for us to see and for you to see also.

Voir dire is a Latin term which means to speak the truth. You are required to answer

fully and completely and honestly. It is also a French term which means to see and to speak. And so we're going to see you and speak to you about your ability to serve as jurors in this case.

It's also incumbent upon you to see us and speak to us about your ability to serve in this case. And that decision will be made in that regard.

The trial should be completed this week. It should not run beyond this week, so that will be the time commitment that you are involved in. And the voir dire process after I'm done with you, the prosecutors will ask you questions, and then the defense lawyers will ask you questions, and then we will begin the exercise of challenges.

There are different ways that you can be challenged. If, for example, you were a witness to this case, you can't serve as a juror. If you were related to anyone introduced here, most likely you could not serve.

I want you to understand that there's nothing wrong with you knowing somebody. I know all of these people. I deal with them everyday, all these lawyers, and the police officer. They're friends of mine. They're people I care about, people that I hope do well. But it's not about friendship or what I feel about. It's about the law. The law's just going to tell all of us what's going to happen here.

So it's important that you understand, knowing someone or knowing something about the case, big deal. I know a lot about the case, and I try it too. It's just that you have to be able to decide the case based on what you hear in the courtroom, not on what some reporter wrote in a newspaper.

So these peremptory challenges — there are two types of challenges. There are challenges for cause, which I've just described to you. If there's some valid cause for you not to serve, then you can be excused. And there are also peremptory

challenges. Those are challenges that are afforded to each side, the prosecution and the defense, and they get four apiece. And they get to decide — they get to excuse four people, each side, for no reason at all.

If, for example, you're a Dallas Cowboys fan, I would probably excuse you because I'm a Washington Redskins fan. I mean, it truly can be that silly. They don't need to explain why you're being excused on a peremptory. If they challenge you for cause, they do need to justify that.

So if you are excused for any reason at all, you really shouldn't be offended.

That's a meaningful participation by the parties in selecting the jury who will try the case.

So these challenges for cause are set forth in the rules of court governing all of the courts of Ohio. I'm going to read them to you. If any of them apply to you when I'm done, I'm going to ask for a show of hands. So please pay attention to this.

1 A person called as a juror may be 2 challenged for cause for any of the 3 following: That you have been convicted of a 4 felony crime that renders you disqualified to 5 serve on a jury. Is there anyone here in 6 that regard? 7 The jurors have not -- apparently no one 8 has been subject to that challenge. 9 That the juror is a chronic alcoholic or 10 drug-dependent person. Again, no takers on -- I don't get a lot 11 of takers on the first two anyhow. 12 13 Have any of you served on a grand jury 14 in Mahoning County in the last year? No one. 15 Have any of you served on a jury, a 16 regular jury, in Mahoning County in the last 17 year? 18 Is there anyone here who's not a 19 resident of Mahoning County? 20 The jurors have been silent, so 21 the court will find that those challenges 22 apply to none of them. 23 Is there any juror here who has a

1 lawsuit pending between you or a member of 2 your family and the State of Ohio or this 3 defendant? 4 No one. 5 None of you knew any of the lawyers. 6 think I asked that before. Is there anyone 7 that knew any of the officers? Someone knew 8 one or two of the lawyers. All right. We'll 9 ask that later. 10 Is there anyone here who's been 11 subpoenaed as a witness in this case? 12 No one. 13 The rest of these, there's several, but 14 they relate to whether or not you're related 15 to anybody. If you don't know them, you're 16 not related to them is what I'm assuming. 17 And is there anyone employed by either 18 of the parties in this case? 19 No one. 20 Is there anyone here who does not speak 2.1 and understand English? 22 All right. Because we're going to use

English as the official language of this

23

trial.

All right. Those are the challenges for cause.

We're also going to select, in addition to the jury panel, we're going to select alternate jurors. Alternate jurors, we're going to pick one or two; I'm not sure yet. But the alternates are the same as the ordinary jurors. Everything is exactly the same except the alternate may not deliberate the case if nothing happens that causes me to excuse another juror. But the alternates will stay here while the jury is deliberating and may be called upon to take the place of one of the regular jurors if a very highly unusual circumstance would happen to develop.

The court instructs you that the law must come to you from the court, not from the lawyers. But I do allow the lawyers to discuss issues of law with you so that they can be satisfied that you understand the law and that you don't reject it or won't accept it. You must accept the law as it is given

to you by the court. You can't change it.

You can't modify it. You can't tweak it.

You have to just swallow it the way it's

given to you.

When you're asked questions when you're called upon during voir dire, there is no wrong answer as long as your answer is honest and complete. So we're going to call the first 12 jurors to the jury box. Our jury box is here, as I've indicated.

The front row is closest to me. Seat No. 1 is closest to the court reporter and proceeds across the front row to Seat No. 6. The back row right behind Seat No. 1 is Seat No. 7 and proceeds across the back row to Seat No. 12.

When I was a bailiff like Ryan is the bailiff, Judge Osborne used to have me call the jurors to the — the first 12 to the jury box and get them seated. I always thought it was so he could help me overcome my shyness in front of a crowd, and also so that he could make me feel important. But when we

finally did have a talk about that years after, after I became a lawyer and he retired as a judge, he told me it was so that I would mispronounce the jurors' names rather than the judge do it. So I don't do that to my bailiff. I'll do it myself. And if I do mispronounce your name, first of all, please forgive me, and second, please correct me so that the lawyers don't make the same mistake.

Seat No. 1, Anthony Ross, please come forward. Seat No. 2, Billy Jo Catanzarite.

MS. CATANZARITE: Catanzarite.

THE COURT: I always thought it should be Catanzarite. All right. Seat No. 3,
Darlene Romesburg. Seat No. 4, Florida
Crump. Seat No. 5, Craig Dray. You can take the scenic route. Seat No. 6, Jeffrey
Frankford. Seat No. 7, Josephine Willison.
Seat No. 8, Angela Sotlar. Seat No. 9,
Nicholas Bruno. Seat No. 10, Rena Firmstone.
Seat No. 11, Kristie Merlo. Seat No. 12,
Cynthia Schneider.

So those seats are a lot better than

those hard benches in the back, huh? All right. Those of you in the rear of the courtroom, it's very important that you pay close attention to the proceedings here at the front of the courtroom, because as I indicated, several of these people may be excused, and you'll be called upon to take their place. If you don't pay attention and we have to repeat everything that we did, then that's no good for anybody. So please try and stay up to date with us as this goes on. So were all of you able to hear the proceedings here at the front of the courtroom?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: (Indicating.)

THE COURT: Everyone. And did any of the challenges for cause apply to any of you?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: No.

THE COURT: And I asked if anyone had heard anything about this case. Did any of you hear anything or know anything or read anything about this case? Please just raise your hands if you did.

## PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

(Indicating.)

2

\_

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: One, two, three, four, seven, eight, nine, ten, and eleven. While we're doing this -- and this is for everyone. I don't want you to tell anybody what you saw In a case that has received some or heard. publicity -- and it's not uncommon at all for that to happen. In fact, half of the cases that I have are reported in the newspaper, and I still have to decide them. I've done this for so long, that's part of Make sure the Vindicator guy isn't here. And because I've learned how inaccurate the Vindicator is on almost all occasions, I read it for entertainment more than I read it for information. But not everyone does that.

My mother, in fact, is 90 years old, and believes everything that she reads in the paper is true. It's just the way she's raised, you know, just the way she is. Even if it says bad things about me, she still thinks it's true because it's in the newspaper.

So when we talk about this publicity issue, the first thing you need to understand is that it really doesn't matter if you read or heard anything about the case. What matters is whether or not you're able to set that aside and decide this case for yourself based upon evidence that is presented to you here in the courtroom. What has been reported in the newspaper, on television, or otherwise, is not evidence of any kind.

Newspaper articles are not evidence.

Lauren Lindvig, I see her every morning. What she says is not evidence. Those are people who report in the news about what they heard. Now, certainly this is something that is supposed to have occurred in 1974. Lauren Lindvig wasn't born then, so she doesn't know squat about this case, and neither do any of the other reporters. The witnesses may know something about this case.

So without getting into any more detail about that, the court instructs you that you are to set aside any impressions that you may

1 have and any information that you may have 2 outside of the courtroom and decide this case 3 based strictly upon the evidence that you 4 hear here in the courtroom and apply that --5 apply the law that I give you to those facts. So when I so instruct you, do you feel that 6 7 you are able to do that and proceed as a 8 juror? Mr. Ross? 9 MR. ROSS: Yes. 10 THE COURT: You think you can do that, Ms. Catanzarite? 11 12 MS. CATANZARITE: Yes, I do. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Romesburg? 14 MS. ROMESBURG: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Ms. Crump? 16 Yes, sir. MS. CRUMP: 17 THE COURT: Ms. Willison? 18 MS. WILLISON: Yes. 19 When I say Ms., I don't know THE COURT: 20 if it's Mrs. or Ms. because it doesn't say 21 here, so I don't want anybody -- I hope 22 you're not offended by that. Because, you 23 know, people are real sensitive anymore.

1 When I grew up you could say most anything to 2 anybody, and people would laugh, but --3 Ms. Sotlar? 4 MS. SOTLAR: Yes. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Bruno? 6 MR. BRUNO: Yes. 7 Ms. Firmstone? THE COURT: 8 MS. FIRMSTONE: Yes. 9 THE COURT: And Ms. Merlo? 10 MS. MERLO: Yes. THE COURT: 11 Huh? 12 MS. MERLO: Yes. 13 THE COURT: You've got to talk loud. 14 Remember I told you you've got to talk loud? 15 MS. MERLO: Yes. 16 THE COURT: So you've just got an 17 example of how we do things. Somebody will 18 say something, and the first juror answers, 19 somebody, well, that's a good answer. 20 think I'll use that answer. It's important that you decide this for yourselves. Do you 21 22 understand the very solemn importance of each 23 and every one of you doing this so that

you're satisfied as you're doing it when you leave here and live the rest of your life?

But you know what, I did the right thing. I did it the way the judge instructed. I did it the way it should be done, and I'm proud of what I did. And I know that I did the right thing. If you can do that, you'll just love this experience.

So setting everything aside is okay; you know? Until you know what's up, the issue, though, is you don't want to use anything that you read in the paper to challenge what some witness has to say. Because what was said in the paper is not before you. It has nothing to do with what we're talking about. So I'm pleased that you feel that you can do that. That's what you're called upon to do.

We have a lot of questions to be asked of you. We've been going for a little while now. I think before the state begins its voir dire, we should take a brief recess. It is a little bit cumbersome to do a recess at this stage of the proceedings because there

are so many of you in the rear of the courtroom, and we have a prospective jury panel here. But what I would ask is that those of you in the rear of the courtroom, you can exit through the back door, and I would want you back here in the courtroom by — oh, we'll go 15 minutes because there's so many. So about 5 to 10:00.

And those of you in the jury box here, the bailiff will conduct you to the jury room. You, too, can move about wherever you wish, but I want you back in the jury room shortly before five minutes till so he can conduct you back into the jury. Remember the seats that you're in right now. That's where you'll report.

During your absence from the courtroom, you are instructed that you are not permitted to discuss this case at all among yourselves or with anyone else. You must not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence. You are not to form or express any opinion about the case. So if

you hear somebody out in the hallway talking about the case, walk away. Again, any information outside of the courtroom is not desirable. It's not a part of what we're supposed to be involved in. All right. We'll be in recess then for 15 minutes.

(WHEREUPON, a brief recess was had, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

(WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel,

Defendant and court reporter enter the

chambers of the Court, and the following

proceedings were had out of the hearing of

the prospective jurors:)

**THE COURT:** We're in my chambers at the request of the defense.

MR. MERANTO: Judge, in my opinion, I think when you asked the general question of the entire venire, that I believe there were more than half of the people that raised their hands with regard to having knowledge of this case from media and/or other sources. We've now put the first 12 jurors in the jury

box, and 9 of those people have expressed some knowledge. We have no idea what that knowledge is, what the extent of it is.

And I appreciate that the court has asked them, and the court's satisfied with the fact that they've said that they can ignore all of that and act fairly, but with all due respect, the court, as you spent some minutes discussing with them, is an imposing thing. The building, the trappings of the court, the fact that most of those people have never served on a jury before.

And I would submit to the court, and the court with its vast experience not only from the bench, but in trial, is well aware that these people, they're going to acquiesce.

And I refer to it with regard to speaking on how I voir dire, it's nice that they sit there and they nod in unison with regard to yes or no, but it's basically a respectfulness and a deference to the surroundings and the court. And I think without exploring what they actually know

about it, I mean, potentially, Judge, nine of the twelve that are seated right now in that box could know that Mr. Ferrara is serving double life in Franklin County. While they say they could put that aside, if they're on the fence, that's going to tip them to the side of a verdict of guilty, and I just think we need a stronger inquiry with regard to that issue.

**THE COURT:** Yes? What's the state want to say?

MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, I guess I have some concerns as the defense does certainly because we don't know what they know. It's difficult to ascertain whether or not they know that fact that he discussed, or they just know general things about the case. I personally haven't read really any of the articles, so I don't know —

THE COURT: So what do you want me to do, remind them of these things? Do you want me to read them the newspaper articles and then ask them if they could put this aside?

It's based

1

MR. MERANTO:

Well, no, Judge.

2

**THE COURT:** What do you want me to do?

I mean, I'm happy that

you're willing to come in here and complain,

but you're offering no particular solution.

we're allowed to inquire of each of those

on their demeanor when they answer the

of that is based on experience.

individuals -- I mean, the court knows part

questions. And you can tell sometimes if a

person's just blowing you off or if they're

it's just yeah, I read this murder's 40 years

sincere that they can ignore that. Maybe

old and it was horrible and this and that.

pretrial you looked there was something in

articles mentions the fact that Mr. Ferrara

the paper, and every single one of those

is serving double life out of Franklin

But I will tell you after every single

3

MR. MERANTO:

THE COURT:

MR. MERANTO:

I think in a serious --

Well, no. I think if

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT:

County.

Well, then maybe there

OFFICIAL SHORTHAND REPORTERS MAHONING COUNTY YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

should've been a request to individually voir dire these jurors or something along those lines instead of what was planned in the case. There's no particular reason in my mind to reinforce or to remind these people of what they may have seen in the newspaper.

MR. MERANTO: Judge, with all due respect, and certainly with deference to this court, we breached this issue, and we talked about it, and you said that you'd handle it, and you'd see if it was needed to necessarily to individually voir dire. Don't say that I didn't bring it up, because I did.

THE COURT: I did say that.

MR. MERANTO: Now, I think it's obvious that I think we need to do that or explore that option.

THE COURT: Is that what you're saying?
You think that's necessary to do that? You,
the prosecutor, you're saying you have
concerns, too? These jurors have answered
each one of them, same as you would seek a
juror to answer, can I be fair and impartial,

1 and if they say yes, then somehow that's 2 They've said they can set whatever 3 publicity that they've been exposed to aside 4 and decide the case based on the facts that 5 are presented in the courtroom and the law 6 that the judge gives them. 7 MS. DOHERTY: And Judge, that is --THE COURT: I'm not sure what else I 8 9 need to get from them. 10 MS. DOHERTY: And that is exactly what I 11 would've asked them. I guess my concern is 12 more that during the voir dire process that 13 the defense and the state engages in, I just 14 don't want somebody to blurt it out. But 15 maybe you could caution them. They've been told not to 16 THE COURT: 17 blurt it out. 18 MS. DOHERTY: Okay. 19 THE COURT: I've told them that three 20 times not to blurt it out. 21 MS. DOHERTY: I know. Okay. 22 THE COURT: I'm not sure what okay 23 Does okay mean that you're satisfied

the way that it is, or you're joining in his request to remind these people what they've read in the paper, I guess?

MS. DOHERTY: No, I guess I'm not joining in that request. I just think we have — because of the publicity, be very cautious if they appear to be beginning to say something out loud. We certainly don't want to contaminate those jurors who have made that concession that they can set it aside, don't know anything about it.

MR. MERANTO: And Judge, just for the -we all know what goes on in a jury room
sometimes because you find out on these
post-relief conviction petitions and things
of that sort that, you know -- I mean, we
found this out in Bennie Adams, one of the
jurors now, one of the issues that's coming
up on his post-relief, one of the jurors
goes, well, you know, this guy raped somebody
18 years ago.

That's completely improper and was never before the jury. They never should've known

that. And yet it's a relevant topic, and it's absolutely something that happens, I believe, on a regular basis in a jury room. And without exploring it, I mean, I just have to object to going forward with this venire based on their response that they all — I mean, more than half of them know about this, and we don't know what they know.

THE COURT: Well, my concern when you talk about vast experience and all of that is all you do is open a can of worms when you start talking to them about what they read in the paper as a -- as a casual observer to now reminding them as a juror, this is what you read in the newspaper.

MR. MERANTO: Well, here's all I'm saying. It's pretty much this specific issue, Judge, the issue of the fact that he's serving a double life sentence out of Franklin County, and if you ask — out of that nine, maybe only two of them are going to say that that's what they know. And I think certainly the other seven probably are

1 already rehabilitated with regard to that 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

issue. But the fact remains that if that information is used or brought forth somehow in the jury room, that's going to be an absolute factor if --

THE COURT: There's no way for a court to stop that. I mean, you tell me what happened in Bennie Adams' case because some juror says that they knew something that they didn't tell the court they knew. happens all the time. All the time. there's absolutely no way to stop that.

I mean, I've been doing this long enough to know that jurors sometimes either don't remember what it is that they heard, or they don't want to tell you what they heard, but they got something there, or they get something from somebody during the trial that affects the way that they decide the case. There's all kinds of things that happen like that that there's no way you can stop that by voir dire. That's what you're asking me to do, stop something by way of voir dire.

The answer that you're looking for is that they can decide the case based on what's presented in the courtroom, the exact answer that all of them gave. And so for me to surrender — and that's what it would be, surrender, to allow inquiry, you're asking me to make inquiry about whether or not they know about this guy being in the penitentiary for a double murder. Then I'm going to eliminate all the jurors, aren't I?

MR. MERANTO: No. No. What I'm saying is if you got those nine and said, what do you know, and they said, I know there's a murder. Anything else? Do you know anything about this defendant? And they say no.

**THE COURT:** Then you're satisfied?

MR. MERANTO: Well, yeah. But if they also say, yeah, I know he's already in jail for another murder, I mean, that's a big deal.

THE COURT: Yeah? Then how do you deal with that if they say that, yeah, they read that, but they're not going to use that

against the defendant, like they just told me?

MR. MERANTO: Well, I've got four peremptories, Judge, and obviously I could at least make up in my mind, and Ms. Weibling and I could discuss and Mr. Ferrara included on, you know what, Juror 1 is full of crap, excuse my French. That you could tell in their voice and their eyes and their inflection that they couldn't put it aside.

THE COURT: All right. I want everybody in the courtroom.

THE BAILIFF: Okay.

(WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel,

Defendant and court reporter returned to the

court, and the following proceedings were had

back in the hearing of the prospective

jurors:)

THE COURT: Okay. There are a couple of things that I needed to clear up that came to light while we were on recess. First of all, Mr. Ross, I think you raised your hand when I asked if you knew anyone?

1	MR. ROSS: Yes.
1	
2	<b>THE COURT:</b> Okay. Who do you know?
3	MR. ROSS: Mr. Meranto.
4	THE COURT: Okay. How do you know him?
5	MR. ROSS: Just as an official, football
6	official.
7	THE COURT: Okay. You used to coach
8	football; is that right?
9	MR. ROSS: Yes.
10	THE COURT: So your relationship with
11	him was in that regard that he was an
12	official and you were a coach?
13	MR. ROSS: Yes.
14	THE COURT: And would there be anything
15	from that relationship that would cause you
16	to favor or disfavor his position in the
17	case?
18	MR. ROSS: No.
19	THE COURT: Okay. So the fact that you
20	know him really doesn't matter?
21	MR. ROSS: Correct.
22	<b>THE COURT:</b> Fair enough. And then
23	Ms. Merlo.

1	MS. MERLO: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Ms. Ruble-Merlo. Is that
3	what it is, Ruble-Merlo?
4	MS. RUBLE: It's Ruble now, yes.
5	THE COURT: You see, what happens is
6	I don't know why they do that. In fact, see,
7	whenever something funny like that happens,
8	we can correct it for the next time, but a
9	jury list just has you as Merlo, and the
10	lawyers have you by another name. So you're
11	the same person, right, Kristi Ruble-Merlo?
12	MS. RUBLE: Yes, I am.
13	THE COURT: And then Ms. Schneider, you
14	spoke with my bailiff about why I didn't ask
15	you?
16	MS. RUBLE: I figured it out, sir.
17	THE COURT: Did you raise your hand?
18	MS. RUBLE: No, sir.
19	THE COURT: Well, that's why I didn't.
20	So are you okay with that?
21	MS. RUBLE: Yes.
22	THE COURT: All right. Now, there were
23	several of you who indicated that you had

2.1

heard something about the case or knew something about the case or read something about the case. My inquiry was about your ability to set that aside and to listen to the evidence that's presented to you and decide this case based solely upon that evidence and the law that is given to you. Now that you've had the recess and had that instruction, is there anyone that feels any differently about that? Okay.

Now, I hate to do this, but we gotta do it. Everyone's got to remain here in the courtroom, you prospective jurors, and I'm going to conduct a brief inquiry of the jurors who have responded affirmatively in that regard in chambers, one by one, so that what you think you know about the case isn't transferred to somebody else, because, you know, poison is that way. It has a way of finding you.

So everyone here in the courtroom is instructed that you're still in the courtroom, and you should behave yourselves.

1 But I will not be present, nor will the 2 parties be present. And we're going to ask 3 these individual jurors as they come forward 4 about that. So it's okay for you to talk. 5 It's okay for you to mingle. Just please 6 keep it to a low roar if you will. We'll be 7 as expeditious in this regard as we can. 8 So I'd like the parties and the reporter 9 and I to retire to chambers, and I'll have 10 the bailiff come out and get you 11 individually. You've got to stay right 12 there, too. I'll try and be quick about 13 this. 14 (WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel, 15 Defendant and court reporter enter the 16 chambers of the Court, and the following 17 proceedings were had out of the hearing of 18 the prospective jurors:) 19 (WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 1, 20 Anthony Ross, entered the chambers of the 21 court.) 22 THE COURT: All right. You're first. 23 That's because you're Juror No. 1.

1 MR. ROSS: Yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: You, sir, indicated that you 3 knew something about the case or was exposed 4 to some publicity about the case. 5 guess the most -- well, the inquiry would 6 simply be, what do you know about the case? Obviously just, you know, 7 MR. ROSS: 8 what you read. I remember vaguely --9 THE COURT: I shouldn't say what you 10 know about the case. What information do you 11 have about the case from any source? 12 MR. ROSS: That a husband and a wife 13 were murdered along with their daughter back 14 in the '70s. It happened somewhere out on, like, Turner Road. I kind of remember that 15 16 back living in Canfield, so even when I was 17 younger, I remember vaguely of that place, you know, that case, but that's about it. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. And what is your 20 source of information? Source or sources? 21 MR. ROSS: Vindicator. 22 Will you follow the THE COURT: 23 instruction to set all that aside and decide

1 the case based strictly upon what is 2 presented to you in the courtroom? 3 MR. ROSS: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Do you understand that 5 what's reported in a newspaper article may or 6 may not be accurate? They have a desire to 7 report, but they also have a desire to 8 sensationalize. 9 MR. ROSS: Yes. 10 THE COURT: And you're satisfied that 11 you can do that? 12 MR. ROSS: Yes. 13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 14 You're excused. Just return to the 15 courtroom. I want Juror No. 2, please, 16 Ms. Catanzarite. 17 (WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 1, 18 Anthony Ross, left the chambers of the 19 Court.) 20 MR. MERANTO: Judge, can we just add to the inquiry, do you know anything about 21 22 Mr. Ferrara? 23 Yeah, if you want. THE COURT:

1	I'll do that.
2	MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Judge.
3	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 2,
4	Billie Jo Catanzarite, entered the chambers
5	of the Court.)
6	THE COURT: Hi. You're Billy Jo
7	Catanzarite?
8	MS. CATANZARITE: Yes.
9	THE COURT: And you're here just simply
10	to tell us what you have learned about this
11	case from outside sources?
12	MS. CATANZARITE: Oh, very little. My
13	husband showed me the paper this morning, and
14	he said, I wonder if that's what you're going
15	to be seeing.
16	THE COURT: That's what I thought when I
17	read the paper, why did they do this?
18	They're just so did you read the article?
19	MS. CATANZARITE: No. I have three
20	kids. I didn't have time to read the article
21	this morning.
22	THE COURT: Have you read any other
23	MS. CATANZARITE: I was busy with my

1	referee gear on.
2	THE COURT: Is that the first you knew
3	about this?
4	MS. CATANZARITE: Yes, that was the
5	first.
6	THE COURT: Do you know anything about
7	this defendant at all?
8	MS. CATANZARITE: None.
9	THE COURT: Do you have the ability to
10	put aside anything you may have learned about
11	this case and decide it strictly upon what's
12	presented to you in the courtroom?
13	MS. CATANZARITE: I believe I do.
14	THE COURT: Thank you very kindly.
15	MS. CATANZARITE: Thank you.
16	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 2,
17	Billie Jo Catanzarite, left the chambers of
18	the Court.)
19	THE COURT: And I'd like Ms. Romesburg,
20	No. 3.
21	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 3,
22	Darlene Romesburg, entered the chambers of
23	the Court.)

1	<b>THE COURT:</b> Hi. How are you?
2	MS. ROMESBURG: Nice to meet you.
3	THE COURT: Well, nice to meet you. So
4	you're Ms. Darlene Romesburg?
5	MS. ROMESBURG: That's correct.
6	THE COURT: And you told us in the
7	courtroom that you had you knew something
8	about this case from outside sources; is that
9	right?
10	MS. ROMESBURG: Yes.
11	THE COURT: What do you know?
12	<b>MS. ROMESBURG:</b> I remember when it
13	happened.
14	THE COURT: Oh, do you?
15	MS. ROMESBURG: My cousin worked at
16	General Motors, so we used to talk about it.
17	But needless to say, I remember recently it
18	being in the paper and just reading. No
19	further discussion with anybody about that.
20	THE COURT: So you read most of what
21	they printed about it because of your earlier
22	interest in the case?
23	MS. ROMESBURG: Uh-huh.
۷ ک	TAD. INTERPOLICE. OIL IIGII.

1	THE COURT: So you're pretty up to date
2	on the news regarding the case?
3	MS. ROMESBURG: Yes.
4	<b>THE COURT:</b> And that in '74 when you
5	talked to people about it, what was that
6	conversation about?
7	MS. ROMESBURG: Just how terrible it was
8	and tragic.
9	THE COURT: The horror of the whole
10	thing?
11	MS. ROMESBURG: Yes. And there was
12	another case, I think in Pennsylvania, was
13	similar, a family like that was murdered.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MS. ROMESBURG: And it was just it
16	was all tragic, terrible.
17	THE COURT: So you've read that
18	something like this did occur, and you
19	followed it, and now you know that someone
20	has been charged with this offense?
21	MS. ROMESBURG: Yes.
22	THE COURT: Do you know anything at all
23	about Mr. Ferrara?

1	MS. ROMESBURG: No.
2	THE COURT: What have you read about, or
3	do you recall what you read about his him
4	being in this case?
5	MS. ROMESBURG: DNA, and that he was in
6	jail all this time. That that really
7	was it's really all I'm shocked today
8	that this is what it is, so I really haven't
9	had much time to ponder on it.
10	THE COURT: That he was in jail. Do you
11	know for what?
12	MS. ROMESBURG: No.
13	THE COURT: And do you know for how
14	long?
15	MS. ROMESBURG: I just remember it was
16	extended.
17	THE COURT: Okay. So I had asked before
18	about the ability to set all that aside. Do
19	you think you have that ability?
20	MS. ROMESBURG: I've never had to use it
21	in this type of situation, and I certainly
22	would hope that I could exercise that.
23	THE COURT: Well, you understand that

what a trial is about is what the truth of the matter is. That's what you're here for, to determine the truth of the matter.

MS. ROMESBURG: Yes.

THE COURT: And so that's not determined by what's in the newspaper. It's determined by what's presented in court.

MS. ROMESBURG: I realize that.

THE COURT: So given that background, given that understanding, do you see how inappropriate it is to use the newspaper, use the media to help you decide the case?

MS. ROMESBURG: It is, and I've learned that over the years. There's been just different instances over my lifetime that I have maybe some first-hand knowledge, and I truly know that those weren't the circumstances that were reported in the Vindicator. I know how easy it is to leave a paragraph out and to change the whole persona of the article.

THE COURT: Well, God bless you. I know it all too well.

1	MS. ROMESBURG: It's terrible, isn't it?
2	THE COURT: It is. And it would be even
3	more terrible if that type of thing was used
4	to deny someone his his liberty, to find
5	someone guilty of an offense that they may
6	not be guilty of. Or vice versa, to let
7	somebody go for an offense they may be guilty
8	of. What's in the media is inappropriate.
9	MS. ROMESBURG: Yes.
10	THE COURT: So do you think you can do
11	that? Do you think you can put that aside?
12	MS. ROMESBURG: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
14	MS. ROMESBURG: You're welcome.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Crump.
16	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 3,
17	Darlene Romesburg, left the chambers of the
18	Court, and Prospective Juror No. 4, Florida
19	Crump, entered.)
20	THE COURT: How do you like the office?
21	MS. CRUMP: It's nice. It's scary,
22	though.
23	THE COURT: So you're Ms. Crump?

1 MS. CRUMP: Yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: We had asked -- what this 3 inquiry is about is because you indicated as 4 some of the others have that you know 5 something about this case from the media. Do 6 you know anything about this case from any 7 other source? 8 MS. CRUMP: No. 9 THE COURT: What do you know about it 10 from the media? 11 MS. CRUMP: Basically I heard it on the 12 news, because I don't read the Vindicator, 13 and I just heard about it this summer, but I 14 wasn't occupied with -- my husband had -- I 15 had been going through a lot of stuff 16 personally, so I just didn't dwell on it. 17 Well, what do you recall THE COURT: 18 about it? 19 Something about a family MS. CRUMP: 20 being murdered years ago, and that the person 21 was in prison now, and they're -- they --22 something about that they are trying this 23 person; that they figured out that this was

1	the person that supposedly did it.
2	THE COURT: So you pretty much know what
3	I told you in court when I read the
4	indictment?
5	MS. CRUMP: Right. Yeah.
6	THE COURT: That they're charging that
7	this occurred in '74; that these three people
8	were killed and all of that.
9	MS. CRUMP: Right.
10	THE COURT: You also said you heard
11	something about this person being in prison?
12	MS. CRUMP: That's what I think I heard.
13	I can't even remember. I just knew I heard
14	about it once it was brought up in court
15	today. That's about it.
16	THE COURT: So do you think any of that
17	would affect your ability to try this case
18	fairly and impartially?
19	MS. CRUMP: No.
20	THE COURT: Do you think you can set all
21	that aside? That doesn't count, you know.
22	MS. CRUMP: Right. I know.
23	THE COURT: You can't think that, use

4	
1	that, even imagine that. So just what you
2	hear in the courtroom.
3	MS. CRUMP: Right. I understand.
4	<b>THE COURT:</b> And okay. Thank you.
5	MS. CRUMP: Okay.
6	THE COURT: Okay. I need Ms. Willison.
7	She's No. 7.
8	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 4,
9	Florida Crump, left the chambers of the Court
10	and Prospective Juror No. 7, Josephine
11	Willison, entered.)
12	THE COURT: Hi.
13	MS. WILLISON: Hi.
14	THE COURT: So you're Ms. Josephine
15	Willison?
16	MS. WILLISON: That's it, yes.
17	THE COURT: Nice sweater.
18	MS. WILLISON: Thank you.
19	THE COURT: Nice and seasonal. We're
20	here in my office just to ask you what it is
21	that you know about this case from outside
22	sources. You indicated that you knew
23	something from the media?

MS. WILLISON: Yeah. Just the newspaper 1 2 readings. 3 **THE COURT:** What do you know? MS. WILLISON: Well, the -- went to get 4 5 the newspaper this morning, and it was right 6 on the front page right there. So I just 7 read the accounts of what had supposedly 8 transpired. You know, dates and the other 9 people that could have been -- well, that 10 were --11 That there were other THE COURT: 12 suspects? 13 MS. WILLISON: Yeah. There were other 14 suspects, and there were a lot of them, you 15 know, but they just couldn't nail it down to 16 one. 17 THE COURT: Okay. So do you know 18 anything about this defendant? Do you 19 remember hearing anything about him or 20 reading anything about him? 21 MS. WILLISON: No, nothing, other --22 THE COURT: Other than what he's charged 23 with in this?

1 MS. WILLISON: Other than what you read 2 in the newspaper. THE COURT: So is there -- I mean, it's 3 4 a lot to ask of people to ignore what you've 5 already heard and just decide the case based 6 upon the evidence. Put all that Vindicator 7 and Lauren Lindvig stuff aside. 8 MS. WILLISON: Yeah. 9 THE COURT: Do you think you can do 10 that? 11 MS. WILLISON: Which a lot of times you 12 have to and make a judgment on your own, you 13 know, from things that -- because there's a 14 lot of things that -- information that's 15 given, but you have to decide. 16 That's not so good. THE COURT: 17 MS. WILLISON: Yeah. Uh-huh. Exactly. 18 THE COURT: So you're satisfied you can 19 do that? Forget about all that other stuff, 20 not use it at all? You can't test the 21 evidence against that stuff. You've got to 22 just test the evidence against the law. 23 MS. WILLISON: What you hear here.

1	THE COURT: Are you okay with that?
2	MS. WILLISON: Yeah. Yes.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
4	MS. WILLISON: Am I dismissed?
5	THE COURT: Yes, you are. Sorry. Next,
6	Ms. Sotlar, Juror No. 8.
7	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 7,
8	Josephine Willison, left the chambers of the
9	Court and Prospective Juror No. 8, Angela
10	Sotlar, entered.)
11	THE COURT: So you're Ms. Sotlar?
12	MS. SOTLAR: I am.
13	THE COURT: We asked that you come back
14	here and talk to us about what you may know
15	about this case from outside sources. Can
16	you tell me what it is that you know?
17	MS. SOTLAR: I just read about it in the
18	Vindicator, that's all.
19	THE COURT: Yeah? Well, what do you
20	know from the Vindicator?
21	MS. SOTLAR: That it happened in the
22	'70s, and
23	THE COURT: I told you that this morning

1	in court, too, huh?
2	MS. SOTLAR: Nothing really, to be
3	honest with you, that I can remember.
4	THE COURT: You didn't read today's
5	article?
6	MS. SOTLAR: No.
7	THE COURT: You know you're not allowed
8	to read it now?
9	MS. SOTLAR: Okay. I didn't know that.
10	THE COURT: I'm going to tell you that
11	you can't read anything more about the case
12	while we're trying it.
13	MS. SOTLAR: Okay.
14	THE COURT: Is it fair to say that you
15	know something about this case, that it's
16	familiar to you about the media, but you
17	can't recall any details?
18	MS. SOTLAR: Correct.
19	THE COURT: So if during the course of
20	the trial some of these details will come
21	back to you, you know, I remember reading in
22	the paper, you know, you can't use that.
23	MS. SOTLAR: Correct.

1	THE COURT: You can't. It has nothing
2	to do with the evidence.
3	MS. SOTLAR: Okay.
4	THE COURT: Can you do that, just decide
5	the case on what you hear in here, wipe all
6	that other stuff out?
7	MS. SOTLAR: Yes.
8	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
9	MS. SOTLAR: I apologize for the
10	coughing.
11	THE COURT: It's okay. I doubt that you
12	can help that.
13	MS. SOTLAR: I can't.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bruno, No. 9.
15	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 8,
16	Angela Sotlar, left the chambers of Court,
17	and Prospective Juror No. 9, Nicholas Bruno,
18	entered.)
19	THE COURT: So you're Mr. Bruno?
20	MR. BRUNO: That's right.
21	THE COURT: All right. So we've asked
22	you to come back here so you can just tell us
23	what you know about this case from outside

\_ -

sources.

MR. BRUNO: I just saw it in passing on the TV news a couple times. I don't really remember too many details about it. I remember there was a boy left alive at the crime. That's really it. I don't really remember anything else.

THE COURT: What's the last time you read or heard something about it? Do you remember?

MR. BRUNO: A couple weeks, maybe a month ago.

THE COURT: Okay. So —— I mean, it may be that what you read and what's presented in the court appears to be the same thing. But it may be that what you read and what happens in the court is completely different. Do you understand that what you read doesn't mean squat, whether it's the same or it's different? You can't use any of that to decide the issues of this case. And it's kind of a mental gymnastics. You know, I tell you to forget about something that you

1 think you know. But you understand the 2 importance of a jury hearing the evidence and 3 deciding the case on the evidence, not on 4 some newspaper article? 5 Yes, I understand. MR. BRUNO: 6 THE COURT: Do you feel you have the 7 ability to do that? 8 MR. BRUNO: I do. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 10 MR. BRUNO: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Ms. Firmstone, No. 10. 12 (WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 9, 13 Nicholas Bruno, left the chambers of the 14 Court.) 15 **THE COURT:** I didn't ask that juror if 16 he knew Mr. Ferrara or knew about him, but it 17 appeared the guy didn't know much of 18 anything, just was reminded of the case when 19 he was called forward. I'll make sure I ask 20 this other one. 2.1 (WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 10, 22 Rena Firmstone, entered the chambers of the 23 Court.)

1	THE COURT: You're Rena Firmstone?
2	MS. FIRMSTONE: Yes.
3	THE COURT: So we've asked you back here
4	to tell us what it is that you know about
5	this case from outside sources.
6	MS. FIRMSTONE: I read articles that
7	have been in the Vindicator.
8	THE COURT: How about today's article?
9	MS. FIRMSTONE: Yes.
10	THE COURT: I need you to tell me what
11	it is you recall reading in the media.
12	MS. FIRMSTONE: There were deaths that
13	took place.
14	THE COURT: I told you that this
15	morning.
16	MS. FIRMSTONE: Of a woman. I don't
17	know if that was the wife. Small children.
18	And that's pretty much all I remember from
19	that.
20	THE COURT: Do you recall anything in
21	the media about this defendant in particular,
22	other than he's been charged with the
23	offenses?

1	MS. FIRMSTONE: No. Uh-uh.
2	THE COURT: So I asked you twice in the
3	courtroom, and I have to ask you again now,
4	is there do you understand the very solemn
5	importance of you deciding this case based on
6	the evidence, not on something else?
7	MS. FIRMSTONE: Yes.
8	THE COURT: Are you able to set aside
9	anything that you read in the paper just as
10	outside information that you can't consider
11	and decide the case based on what you hear in
12	the courtroom?
13	MS. FIRMSTONE: Yes.
14	THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you.
15	MS. FIRMSTONE: Okay. Thank you.
16	THE COURT: Kristie Ruble-Merlo, bring
17	her in, please.
18	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 10,
19	Rena Firmstone, entered the chambers of the
20	Court, and Prospective Juror No. 11, Kristie
21	Ruble, entered.)
22	THE COURT: Okay. So which is it?
23	MS. RUBLE: Ruble. Merlo could go.

1 THE COURT: Is that what you want -- how 2 you want me to refer to you as, Ms. Ruble? 3 MS. RUBLE: Yes, please. 4 THE COURT: I'm going to make a note of 5 that. 6 MR. MERANTO: Does that mean we were 7 right and the court was wrong, Your Honor? 8 THE COURT: No, it doesn't mean anything 9 like that. What it means is you got 10 something different than what I got. 11 MR. MERANTO: Okay. 12 THE COURT: So Ms. Ruble, we've asked 13 you to come back here because you indicated 14 that you knew something about the case from an outside source. And I don't like to even 15 16 say it that way, that you know something, 17 because you really don't. You just were 18 exposed to some publicity about the case; is 19 that right? Right. 20 MS. RUBLE: 21 THE COURT: What do you recall of the 22 publicity? What do you know from the 23 publicity?

MS. RUBLE: Just that there was three people involved, a family, and that the husband, a wife, and a little girl, and that the baby was left in the crib unharmed.

That's basically really all that I heard.

**THE COURT:** Did you read the article today?

MS. RUBLE: No.

THE COURT: Okay. See, what the Vindicator does when they write an article, they write an article in 1974, and they've been writing the same article ever since. They have no original thought. If you ever read Bertram de Souza, you'd -- you don't read that, do you?

MS. RUBLE: No.

THE COURT: God bless you. I have to because of my job, but they never write anything new. It's always regurgitation of the same thing. Anyhow, in this reading that you've done or this exposure to publicity, did you learn anything about this defendant?

MS. RUBLE: No.

1 THE COURT: Okay. And you understand 2 how inappropriate it is to decide the case 3 based on the newspaper? 4 MS. RUBLE: Yes. 5 **THE COURT:** Or based on some newspaper's 6 opinion of what you should do. See, I 7 wouldn't have a job if I just did what the 8 Vindicator told me to do, because there's 9 nothing just or proper in that. You know, 10 they're -- they just have an opinion. 11 MS. RUBLE: Yes. 12 **THE COURT:** So the evidence in the case 13 is going to be presented to you in the 14 courtroom, and that's how you have to decide 15 the case. Do you trust your ability to set 16 all that other information aside and decide the case based on the evidence from the 17 18 courtroom and apply the law that I give you 19 to decide? 20 MS. RUBLE: Yes, I do. 21 THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you 22 very much. 23 MS. RUBLE: Thank you.

(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 11, Kristie Ruble, left the chambers of the Court.)

THE COURT: Okay. So I've questioned all nine of those persons. Does the state wish to address the court concerning that inquiry during the court's -- still during the court's voir dire?

MS. DOHERTY: No, Your Honor.

**THE COURT:** And how about the defense?

MR. MERANTO: I think Ms. Weibling still has reservation, Your Honor, but I'm satisfied, so I'm going to make that call and say I think we're good, Judge, but I think it was important that we did that, all kidding aside, and I appreciate the court's indulgence. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. So when we -we're going to turn this over to the state
very shortly, and when you're done, the
defense will go, and then we'll probably
discuss how we're going to do this with
peremptories and satisfying this issue with

people who come forward. It's probably one of the first things I ask someone who comes forward. And if they're so exposed to publicity, then we'll bring them back here and ask them that right away before we go on with them.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, when we started before you talked to Juror No. 12

Ms. Schneider, and said that she had asked Ryan a question.

MR. MERANTO: Yeah. I missed that, too.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: I didn't understand what that was about.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I thought I put that on the record and made it clear, but thank you if I didn't. She asked Ryan why I didn't ask her if she could be fair and impartial.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: And I said because she didn't -- I told Ryan because she didn't raise her hand. But Ryan said -- Ryan's response to her -- and please understand,

1 when a juror asks a question of my bailiff, 2 he's instructed not to answer them, but to 3 tell them that he'll report that to me and 4 seek an answer, which is what he did with 5 And then he told her that he would --6 after he talked with me that I would deal with that in the courtroom. And so she --7 8 that's what she said when she answered, she 9 figured it out that -- why I didn't ask her, 10 it's because she didn't raise her hand. 11 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okav. THE COURT: So that was it. 12 13 MS. CANTALAMESSA: We weren't sure if she said that she did raise her hand or 14 15 something like that. 16 THE COURT: Yeah. She did not raise her 17 At least in my interpretation when I 18 talked to her again in there, she confirmed 19 that she didn't raise her hand, and that's 20 why she understood I didn't ask her. 2.1 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you. 22 (WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel, 23 Defendant and court reporter returned to the

court, and the following proceedings were had back in the hearing of the prospective jurors:)

THE COURT: Okay. The court has already discussed most of the things I need to discuss with you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. As I indicated, the State of Ohio will have questions for you during voir dire, and the defense will have questions for you during voir dire. Their voir dire should be approximately a half an hour apiece, and we'll proceed from there. So the State of Ohio is called upon now to proceed.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your
Honor. Good morning, everyone. As the judge
said before and introduced me, my name's Dawn
Cantalamessa, and I'm sitting with Becky
Doherty. We're assistant prosecutors here in
Mahoning County. She's the chief of the
criminal division, and I'm chief trial
counsel in the criminal division. So we get
to go around to different courtrooms and try
a multitude of cases or a variety of cases in

all the different courtrooms. So we get more experience being in front of all the different judges.

I've been with our prosecutor's office for over 10 years now, and before that I was prosecuting in Florida in Seminole County, but all my family is from here, and my husband's family, so, you know, you always want to move back where there's family, and plus the great weather we're having. You do miss the seasons when you're in Florida, that's for sure.

I have two little kids. I have a five and a six-year-old, so I can understand some people who are trying to get ready in the morning and get all your stuff together and worried about what's going to happen at night. But what we ask and what the court asks as well is that you pay attention to the evidence as it's going on during the day and try to set aside anything that's going on in your life and set that aside and just pay attention and keep track of everything that's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

going on in the courtroom as it's going on.

Can everyone promise to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: (Indicating.)

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Ms. Doherty's been here since '09, and before -- we kind of stole her from the Summit County Prosecutor's office, so she's been prosecuting many years. We won't say how many. And then Detective Mondora's also sitting here. He did not originally investigate this case. The case was originally investigated in 1974, as you heard from the indictment, and none of us were really around then. But we will talk about the evidence, and anybody that we bring in or hopefully some of them, at least some of them, will be from the scene from 1974. There's not a lot of people left. But you might hear some names of people who have passed on, that kind of thing.

Now, the judge read you the indictment and has told you that an indictment is simply just a piece of paper informing the defendant of what he's been charged. Has anyone ever

gotten a speeding ticket?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: (Indicating.)

MS. CANTALAMESSA: I hope I'm not the only one. Just like that speeding ticket informs you of what you have to do in response to that, an indictment simply informs the defendant of what he has to do, where he has to go to respond to those charges. It simply informs him of the charges and the elements of those charges.

In Ohio every criminal offense is made up of elements, just like ingredients to cookies. So for example, everything that happened in Mahoning County, we have to prove happened in Mahoning County. Otherwise we shouldn't be here; right? So it might seem odd during the course of the testimony, but there will be a question here and there about, excuse me, Mr. Witness, is that location, or did this happen in Mahoning County, Ohio? Okay? And that's because we have to meet each and every one of our elements in order to find someone guilty.

Does everyone understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

(Indicating.)

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Has anyone ever made chocolate chip cookies? Mrs. Catanzarite, you've made chocolate chip cookies, right, before we had all the stuff you just plop on from the refrigerated dough? Just like those ingredients make up chocolate chip cookies when you read them on the back of the Toll House package or whatever, just like those ingredients make up chocolate chip cookies, elements make up each offense. So if we weren't to put in chocolate chips into those chocolate chip cookies, Mrs. Sotlar, would those be chocolate chip cookies if we didn't add chocolate chips?

MS. SOTLAR: No.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right. So we have to add each and every element — we have to prove each and every element of that offense beyond a reasonable doubt. Does everyone understand that?

**PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Has anyone ever heard the phrase innocent until proven guilty? We watch enough TV; right? Can everyone promise to follow that presumption, that the defendant is presumed innocent until the state proves his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt? Can everyone promise that?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Is anyone sitting there now because of the nature of these charges and knowing that an indictment's been filed, think that the defendant's automatically guilty now? Anyone?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: No.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: That's all we ask, too, because we want -- we want the burden of proof -- as the State of Ohio, we want the burden of proof to prove each and every element beyond a reasonable doubt of each and every offense. The defendant has no burden whatsoever. The defendant only has rights, and we'll talk about that in a minute.

Our burden of proof is beyond a

1 reasonable doubt. Has anyone ever heard that 2 before? They talk about that on TV; right? 3 Sometimes they say beyond a shadow of a 4 doubt, beyond all doubt. The burden of proof 5 is beyond a reasonable doubt; okay? 6 definition that means not 100 percent, 7 because none of us were there at the time. 8 Unless we have a video of it or were present 9 as it's happening, we can't prove something 10 happened 100 percent. Is everyone 11 comfortable with that? 12 PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes. 13 MS. CANTALAMESSA: This is the same 14 burden we have in every criminal case. It's 15 beyond a reasonable doubt, not beyond all 16 doubt. Everyone's okay with that? 17 PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes. 18 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Mrs. Willison? 19 MS. WILLISON: Yes. 20 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Did you see the pen I 2.1 was holding? 22 MS. WILLISON: Yes, I saw it. 23 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. You saw the

1	pen. Where is that pen now? Do you know?
2	MS. WILLISON: On the podium.
3	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Let me tell you right
4	now just to help along with the little
5	example I have, the pen's on the floor; okay?
6	Let's say that you have to prove that I
7	dropped that pen on the floor to someone out
8	in the hallway, and they weren't in here when
9	I did it. Do you think you could do that, to
10	prove that pen's on the floor?
11	MS. WILLISON: I heard a click, and I
12	thought it clicked on the podium.
13	MS. CANTALAMESSA: That's okay. Do you
14	think you could prove that I dropped it on
15	the floor to someone out in the hallway?
16	MS. WILLISON: I don't think so.
17	MS. CANTALAMESSA: What if I told you
18	you're allowed to call witnesses? You can
19	call witnesses who saw me drop the pen.
20	Mrs. Schneider, did you see me drop that pen?
21	MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
22	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Now, let's say you
23	can call Mrs. Schneider and Mr. Frankford.

Ι

That

New terms.

1

Mr. Frankford, did you see me drop that pen?

2

MR. FRANKFORD: I saw you throw it.

Good.

3

4 like that. Let's say, Mrs. Willison, you can

MS. CANTALAMESSA:

5 go out in the hallway with your two witnesses

6

and prove to somebody out in the hallway that

7

I dropped or threw my pen on the floor. Do

8

you think you can do that now?

9

MS. WILLISON: Yes.

10

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. That's exactly

11

what we're going to do here in this trial.

12

We're going to call witnesses. We're going

13

to ask that you sit and pay attention to

14

those witnesses, you listen to those

15

witnesses, you judge the credibility of those

16

witnesses and decide what happened. Let's

17

say, Mrs. Willison, you go out in the

18

hallway, and Mrs. Sotlar comes with you;

19

okay? And you're trying to prove to someone

20

out in the hallway that I dropped or I threw

21

my pen on the floor. That pen's on the

22

floor. And someone says to you two, I don't

That pen could be anywhere.

23

think so.

1 pen could've been sucked up by aliens that 2 were flying over the Earth at the time. 3 you think that's reasonable that someone 4 would say that? 5 MS. WILLISON: No. 6 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Mrs. Sotlar? MS. SOTLAR: No. 7 MS. CANTALAMESSA: That's not 8 9 reasonable, is it? Do you think that's 10 reasonable, Mrs. Willison? 11 MS. WILLISON: No. 12 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Proof beyond a 13 reasonable doubt is not proof beyond all 14 doubt or imaginary doubt or beyond an unreasonable doubt; okay? It's proof beyond 15 16 a reasonable doubt. So we're going to ask 17 you to use your reason and your common sense. 18 Does everyone think they could do that? 19 PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes. 20 MS. CANTALAMESSA: We're going to ask 2.1 you to test the evidence by asking yourself, 22 is that logical? Does that make sense? Is 23 that person credible? Does everyone think

they could do that?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Let's say you have —
you're going to prove that I dropped my pen
on the floor, okay, Mrs. Willison? And I'll
get other people involved so you don't feel
like you're being picked on. Let's ask
Mrs. Crump. Do you think that if I called
everybody, or if Mrs. Willison called
everybody to prove that I dropped the pen on
the floor, that everybody would testify in
the exact same way?

MS. CRUMP: No.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Why not?

**MS. CRUMP:** Because everybody has a different perspective.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right. Do you think they're lying because they have a different perspective or they use different words like Mr. Frankford said throw and Ms. Schneider, we agreed that was dropped? Do you think that they're lying because it's different?

MS. CRUMP: No.

1 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think human 2 inconsistencies are very natural? 3 MS. CRUMP: Yes. 4 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Let's say it's a year 5 from now. Do you think everybody would 6 testify in the exact same manner again? 7 MS. CRUMP: No. 8 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Would it be even more 9 different, maybe a wider range of how they 10 would differ? MS. CRUMP: I don't know if it would be 11 12 wider, but it would be different. 13 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Let's say it's 14 39 years from now. Do you think there would 15 be more sway in perspective as to how 16 everyone testifies? 17 MS. CRUMP: I don't know. 18 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Do you think 19 you can keep an open mind and listen to 20 everyone's testimony and decide whether it's 2.1 a slight inconsistency, a big inconsistency, 22 whether they're credible, whether they're 23 telling the truth or whether they're telling

what they remember specifically from the case? Can everyone do that? Can everyone keep an open mind?

### **PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Now, when we have to prove something beyond a reasonable doubt, the law says it's proof beyond a reasonable doubt, proof of such evidence that you're firmly convinced of the truth of the charge. It means not 100 percent. Is everyone still comfortable with that? We don't have to prove anything beyond all doubt, because none of us were there. Is everyone okay with that?

## PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Now, I also talked about it's our burden, and I talked about that the defendant has only rights. We have the burden of proof. We have to prove each and every element of every offense charged beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant has only rights. Has anyone ever heard on TV you have the right to remain silent, that kind of

2.1

thing, when they're reading someone their rights on those cop shows? That carries forward throughout the entire trial. A defendant has no burden to prove anything. Okay? He has only rights. He has the right to testify or not to testify. The defense doesn't have to do anything. Is everyone comfortable with that?

# PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: You know, a lot of times we hear, I want to hear both sides to every story. You're not necessarily going to hear that in the courtroom. Is everyone okay with that?

#### **PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Now, like I said, the defense has rights. He has a right to testify or not testify. He has a right to all of our evidence. He has the right to subpoena witnesses, if he chooses. And he has the right to a jury trial. It's the same rights we all enjoy as U.S. citizens. Does everyone understand that? I can go up to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Mr. Martino right here, and I'm so frustrated, and I punch him in the face, in front of everyone in this room. And I'm sure he would go sign a complaint against me. I could go to my arraignment, plead not guilty, and demand my jury trial, even with all these witnesses. Does everyone understand that?

**PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: The state still has to prove my guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Now, we are going -- we're going to hope to show you the who, the what, the where, the how, the when, but we don't necessarily know The law says proof of motive is not the why. required. We don't have to prove what the defendant's motive was. We don't necessarily know why anyone commits certain crimes that they commit. Does everyone understand that? And you hear from TV -- does anyone hear from TV they don't have the motive to do that, or they have the motive to do that? Is everyone comfortable with the fact that we don't have to prove motive? Is everyone okay with that?

# **PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Now, from the evidence you might have theories, but it's nothing that we have to prove. It's not included in any of the elements of the crime. Is that okay?

**PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

would have to sit and listen to the evidence and judge the credibility of the witnesses; okay? You have to decide who's telling the truth, who's not telling the truth, if they're telling the whole truth, some of the truth, not any truth. It's up to you as each individual juror. Does everyone think they could do that? Mrs. Catanzarite, you have the three kids, which is perfect, and they're all two years apart. So it's perfect with my example. Have you ever had to decide between your three kids who was telling the truth and who wasn't telling the truth?

MS. CATANZARITE: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. What kind of

1	things do you use in your everyday life in
2	order to do that?
3	MS. CATANZARITE: It depends on the
4	situation.
5	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay.
6	MS. CATANZARITE: It depends on what I
7	see, what I hear. And the look of mom
8	whenever look them in the eyes and
9	convince them that I know, even though I may
10	not know. And then they tell me.
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: So you're definitely
12	using their body language; right?
13	MS. CATANZARITE: Yes.
14	MS. CANTALAMESSA: You're using what's
15	logical, what makes sense from the evidence
16	you see; right?
17	MS. CATANZARITE: (Nods head.)
18	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think you
19	would use those same tools when judging the
20	credibility of the witnesses on the witness
21	stand?
22	MS. CATANZARITE: Similarly.
23	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. And you're a

teacher, too; right?

MS. CATANZARITE: I am.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: So you probably use those same tools when you're at school.

You're looking for what makes sense. We want you to use your reason and your common sense.

We want you to look at the witnesses when they testify. Look at their body language.

See if they have any bias. See if those witnesses had the chance to observe what it is they are testifying about. Can everyone do that?

### PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can everyone promise, along with that credibility of the witnesses, judging their credibility, that they will start every witness, no matter what they do, whether they're police officers or doctors or scientists, can they start everyone off on an equal level? Can everyone promise to do that?

**PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Is anyone going to

2.1

give police officers more credibility just because they're police officer? No one? What about doctors? Is anyone going to give doctors more credibility? What about less credibility? Is anyone going to give them less credibility just because of who they are?

### PROSPECTIVE JURORS: No.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: That's all we ask. We ask you to keep an open mind throughout the entirety of the case, not to render a decision or a verdict until you've heard all the evidence and to use your reason and your common sense. Can everyone promise to do that?

#### **PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can everyone promise — even if you don't like a witness, say you're a Steelers fan, and they come in with a Browns shirt on, and you're like, oh, I don't want to listen to this person. Can everyone promise to keep an open mind, at least listen to that witness and judge their

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

1112

13

\_ -

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

credibility, test their evidence with the same tools you would test any other witness?

Can everyone promise to do that, even if you don't like the witness?

**PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: There's going to be times as jurors because you are the fact finders. You're going to listen to the You're going to determine what evidence. happened. You're going to determine what the There's going to be times like we facts are. talked about that some people are going to conflict. You might see it as a slight inconsistency. Someone else might see it as not an inconsistency at all. You as individual jurors need to determine what's important and what's not so important. Let's say I made -- or it's been voted into the legislature that eating a BLT in Mahoning County, Ohio is illegal; okay? Not only are we not going to be able to smoke in public, but we're not allowed to eat BLTs. charge Mr. Martino -- he charged me with

\_ -

assault, so I'm going to charge him with eating a BLT. And I'm going to bring three witnesses.

Now, what happens in the trial is the judge will give you the elements of the crime before the evidence. He's going to tell you that the state has to prove that Mr. Martino had bacon, lettuce, and tomato before he can be found guilty of eating a BLT. Does everyone understand that? So the judge will read to you the elements before, like he does here, and then I present my evidence.

I call my first witness, and they say, I saw Mr. Martino eating a BLT sandwich, and he was at the old B Dub's, and he had three strips of hickory smoked bacon and two slices of beefsteak tomato, Boston bib lettuce, and he had that with french fries and a Diet Coke. And I thank that witness.

And I bring the next witness, and they say, I saw Mr. Martino eating a BLT, and it had three strips of what I thought was real crispy bacon or peppered bacon, and it had

some red tomato, some lettuce. Could've been romaine lettuce. And he had that with some kind of soda and some pretzels. And I thank that witness.

The third witness comes on and says, I saw Mr. Martino eating a BLT sandwich. It had four strips of bacon, and I could smell it from across the room, and two slices of the most ripe tomatoes I've ever seen, and some lettuce on there. There was definitely green lettuce, very green lettuce. And he had that with french fries, and I think an iced tea. So I thank that witness.

The judge reads you the elements again, and says, the state has proved Mr. Martino has eaten a BLT if they've proven bacon, lettuce, and tomato.

Mr. Dray, did you hear evidence of bacon?

MR. DRAY: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Did you hear evidence of lettuce?

MR. DRAY: Yes.

1 MS. CANTALAMESSA: And did you hear 2 evidence of tomato? 3 MR. DRAY: Yes. 4 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Did you hear some 5 conflicts in their testimony? 6 MR. DRAY: Yes. 7 MS. CANTALAMESSA: You as an individual 8 juror need to resolve whether those conflicts 9 go to an important detail or a not so 10 important detail. Do you think you can do 11 that? 12 MR. DRAY: Yes. 13 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think 14 Mr. Martino ate a BLT? 15 MR. DRAY: Yes. 16 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Guilty. 17 watched the -- at least before I had kids, I 18 used to watch the Food Network a lot. 19 it's more cartoons and Disney channel. But a 20 lot of my examples have to do with food. 2.1 hope to make you really hungry before lunch, 22 and then the restaurants downtown here should 23 make some money.

Now, the law does not require that we present anymore evidence than one witness. There's not a number of witnesses that the law requires. Does anyone think it takes more than one witness to testify about the facts before you can find someone guilty of something, if you believe that witness beyond a reasonable doubt? Does anyone think it takes more than one? Anyone?

Want an example? Mrs. Firmstone -- Ms. Firmstone, where did you park today?

MS. FIRMSTONE: In the parking lot the street over from the courthouse.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Was there an attendant there?

MS. FIRMSTONE: No.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Let's pretend there was. It makes it easier for my example. I play with the examples a little bit. Let's say you get excused today, and as you're walking back to your car, you pull out your keys, and you're carrying your purse. The attendant starts to approach you, and you're

like, oh, my goodness, what happened? Did I not pay enough money? Did something happen to my car while I was gone? As the attendant approaches you he pulls out a gun and robs you of your keys and your purse.

You're the only one around. You're the only witness. You immediately go over to the Youngstown Police Department and report that person, and they find that person. Do you think that person should be found not guilty because you were the only witness to that? You would want a jury to believe you; right?

MS. FIRMSTONE: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: In the law we try to stress quality over quantity. There will be no instruction that's read by the judge that says unless the state's shown by two witnesses, you have to find someone not guilty. There's nothing like that. If a jury were to listen to your statement and believe what you had to say beyond a reasonable doubt, they could find someone guilty of that. Does everyone understand

that?

**PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Mr. Frankford, you have two kids; right?

MR. FRANKFORD: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: I don't want to pick on Ms. Catanzarite the whole time. Let's say -- do your kids like chocolate cake?

MR. FRANKFORD: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Most kids do; right?

Let's say it's the middle of the summer, and you decide you're going to make a delicious dinner for the kids and your wife. And it's a special occasion, and you've gone all out.

I don't know if you like the grill or whatever, but you decide you're going to make a chocolate cake as well.

You get out the recipe book, and it just ends up being beautiful. It's a beautiful chocolate cake with chocolate icing, and you found a beautiful cake plate to display it on. And you make that, because you always make dessert first, and then you move on to

what you're going to make for dinner. Set that aside and say nobody's to touch this chocolate cake. It's for after dinner; right?

So you move on to your meal, and you're starting to make that. You discover you've forgotten an ingredient, and you tell your kids, don't touch the cake. I'm going to run to the store. I'll be back in five minutes flat. Nobody touch that. Your wife's not home, but it's okay. You're back in four and a half minutes.

When you get back, a slice of cake is cut out of that delicious, beautiful chocolate cake. There's a dirty plate, fork, and knife in the sink. And your kids are sitting at the kitchen table, angelically, trying to find homework to do in the summer. So you ask the kids — oh, and the little one still has chocolate icing all around their face, but I think it's because the older ones are smart enough to wipe it off.

But anyway, you ask the kids, who ate

this cake? They say, the dog ate it. So you ask the older one, who ate this cake? And she said, the dog ate it. Do you know what happened to that cake?

MR. FRANKFORD: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Did you need to have seen them eat the cake in order to know what happened to it?

MR. FRANKFORD: No.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: No. That's what's called circumstantial evidence; okay? The law says circumstantial evidence and direct evidence are of equal weight; okay? And circumstantial evidence is evidence that you can infer from that direct evidence. It's facts and circumstances that you can infer from what's presented. Can everyone agree with that, that direct and circumstantial are of equal weight? And circumstantial can be just as heavy. Do you believe that to be true, Mrs. Romesburg?

MS. ROMESBURG: Sounds like it's true.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yeah. And you've

1 heard that on TV, too; right? Everybody's 2 like, oh, that's just circumstantial. 3 the law says that circumstantial and direct 4 are of equal weight. Are you all okay with 5 that? PROSPECTIVE JURORS: 6 Yes. 7 THE COURT: You have about 10 minutes. 8 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Thank you, 9 Judge. I'm almost done anyway. Does anyone 10 have any religious, moral, or ethical reasons 11 why they cannot sit in judgment of someone 12 else? Mrs. Romesburg, you had -- your 13 sister's home was robbed. Was that just this 14 past month? 15 MS. ROMESBURG: October. 16 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Did they find anybody 17 that did that? 18 MS. ROMESBURG: No. 19 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Are they still 20 searching? Is it still an open case? 21 MS. ROMESBURG: It's still open. 22 MS. CANTALAMESSA: What agency 23 investigated that?

1 MS. ROMESBURG: Coitsville Township. 2 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Do you know 3 whether or not they had the crime scene out 4 there, the crime lab out there? 5 MS. ROMESBURG: Yes. 6 MS. CANTALAMESSA: And do you -- because 7 they haven't found anyone yet, do you hold 8 anything against the police or against the 9 justice system because of that? 10 MS. ROMESBURG: No. 11 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. And that's 12 what I'm going to ask. I'm going to go 13 around and -- some people have mentioned a 14 few cases that they've had in their past. 15 just want to make sure everyone can set aside 16 any kind of bias you might have for or 17 against somebody, set that aside. And we 18 want everybody to have an open mind and 19 everyone to start off on an equal level. 20 everyone do that? 21 PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes. 22 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Is there any reason, 23 Ms. Romesburg, that you couldn't be fair and

1	impartial in this case?
2	MS. ROMESBURG: No.
3	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And Mrs. Crump, your
4	husband works for the Sheriff's Department?
5	MS. CRUMP: Yes.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: He works in the jail;
7	right?
8	MS. CRUMP: Yes.
9	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Anything about
10	your relationship with your husband that
11	would cause you any concern or think that you
12	would side with either the state or the
13	defense, anything like that?
14	MS. CRUMP: No.
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Could you set that
16	all aside and be fair and impartial and
17	render your decision based solely on the
18	evidence?
19	MS. CRUMP: Yes.
20	MS. CANTALAMESSA: You also had some
21	cousins that were victims. One cousin or
22	more than one?
23	MS. CRUMP: Two.

1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Anything about
2	that cause you any concern that you feel you
3	would you couldn't set that aside in
4	rendering a verdict in this case?
5	MS. CRUMP: No.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Were people
7	arrested in those situations?
8	MS. CRUMP: Yes.
9	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And were you involved
10	in the trial or anything like that? Was
11	there a trial?
12	MS. CRUMP: Yes.
13	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. And how long
14	ago was that?
15	MS. CRUMP: It's been a while. It's
16	been a while. I can't even tell you.
17	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you remember what
18	agency or when that happened?
19	MS. CRUMP: Youngstown.
20	MS. CANTALAMESSA: This obviously is not
21	a Youngstown case. It happened in Canfield
22	Township. So we have the Sheriff's
23	Department. There might be mention of people

1 from Youngstown coming in and delivering 2 evidence, that kind of thing. Anything to 3 cause you concern about that? Same question. 4 Can you be fair and impartial? 5 Yes. MS. CRUMP: MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. And Mr. Dray, 6 same kind of question. You had a situation 7 8 with your wife. Is that while you were 9 married? 10 MR. DRAY: No. Before I was married to 11 her. 12 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Before you 13 were married. And were you involved? 14 MR. DRAY: No. 15 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Anything regarding 16 that situation that would cause you to either 17 side with the state or side with the defense 18 because of that? 19 MR. DRAY: No. MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think you 20 21 could set anything you remember or anything 22 your wife kind of told you about this case, 23 set that aside?

1	MR. DRAY: Yes.
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And Mrs. Ruble, you
3	talked about a situation in your
4	questionnaire as well.
5	MS. RUBLE: Yes.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Was that was your
7	situation investigated by the police?
8	MS. RUBLE: Yes.
9	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And which agency was
LO	that?
L1	MS. RUBLE: Boardman.
L2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Boardman. Was
L3	anything was anyone ever charged?
L4	MS. RUBLE: It was all civil.
L5	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Anything about
L6	that, would that cause you to side with
L7	either the state or the defense in this case?
L8	MS. RUBLE: No.
L9	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think you can
20	set aside anything that happened in that
21	considering it's totally different, do you
22	think you can set that aside or listen to the
23	facts in evidence in this case?

1	MS. RUBLE: Yes.
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And Mrs. Schneider,
3	you were on a jury before?
4	MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
5	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Was it criminal,
6	civil?
7	MS. SCHNEIDER: It was civil.
8	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And that case and
9	that was about 10 years ago?
10	MS. SCHNEIDER: It's been a while.
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Was it here in
12	Mahoning County?
13	MS. SCHNEIDER: No. I was in Warren.
14	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And I'm sure during
15	that case you heard about a different burden
16	of proof than our beyond a reasonable doubt;
17	is that right?
18	MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
19	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think you can
20	set aside anything you remember about the
21	jury instructions, the law, everything like
22	that? Can you set that aside and base your
23	decision on the law as this judge gives it to

you?

\_

MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Does anyone,

because -- and I think it's better maybe just to ask the whole group. Anything that mentioned either a car being stolen or a house break-in or anything like that, anyone who has a prior case like that think that they wouldn't be able to set that aside and would as they're sitting here right now either siding with the state or siding with the defense? Does anyone have that opinion?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: No.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Anyone who sat as a juror before, whether it was a felony or a misdemeanor or criminal, civil, think they couldn't set aside what they learned from their prior jury service and just listen to the law and the definitions as this judge gives it to you? No one? Okay.

Does anyone have any questions for me?

This is the only time we can really converse back and forth. After we're done with voir

1 dire, we kind of can say hi, good morning, 2 and stuff like that, but we're not allowed to 3 really talk to you. I think that's it, 4 Judge. I'm good. Thank you. 5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you 6 kindly. Mr. Meranto. 7 Thanks, Judge. Before we MR. MERANTO: 8 start, though, I didn't want to interrupt 9 Ms. Cantalamessa, but I heard Mr. Dray 10 talking, and that stalking case involving 11 your wife, that was you that stalked her? 12 And then you married her? 13 MR. DRAY: No. He's in prison. 14 MR. MERANTO: That's the power of an 15 accusation, Mr. Dray. I just wanted to --16 MR. DRAY: Oh, okay. 17 MR. MERANTO: Before you jumped across 18 and knocked me down there. I wish that bar 19 was here. That's why I --20 MR. DRAY: Okay. 21 MR. MERANTO: Good morning, ladies and 22 gentlemen. I'm Tony Meranto as I said 23 I didn't say it. The judge said it. before.

This is Ms. Weibling. And Mr. Ferrara over here we're representing. I'm not going to go through my little sordid past because I've been doing defense work pretty much a long time and I'm proud of that. We in the defense bar say we're the last thing between you and tyranny, so remember that when you think about the defense lawyers.

I did prosecute when I first started practice. I think I lasted seven months, and it wasn't good for me. It wasn't good for anybody. But I'm happy with what I'm doing now.

Appreciate your service, because as the judge stated, and I can't can emphasize it more, without people that are willing to come down here and participate — this is the most important thing in the world. Think about if someone you cared about or somebody you knew, just was an acquaintance, you would want them to have sincere, thoughtful people to pay attention to what's going on and make sure that they got a fair shake. By the way,

that's all we're looking for here.

The judge has asked you a number of times, Ms. Cantalamessa has asked you, nobody's in here that has any preconceived notions about this, which way to go with this case; is that true? Everybody?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: (Indicating.)

MR. MERANTO: And as we stand here right now, Mr. Ferrara is not guilty. Everybody's okay with that?

**PROSPECTIVE JURORS:** Yes.

MR. MERANTO: And we talked about this presumption of innocence. Really it's a presumption of not guilty; okay? So

Mr. Ross, since you recognized me without my black and white stripes from years ago, if I could talk to the judge and everybody else here into just being done with this right now, and we sent you back to the jury room right now and said you've got to give me a verdict right now, what would your verdict be?

MR. ROSS: Not guilty.

1 MR. MERANTO: Okay. Haven't heard 2 anything. Don't need to hear anything; 3 right? We talked about this indictment. The 4 judge told you it's a piece of paper. And I 5 believe Ms. Willison, you said you had a 6 speeding ticket. You raised your hand? 7 MS. WILLISON: Yes. Uh-huh. 8 Tell me about how that MR. MERANTO: 9 went with the speeding ticket. What happened 10 with the officer? MS. WILLISON: I was coming home from a 11 12 meeting in a hurry and was given a speeding 13 ticket. 14 MR. MERANTO: Did he have any dialogue 15 with you? Did he say, hey, explain to me --I said, well, you know, 16 MS. WILLISON: I'm supposed to be home at such and such a 17 18 time, and I wasn't, so I was in a hurry, and, 19 you know, he says, well, you know, this is 20 what the speed limit was, and I realized it. 21 I said, oh, I was going that fast? And it 22 was just that. 23 MR. MERANTO: And he gave you the

1	ticket, and did you pay it? Did you contest
2	it?
3	MS. WILLISON: No.
4	MR. MERANTO: Anybody ever have a ticket
5	that they contested, speeding ticket or
6	otherwise? No? Okay.
7	Ms. Schneider, you participated I think
8	in that example with regard to
9	Ms. Cantalamessa dropping her pen on the
10	ground; correct?
11	MS. SCHNEIDER: Correct.
12	MR. MERANTO: And I believe
13	Ms. Cantalamessa asked Ms. Willison, hey,
14	where's your pen? And she said, it's on the
15	podium. Well, we now know it was actually on
16	the floor.
17	MS. SCHNEIDER: Right.
18	MR. MERANTO: So reasonable minds can
19	differ with regard to those things.
20	Ms. Cantalamessa also used another
21	example. Ms. Firmstone, she said, well, if I
22	punched Mr. Martino right here, and you guys
23	all saw it, and I could still plead not

guilty. I want to talk a little bit about that with you.

Mr. Ferrara gets this piece of paper, this indictment, and all that's required of him is to come before the bar and say I'm not guilty. Those words. At that point, it's like a big, iron curtain drops down, and all those rights that Ms. Cantalamessa talked about kicked in; okay? Right to remain silent, right to a jury trial. That's why we're all here, all those things.

So I want to be clear about this because I think what she's saying is, well, everybody in this room saw her punch Mr. Martino. Why are we having a trial? You know, well, yeah, so the guy says not guilty, and now we have to go through this. Do you understand that every case is not that clear?

MS. FIRMSTONE: (Nods head.)

MR. MERANTO: Do you agree with that?

MS. RUBLE: Yes.

MR. MERANTO: Ms. Crump, do you agree

with that?

MS. CRUMP: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MR. MERANTO:

So the fact that there's

been a not quilty plea and we're having this

trial, that's not just a formality.

Mr. Bruno, do you understand that you're the

sole judge, collectively, if you're selected

to be on a jury, as to whether or not

Mr. Ferrara did it or not?

MR. BRUNO: Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. MERANTO: This was a terrible crime. Some of you said you heard about it. But the reason we're here is that the State of Ohio, they said Mr. Ferrara did it. Ms. Sotlar, do you understand that?

> MS. SOTLAR: (Nods head.)

MR. MERANTO: And I wanted to ask you a question because Ms. Cantalamessa was talking to you about her burden and the fact that the state, since they charged Mr. Ferrara, they have to prove Mr. Ferrara did it. They have to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt. And she was saying, you understand that we don't have to do anything? We don't have to put on

evidence. We don't have to say anything.

And you kind of had a puzzled look on your
face. So if I were to ask you to go back
right now into that jury room and give me a
verdict, what would your verdict be?

MS. SOTLAR: Not quilty.

MR. MERANTO: Okay. When that big curtain drops down, I love those old movies and everything they used to say, the defendant's cloaked in innocence. And that goes back to this presumption right here. Let's face it, Mr. Ferrara got indicted, Mr. Dray. He's here; right?

MR. DRAY: Right.

MR. MERANTO: We all know about the power of an accusation now and how that can be. Some people here were wondering. I mean, how many of you were wondering, what's with Mr. Dray, and did he actually do something? Is that true?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: (Indicating.)

MR. MERANTO: And I did that to you with that one little statement and without any

evidence or not one witness. So it's a big thing. You would agree with that?

MR. DRAY: I would agree.

MR. MERANTO: Can you tell me honestly that you believe as we're sitting here, because human nature might be, well, the guy got — he's got to be here for a reason. He must have done something. He got indicted. Can you tell me that you believe in your heart right now, because the judge has instructed you and we've told you that he's not guilty?

MR. DRAY: Yeah.

MR. MERANTO: And if you went back right now, you'd say, I didn't hear anything, he's not guilty?

MR. DRAY: That's correct.

MR. MERANTO: Now, Mr. Frankford, let's talk about this BLT sandwich and those three witnesses. Because I'll go with that food. I can't stand all the food talk, but we'll talk about it. If you — did you ever eat a BLT?

1	MR. FRANKFORD: Yes.
2	MR. MERANTO: Do you like it?
3	MR. FRANKFORD: Yes.
4	MR. MERANTO: Okay. Well, how do you
5	have your BLT?
6	MR. FRANKFORD: Bacon, lettuce, and
7	tomato, mayonnaise, white bread.
8	MR. MERANTO: Bacon, lettuce, tomato,
9	mayonnaise, white bread. So if I served you
10	a BLT and it didn't have any mayonnaise on
11	it, would you be less than happy with that
12	BLT?
13	MR. FRANKFORD: I'd eat it, especially
14	right now.
15	MR. MERANTO: You'd eat it. But you
16	prefer mayonnaise; right?
17	MR. FRANKFORD: Yes.
18	MR. MERANTO: But as far as the
19	definition goes, it had bacon, it had
20	lettuce, it had tomato, so
21	MR. FRANKFORD: It's a BLT.
22	MR. MERANTO: It's a BLT. Could you
23	live without the tomato?
	II

1	MR. FRANKFORD: I'm sorry?
2	MR. MERANTO: Could you live without the
3	tomato if I didn't have it?
4	MR. FRANKFORD: Yes.
5	MR. MERANTO: So you could live with
6	bacon, lettuce, mayonnaise; right?
7	MR. FRANKFORD: Right.
8	MR. MERANTO: But would that make the
9	definition of the BLT according to law?
10	MR. FRANKFORD: No, it would not.
11	MR. MERANTO: Certainly if there was no
12	bacon
13	MR. FRANKFORD: No.
14	MR. MERANTO: it's not a BLT at all.
15	I mean, that's whole you're not going
16	to you go to a restaurant and they go, we
17	have mayonnaise, lettuce, and tomato, but we
18	don't have any bacon.
19	MR. FRANKFORD: My wife would be fine
20	with that, but I wouldn't.
21	MR. MERANTO: You think you're going to
22	make another choice probably and move on?
23	Mr. Bruno, agree with that?

MR. BRUNO: I do.

MR. MERANTO: Now, Ms. Cantalamessa referred to bacon, lettuce, and tomato. It's an analogy to the elements of a crime. And there are certain elements that the state must prove. And they have to prove each and every one of them beyond a reasonable doubt. So Mr. Bruno, if you looked at the sandwich that was served to Mr. Frankford, and all you could see was the lettuce hanging off the —you know, they give you one of those big pieces of lettuce, could you say definitively that it was a BLT?

MR. BRUNO: No.

MR. MERANTO: Okay. Even though you heard Mr. Frankford order it, you might want to make that assumption, but if I said, hey, your life depends on it, is that a BLT?

MR. BRUNO: No.

MR. MERANTO: Okay. Now, there are going to be a number of elements that the state has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt in this case. And each element, unlike the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

sandwich scenario with Mr. Frankford, each and every element is equally important. For example, Ms. Sotlar.

MS. SOTLAR: Yes.

MR. MERANTO: If the state put on all of its evidence, and you said, man, wow, this is over -- I mean, please, I don't have any doubt. And you went back to the jury room, and you heard the other jurors talking, and they said, you know what, I know I -- I think this was somewhere out near Canfield, but did they ever say where this crime took place? And you go, well, no. Wait a minute. You didn't hear them say Mahoning County or Canfield. And you realize that you believe Mr. Ferrara did it. I mean, there's no doubt in your mind. But you absolutely found out they -- they never put on any evidence about where this took place. What would your verdict have to be?

MS. SOTLAR: Well, she said you had to have the what, where, when, why, so it would be not guilty.

1 MR. MERANTO: So even though you might 2 say, well, come on, we're all in Mahoning 3 County, the judge told us his jurisdiction's 4 based on the fact we're here in Mahoning 5 County, we know it was in Mahoning County. 6 Let's just -- let's -- I mean, that doesn't 7 make -- that's not the important thing here. 8 People died here. I believe Ferrara did it. 9 We gotta convict him. Ms. Ruble, what do you 10 think about that logic? MS. RUBLE: I don't know. He would be 11 12 not quilty. 13 MR. MERANTO: Ms. Firmstone? 14 MS. FIRMSTONE: Yes. Not guilty. 15 MR. MERANTO: You sure? 16 MS. FIRMSTONE: Yeah. You said they had 17 to have all the evidence. 18 MR. MERANTO: So one element, unlike the 19 sandwich thing, they're all of equal 20 importance. Let's talk about another thing. 21 Ms. Catanzarite, what if you say, well, there 22 was really a lot of bacon on that sandwich. 23 Tons of bacon. I saw lettuce peeking out

over the end of that roll, bread, whatever, but, man, I didn't -- I thought I saw something red. I don't know. I'm not too sure. It had to be the tomato because it was a BLT, so it was tomato.

And you say, well, you know what, God, the bacon was everywhere. It was falling off the sandwich. And I know there was lettuce, so they're pretty good on lettuce, too. But man, tomato, I think it was tomato, but — well, you know what, I'm gonna say it's a BLT because they were real strong on bacon, and I'm pretty strong on lettuce, so I'm gonna throw in tomato. I'm going to give them tomato. Can you do that with this case?

MS. CATANZARITE: No.

MR. MERANTO: Okay. So the state can be strong on one element, but if they don't have them all, like she said, you don't have chocolate chips, you got no chocolate chip cookies; right? Call them something else, Ms. Crump; right?

MS. CRUMP: Uh-huh.

1 MR. MERANTO: Not chocolate chips. 2 MS. CRUMP: Yes, sir. 3 MR. MERANTO: All right. Ms. Crump, 4 Ms. Cantalamessa asked you about the quality 5 of testimony and how different people might 6 describe things in a different way. And I 7 apologize. I had a little illness, and I get 8 a little dry. But I don't mean to be 9 disrespectful. How about after a year, you 10 might really expect them to -- the testimony 11 might have changed; right? You can 12 understand that? 13 MS. CRUMP: Yes, sir. 14 MR. MERANTO: And she said, well, how 15 about 39 years? Okay. Because the state 16 chose to bring this case because they chose 17 to bring it. They're the ones who gave 18 Mr. Ferrara the indictment; right? It wasn't 19 me, it wasn't you, was it? 20 MS. CRUMP: No. 21 MR. MERANTO: Okay. They're stuck with 22 whatever evidence they can produce and the 23 quality of it. So because it's 39 years

1 later, and for example, you may hear 2 something that just doesn't make sense to 3 you, would you be willing to write it off and 4 say, well, God, you can't expect them to 5 remember after 39 years? What do you think 6 about that? 7 That's a valid point. MS. CRUMP: It's 8 very human nature to forget things. I don't 9 know what to think about that. 10 MR. MERANTO: Well, are the charges 11 against Mr. Ferrara any less serious because 12 it's 39 years later? 13 MS. CRUMP: Oh, no. 14 MR. MERANTO: Is it fair then to 15 Mr. Ferrara to kind of want to give them a 16 break on how they present the testimony or 17 I mean, if that happens? whatever? 18 MS. CRUMP: No. MR. MERANTO: Okay. So we're square, 19 20 whether it happened yesterday, last year, or 39 years ago, their burden is exactly the 21 22 same? Ms. Romesburg? 23 MS. ROMESBURG: Yes.

1	MR. MERANTO: You with me? You agree
2	with that?
3	MS. ROMESBURG: I'm listening, yes.
4	MR. MERANTO: I know you're listening,
5	but I'm asking you if you agree with that.
6	MS. ROMESBURG: Yes.
7	MR. MERANTO: Is there anybody here that
8	thinks, man, it's unfair that the state has
9	got to try and prove this after 39 years?
10	You ought to be happy whatever evidence
11	they have, we should be happy with that.
12	Mr. Ross?
13	MR. ROSS: No. They would have to
14	MR. MERANTO: You're a teacher; right?
15	MR. ROSS: Right.
16	MR. MERANTO: I mean, certain things
17	just gotta be done; right? They gotta be
18	done. Details; right?
19	MR. ROSS: Yes.
20	MR. MERANTO: Okay. Certainly you could
21	understand that over a lapse of time some
22	testimony might differ; right?
23	MR. ROSS: Yes.

1 MR. MERANTO: But you still understand 2 that they still have to prove all the 3 elements beyond a reasonable doubt to you? 4 MR. ROSS: Yes. 5 MR. MERANTO: Mr. Bruno, Christmas is 6 coming. You ever shop at the Southern Park 7 Mall, out that area out on South? 8 MR. BRUNO: Yes. 9 MR. MERANTO: Have you ever been -- do 10 you drive? MR. BRUNO: I drive. 11 12 MR. MERANTO: Ever go out to the area of 13 South Avenue and 224 with a passenger in a 14 car? 15 MR. BRUNO: I have. 16 MR. MERANTO: Okay. Now, it's bad 17 enough during the rest of the year, but 18 Christmas time now is upon us. So you're at 19 that light, and you gotta make a left, and 20 they've done -- it's kind of confusing now 21 because they've changed the traffic patterns. 22 The lights aren't the same. So you're 23 sitting, and you're kind of in a hurry.

2.1

got a passenger there, and you're making a left-hand turn any which way onto South from 224, onto 224 from South. And it's busy. And you hear the passenger say, okay. You're okay my way. Go ahead and turn. Something like that ever happened to you? Maybe not at that intersection, but —

MR. BRUNO: Yes.

MR. MERANTO: Go ahead and turn. You take a look over, make sure, especially, by the way, if they're telling you to turn and it's going to be your door that's facing the oncoming traffic. Is that a reasonable doubt to have?

MR. BRUNO: Yes.

MR. MERANTO: And listen, that's not just any doubt, because she's right, you can always have some crazy or imaginary doubt about something. But a reasonable doubt is one based on your common sense and your reason, and pretty much to take that look, that's a reasonable doubt.

THE COURT: You have about 10 minutes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Judge. Now, we talked a little about -- I don't know if it was mentioned -- about how you're going to decide this, and that you're going to -- each one of those individual questions I asked you, you're going to make your own decision. But when you actually get the case -- and that's not until all the evidence is in, closing arguments, all that stuff the judge told you about. You're going to go in and collectively discuss it. Now, everybody's committed to me that if I sent -- is there anybody back here that if I sent you to the jury room right now would say anything other than not quilty? Mr. Frankford?

MR. FRANKFORD: Not guilty.

MR. MERANTO: All right. Ms. Willison, the state gets done with putting on their evidence and the judge sends you back there, and you say to yourself, I don't know. 50/50, but I think he did it. Based on the law, what is your verdict going to have to be at that point?

1 MS. WILLISON: If there's any doubt -- I 2 don't think you should have any doubt on what 3 you heard. 4 MR. MERANTO: Well, I told you -- I'm 5 getting inside your head for a minute here. 6 I say -- you go back, and you say, I think --7 I think he -- I think he probably did it. Is 8 that -- in your mind, would that be good 9 enough for you to say that's beyond a 10 reasonable doubt? 11 MS. WILLISON: No. 12 MR. MERANTO: Okay. So you understand there's a difference? 13 14 MS. WILLISON: Yes. MR. MERANTO: Okay. And that beyond a 15 16 reasonable doubt, it's a tough burden. 17 MS. WILLISON: Uh-huh. MR. MERANTO: It's not impossible. 18 Ιt 19 happens every day. But the state's gotta do 20 that. Ms. Sotlar, you're not going to hear 21 anything from Mr. Ferrara. Can you say to 22 yourself, well, the judge says I can't even 23 consider that, so I'm not going to consider

1	it? The state's gotta prove their case. I
2	mean, Mr. Ferrara did say something; right?
3	He said not guilty. And do you agree with me
4	that that's the same right you have or I have
5	or anybody has?
6	MS. SOTLAR: Yes.
7	MR. MERANTO: Do you think that's an
8	important thing?
9	MS. SOTLAR: Yes.
10	MR. MERANTO: Okay. So you're not going
11	to hold that against Mr. Ferrara because
12	you're not going to hear his side?
13	MS. SOTLAR: Right.
14	MR. MERANTO: Okay. Ms. Ruble, do you
15	think that's fair?
16	MS. RUBLE: No.
17	MR. MERANTO: Excuse me? I can't hear
18	you.
19	MS. RUBLE: No.
20	MR. MERANTO: You don't think that's
21	fair? You don't understand the question?
22	You can ask me. That's okay. I'm not trying
23	to trip anybody up here, seriously. I just

want to find out how you feel. Do you think it's fair that the law says Mr. Ferrara doesn't have to say anything, and he's not going to say anything, and you're not going to hear his side? The state has to prove — has to make its burden beyond a reasonable doubt.

MS. RUBLE: Yes.

MR. MERANTO: Are you okay with that?

MS. RUBLE: Yes.

MR. MERANTO: You're not going to hold it against Mr. Ferrara?

MS. RUBLE: No.

MR. MERANTO: Ms. Catanzarite, you have those three kids, and you want to find out what's going on with them. Let me ask you this; you come home, cake's gone, the little one's too dumb to wipe his face, right, and the other two — because he doesn't know any better. And the other two are sitting there, and they — all three of them, they even get the little three-year-old to say, I didn't do it. They don't say the dog ate it. They

say, what happened to the cake? I don't
know. And that's all they say.

Now, you've got three kids there. Let's make them all the same age for this story, because you're going to blame the two older ones before the three-year-old. But they're all the same. And one of them has got icing on his face. The other two got nothing. And all you got is I didn't do it. I don't know. I don't know what happened to the cake. What would you do there?

MS. CATANZARITE: I don't know. I'd probably enlist my husband to help me solve it.

MR. MERANTO: Oh. Well, if you get selected for this jury, it's on you. And would you be able to make the call based on the instruction the judge gives you, based on all the law we talked about? You could do that?

MS. CATANZARITE: I believe so.

MR. MERANTO: Okay. So it might be nice to think you know what happened, but unless

you actually know, then you don't know, do you? And ladies and gentlemen, if you don't know, Mr. Bruno, what is your verdict?

MR. BRUNO: Not guilty.

MR. MERANTO: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you. Anybody have any questions they want to ask me about anything? No?

Just a couple things I'm going to leave you with. When I first became a lawyer, I always -- I was so happy. I was working for some lawyers, and I'd dress up every day to go in before I even became a lawyer. And I always have one of these in my pocket. And one of the lawyers called me aside one day, and he said, you know, we don't wear that. We don't do that. And I go, you know, what do you mean? He said, well, you know, you don't want to be flashy like you're trying to say something; you know? You do your talking in court, and we just don't do that. And I looked around the office, and none of those guys did.

Now, what they didn't know is that my

dad was a salesman, and all week he wore, like, dark gray and black suits. It was in the '60s, '70s, '80s. And on the weekend when he went out with my mom he always would wear something colorful, and he always had one of these. And a lot of the ones I wear are his.

I had another lawyer tell me, don't ever pick a juror that's wearing red because they're over-confident. You shouldn't do it. My point is, we all have those things inside of us that nobody else knows about, and no one's telling you that you gotta leave those at the door when you walk in. You're going to use your reason, your common sense, your background to make those decisions just like I did, because as you notice, I'm still wearing these. You know, my father's probably watching somewhere, so don't hold anything against me.

Mr. Ferrara, you might notice him shaking over here. He's got Parkinson's.

That's just part of who he is. This is part

of who I am.

And I think Ms. Cantalamessa mentioned the fact that, you know, we're -- we get along pretty well. And if you see us joking or talking to each other, we can't talk to you anymore, please don't hold that against us. We take this as serious as anything we do, but you know, like they say, if you don't laugh sometimes you're gonna cry. So thank you once again for your time and attention.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Meranto. All right. On behalf of the state, does this panel pass for cause?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.

**THE COURT:** On behalf of the defense?

MR. MERANTO: Pass for cause, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So we're going to begin the exercise of peremptory challenges. This means that each party gets to exercise four peremptories. They do it alternatively. The state goes first, then the defense, then the state, then the

defense, until they exhaust their peremptories or they waive peremptories.

They don't have to exercise peremptories.

It's the choice they make. If you're excused on a peremptory, the bailiff will give you your card, and you're to take that back up to Mr. Jackson in the jury room, and he'll give you further instructions concerning your service.

You should not be offended if you're excused. Again, it's just a judgment call on their part, and it's not a science. It's an art. Sometimes artists can sell their paintings, and sometimes they can't, so don't be offended. All right. We'll call upon the state for the exercise of your first peremptory challenge.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, the state would like to thank and excuse Juror No. 7, Mrs. Willison.

THE COURT: All right. Mrs. Willison, thank you very much. Staci Metzinger, please come forward and take Seat No. 7. Good

2

3

4 5

6

7

9

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

morning.

MS. METZINGER: Good morning.

THE COURT: Were you able to hear the proceedings here at the front of the courtroom?

MS. METZINGER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, give me a critique, will you, because some of the jurors didn't do so well at answering out loud, did they? Well, you may be working with them. Don't answer that. There was a lot of nodding of the head and sometimes very nice and soft, like, type of an answer. please keep your voice up for us if you will. The lawyers should be making you do that, too, but they don't want to get you mad at them so they don't say anything. They just kind of blow that over. I have to try and make sure you do talk loud enough. The court asked if -- the court asked if there were any of the challenges for cause that were applicable to you, the things that I read.

MS. METZINGER: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I also asked if you knew or heard anything about the case.

MS. METZINGER: I do not.

THE COURT: Okay. There are several tenets of law that I discussed. The presumption of innocence, the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, the use of the indictment, that type of thing. Do you have any difficulty or any objection to following the law that I've given you so far?

MS. METZINGER: No, I don't.

THE COURT: Do you understand the importance of following the law that I give you and applying it to the facts of this case?

MS. METZINGER: Yes.

THE COURT: All of us are bound by that same law. We wouldn't have a chance if 12 people went back to the jury room and you're all using different laws and trying to unanimously decide what the verdict should be. We all have to use the same law, and we all have to submit to it, whether we agree

with it or not. So that's very important.

Additionally, you'll be called upon at the appropriate time to deliberate with your fellow jurors. And what that means when you go back to the jury room is you have to tell the other jurors what you think and why you think that way, and you have to be willing to listen to what they say about what they think and why they think that way, and you have to be willing to change what you think or at least allow what they think to influence what you're doing because your initial impression may not be the correct impression. It may be something that someone can show you you should think a different way about them.

But you have to be willing to stick to your guns, too, after a fair consideration of everything that you're correct and your position should be maintained. So it takes courage to do the job. It takes certainly a responsibility and a devotion to the effort. Do you feel that you're up to that?

MS. METZINGER: Yes, I do.

1 THE COURT: All right. Well, you 2 hesitated for a moment. You thought that 3 through. That's good. 4 MS. METZINGER: I have to examine. 5 THE COURT: Pardon? Internal examination. 6 MS. METZINGER: 7 Good. We all need to do THE COURT: 8 that, because this is something very 9 difficult that we ask. It's something that 10 you're not used to doing. It's something 11 that may be foreign to you, but it's 12 something that people do, something that we 13 call upon people to do all the time. 14 there anything asked by the court or by 15 counsel that you need to discuss with us? 16 MS. METZINGER: No. 17 I mean, anything anybody THE COURT: 18 asked that raises a flag or that type of 19 thing? 20 MS. METZINGER: No. **THE COURT:** Okay. Is there any reason 2.1 22 that you can think of why you should not sit 23 as a fair and impartial juror in this case?

1 MS. METZINGER: No. 2 **THE COURT:** Very well. The state may 3 inquire. The inquiry, of course, is limited 4 to this juror, and should be brief. 5 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your 6 Honor. Good morning. 7 MS. METZINGER: Good morning. 8 MS. DOHERTY: Is there anything that I 9 brought up that you thought you would've had 10 a different opinion than some of the other 11 jurors? 12 MS. METZINGER: No. 13 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Are you 14 comfortable with the fact that the law does 15 not require, and the judge won't read you any 16 definition that says the state has to prove 17 by two or more witnesses that this crime 18 occurred? Are you okay with the fact that 19 it's quality over quantity? 20 MS. METZINGER: Yes. 21 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you have anything 22 in your background or -- I know you said your 23 parents were the victims of some thefts and

1	that kind of thing. Anything about that
2	which would cause you to give less or more
3	credibility to any certain type of witnesses,
4	like police?
5	MS. METZINGER: No.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you keep everyone
7	on an equal playing field until you hear
8	their testimony?
9	MS. METZINGER: I hope so.
10	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And you have five
11	kids?
12	MS. METZINGER: Uh-huh.
13	MS. CANTALAMESSA: So you have some
14	experience in judging credibility of their
15	stories, that kind of thing?
16	MS. METZINGER: Yes, I do.
17	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you use those same
18	tools that Mrs. Catanzarite he kept doing
19	my name wrong, too. Do you use those same
20	tools, body language, logical, all your
21	reasoning? Do you use those same rules when
22	judging your kids' credibility?
23	MS. METZINGER: Yes, I do.
	II

1 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think you can 2 do that for witnesses who come in and 3 testify? 4 MS. METZINGER: Yes. 5 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Is there any reason 6 why just as you're sitting here right now 7 that you would be siding with either the 8 state or the defense, not hearing any of the 9 evidence at this point? 10 MS. METZINGER: No. 11 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Is there 12 anything that you feel that you have this 13 opinion that DNA is unbelievable or 14 fingerprints are unbelievable? Anything like that? 15 16 MS. METZINGER: No. 17 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Can you keep 18 an open mind with regard to the scientists as 19 well, to listen to their testimony before you 20 decide whether they're credible or not or 2.1 whether to listen to that evidence? 22 MS. METZINGER: Yes. 23 MS. CANTALAMESSA: You said in your

1	questionnaire that your parents were the
2	victims of these thefts and vandalism. Did
3	you did you write the perpetrators were
4	unfound or not found? They never found who
5	did it?
6	MS. METZINGER: Correct.
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you know what kind
8	of evidence they had about that? Just the
9	damage, or did they send the crime lab out?
10	MS. METZINGER: No, there was no
11	evidence.
12	MS. CANTALAMESSA: They didn't come out
13	and do fingerprints?
14	MS. METZINGER: No, none was collected.
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you have any
16	religious, moral, or ethical reasons why you
17	can't sit in judgment of someone else?
18	MS. METZINGER: No.
19	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you have any
20	specialized training as regards to guns or
21	anything like that?
22	MS. METZINGER: No.
23	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. You had you
	I <b>T</b>

1	took some nursing classes. Are you in school
2	right now?
3	MS. METZINGER: No.
4	MS. CANTALAMESSA: But you did go to
5	YSU, right, for a while and studied nursing?
6	Do you have any did you take any classes
7	regarding forensic evidence or anything like
8	that?
9	MS. METZINGER: No.
10	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Are you okay with the
11	law as it's required that direct evidence is
12	of equal weight as circumstantial evidence?
13	Are you okay with that?
14	MS. METZINGER: Yes.
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And can you follow
16	that law as the judge gives it to you?
17	MS. METZINGER: Yes.
18	MS. CANTALAMESSA: I have nothing
19	further. Thank you.
20	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Meranto.
21	MR. MERANTO: Thank you. Hi,
22	Ms. Metzinger. How are you?
23	MS. METZINGER: Fine.

1 MR. MERANTO: Obviously because you're 2 sitting here now, you answered -- you don't 3 know myself, you don't know Mr. Ferrara; 4 right? 5 MS. METZINGER: Correct. 6 MR. MERANTO: Are you comfortable that 7 the law tells you that you need to decide this case like you would decide the most 8 9 important things in your own life? 10 MS. METZINGER: Am I comfortable with 11 that? 12 MR. MERANTO: Yeah. 13 MS. METZINGER: Yes. 14 MR. MERANTO: Can you give us that same 15 deference? Because that's a big deal. I'm 16 sure the most important thing in your life, 17 probably your kids; right? 18 MS. METZINGER: Yes. 19 MR. MERANTO: You don't know us. You're 20 removed from us. But you're here to do a 21 It says, you know, you've got to kind 22 of consider it like you would consider making a decision about your kids. Comfortable with 23

1	that?
2	MS. METZINGER: Yes.
3	MR. MERANTO: If I sent you back right
4	now to give me a verdict, what would the
5	verdict be?
6	MS. METZINGER: Not guilty.
7	MR. MERANTO: Thank you. Nothing else.
8	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Is
9	Ms. Metzinger passed for cause by the state?
10	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: By the defense?
12	MR. MERANTO: Pass for cause, Your
13	Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. Then we'll turn
15	to the defense for the exercise of your first
16	peremptory challenge.
17	MR. MERANTO: Your Honor, we would thank
18	and excuse Juror No. 3, Ms. Romesburg.
19	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All
20	right. Michelle Tracy. Good morning.
21	MS. TRACY: Good morning.
22	THE COURT: How are you today?
23	MS. TRACY: I'm good.

1 THE COURT: Were you able to hear the 2 proceedings here at the front of the 3 courtroom? 4 MS. TRACY: Yes, I was. 5 THE COURT: All right. So do you have 6 any questions of me based upon what the court 7 and the lawyers have said so far? 8 MS. TRACY: No. 9 THE COURT: Were any of the challenges 10 for cause that I read applicable to you? 11 MS. TRACY: No. 12 THE COURT: Do you know anything about 13 this case from any source outside of the 14 courtroom? 15 MS. TRACY: Yes. 16 Okay. We're going to THE COURT: 17 discuss that in a moment. I had asked the 18 other jurors about their ability to set 19 information aside and decide the truth of 20 this matter based upon the evidence that's 2.1 presented here in the courtroom and pursuant 22 to the law that I give you. Do you feel you 23 have the ability to do that?

1	MS. TRACY: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm going to
3	have you and all of the parties come back to
4	my office with me so we can discuss what you
5	may know about the case.
6	MS. TRACY: Okay.
7	THE COURT: And so we'll do that at this
8	time.
9	(WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel,
10	Defendant, Prospective Juror No. 3, Michelle
11	Tracy, and court reporter enter the chambers
12	of the Court, and the following proceedings
13	were had out of the hearing of the
14	prospective jurors:)
15	THE COURT: So we're in my chambers
16	simply to ask what it is that you have heard
17	about this case or learned about this case
18	outside of the courtroom.
19	MS. TRACY: I usually don't watch the
20	news, but you know my husband, so
21	THE COURT: I do?
22	MS. TRACY: Yes, you do.
23	THE COURT: Oh. That Tracy?

1	MS. TRACY: That Tracy, yes. He informs
2	me of all this. The only thing I know so far
3	is he is serving a life sentence for murder,
4	and in '74 something with the DNA that they
5	found, and he's accused of killing a woman
6	and her child.
7	THE COURT: Okay. So
8	MS. TRACY: That's all I know.
9	THE COURT: So you've actually talked
10	with your husband about this?
11	MS. TRACY: Yes.
12	THE COURT: You husband is Lee?
13	MS. TRACY: Yes.
14	THE COURT: And he was an FBI agent?
15	MS. TRACY: Secret Service and Air
16	Marshals.
17	THE COURT: He's retired now?
18	MS. TRACY: And then we have our son is
19	a post commander with the highway patrol.
20	THE COURT: So you've actually talked
21	with your husband about it, and he did
22	investigative work and that type of thing, so
23	he's someone that probably knows what he's

talking about.

MS. TRACY: Yeah.

THE COURT: I mean, I've always respected him. He's a good man and all of that. So of course the conversations that you've had with him, was that any -- any different from what you read in the paper? You watched it on the news?

MS. TRACY: We don't get the paper, so I didn't read the paper. No. That's basically all that I know about it.

THE COURT: So in that discussion with him or in the information you gained from the media, do you have an opinion about the outcome of this case that you can't set aside?

MS. TRACY: Well, they were asking the people if you had to go in right now and give a verdict, I would probably say guilty. Now, I can — you know, I'd be able to sit and listen, but, you know, that would be my first inclination, coming from a law enforcement background.

1 THE COURT: Uh-huh. Well, that's -- you 2 know, there's nothing wrong with that. 3 MS. TRACY: I mean, it's --4 THE COURT: That's why we're making 5 inquiry. 6 MS. TRACY: Right. I understand. 7 THE COURT: It's certainly appropriate. 8 It's good that you say those things to us. 9 At the same time, that doesn't mean that it's 10 inappropriate for you to serve. 11 MS. TRACY: Right. 12 THE COURT: You're honest about how you 13 feel. But beyond that -- I mean, I'll just 14 tell you, you know, there are rules that can 15 be enforced regarding asking jurors what 16 their verdict would be. There's good reason 17 to do that. That's why I allow it. It's not 18 inappropriate in my mind to do that. 19 MS. TRACY: Right. THE COURT: And it's a pretty good 20 2.1 indicator of where people are coming from. 22 But most of the time, at least in my opinion 23 when people walk into a courtroom and they

see a defendant sitting there they don't think what's he wrongly accused of. They think, what did he do wrong.

MS. TRACY: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: You're no different from anybody else that walks in a courtroom that way. But when you tell people like you tell the Pittsburgh Steelers if you want to catch a pass that counts, you have to have both feet in bounds, not one foot in bounds. Even though you don't like that, if you're going to play that game, you have to have two feet in bounds for it to count.

MS. TRACY: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: So this certainly is not a game, but the rules, they have to be followed when we're doing this. It really doesn't matter what you think or what you feel. It matters that you can set that aside, use the evidence and decide whether someone is legally guilty or not guilty.

MS. TRACY: Right. Right.

THE COURT: So --

MS. TRACY: That I could do. I could listen to all of it, set that aside. But, I mean, if they asked me right now, without hearing any of this evidence, which was one of the questions —

THE COURT: Well, you can't be called upon to render a verdict right now. That's why it's normally not allowed. It's a fiction; okay?

MS. TRACY: Well, you know, the examples they were using is what I'm talking about.

**THE COURT:** For sure.

MS. TRACY: Okay.

THE COURT: But could you, understanding the very solemn importance of this, could you put aside those things, those feelings, and follow the law that I instruct you and consider the case based solely upon the evidence that is presented, not on anything you watched on the news or anything you talked about with your husband?

MS. TRACY: Right. Yeah, I think I could. Yeah, I could.

1 THE COURT: All right. So is there 2 anything else you remember about the case 3 publicity-wise? 4 MS. TRACY: Not really. Honestly, 5 that's all I know is that he's serving now 6 and they found with the DNA, and he's being 7 accused of the other two murders now that 8 happened in '74. That's really all I know. I don't even know anything about why -- I 9 10 mean, I knew it was murder, but why or the circumstances behind the first one. 11 12 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 13 MS. TRACY: I've got you stumped. 14 THE COURT: No. That's fine. I just 15 was trying to see if I had anything else I 16 needed to ask. 17 MS. TRACY: Okay. 18 THE COURT: Thank you. 19 MS. TRACY: Go sit back in the jury box? 20 THE COURT: Yeah. The bailiff will take 21 you right there. 22 (WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 3, Michelle Tracy, left the chambers of the 23

1 Court, and the proceedings continued as 2 follows:) 3 THE COURT: Okay. So I'm ready to go 4 back in. Is there anything else from the 5 state? 6 MS. CANTALAMESSA: No. 7 THE COURT: The defense? 8 MR. MERANTO: No. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 (WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel, Defendant and court reporter returned to the 11 12 court, and the following proceedings were had 13 back in the hearing of the prospective 14 jurors:) 15 Ms. Tracy, I instructed the THE COURT: 16 other jurors concerning the presumption of 17 innocence. Presumption of innocence is a 18 legal tenet that has to be followed so that 19 people who are accused are not wrongly convicted. Because it's easy when the 20 2.1 government says somebody did something wrong 22 for people to kind of sign up with that. 23 the presumption of innocence is a shield

against that so that when someone is brought to trial, that even though there's an accusation made against him -- which all of us as humans wonder, you know, why there's an accusation against someone.

You have to remind yourself of a few things. First of all, not everybody that's accused is guilty. Sometimes the accuser's wrong, not the person accused. Additionally, this is an exercise in law. It's not an exercise in morality where the good Lord may know what happened here, but we don't. So we're stuck with just making a legal decision, not an ultimate and moral decision.

So we're all asked to almost view something like this in the abstract where it may not be the way that we normally think, but we have to afford the defendant the presumption of innocence. We have to hold the State of Ohio to this burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt. We have to follow the law and only use the evidence that we hear here in the courtroom to decide the

1 truth of this matter. And if there are any 2 matters outside of that from the media or 3 from some other source that affect your 4 ability to do that, then you just need to 5 tell us that. And of course you just told us 6 that you're okay with that; that's correct? MS. TRACY: 7 Yes. 8 THE COURT: You feel you're able to 9 perform this task? 10 MS. TRACY: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Very well. You understand 12 that if you undertake this responsibility 13 it's -- it's a solemn responsibility, it's a big deal? 14 15 MS. TRACY: Yes. 16 THE COURT: So we always -- I did ask 17 you about whether or not any of the 18 challenges for cause applied to you; is that 19 correct? 20 MS. TRACY: Right. 2.1 THE COURT: And is there any reason you 22 can think of now that we've talked that you 23 cannot be a fair and impartial juror?

1	MS. TRACY: No. I can.
2	THE COURT: Very well. The state may
3	inquire.
4	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your
5	Honor. Good morning.
6	MS. TRACY: Good morning.
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Mrs. Tracy, do you
8	have any training with guns? I know your
9	husband's retired Secret Service.
10	MS. TRACY: No, I don't.
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: He never took you to
12	get CCW or anything?
13	MS. TRACY: No.
14	MS. DOHERTY: What about did you ever
15	work outside the home?
16	MS. TRACY: No.
17	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Did you go to
18	college?
19	MS. TRACY: No.
20	MS. CANTALAMESSA: You also have some
21	children in law enforcement?
22	MS. TRACY: Yes.
23	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you promise just

1 like everyone else has promised to keep all 2 of the witnesses on an equal level until you 3 hear their testimony before deciding how 4 little or how much credibility to give them? 5 MS. TRACY: Yes. 6 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you promise to 7 keep an open mind throughout the entire case 8 before rendering your verdict? 9 MS. TRACY: Yes. 10 MS. CANTALAMESSA: The example I use for 11 direct and circumstantial evidence, can you 12 follow the law as the judge gives it to you 13 that circumstantial evidence and direct 14 evidence are of equal weight? 15 MS. TRACY: Yes. 16 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you have any 17 religious, moral, or personal reasons why you 18 can't sit in judgment of someone? 19 MS. TRACY: No, absolutely not. MS. CANTALAMESSA: And I'm sure raising 20 2.1 three kids you had to judge their credibility 22 as well and decide who to believe and who not 23 to believe. Can you promise to use those

1	tools you use with your own kids when judging
2	the credibility of the witnesses from the
3	witness stand?
4	MS. TRACY: Yes.
5	MS. CANTALAMESSA: That's all the
6	questions I have. Thank you.
7	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Meranto.
8	MR. MERANTO: No questions, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: All right. Is Ms. Tracy
10	passed for cause by the state?
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: By the defense?
13	MR. MERANTO: Pass for cause.
14	THE COURT: Very well. Then we'll
15	return to the state for the exercise of your
16	second peremptory challenge.
17	MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, the state
18	would like to thank and excuse Juror No. 11,
19	Mrs. Ruble.
20	THE COURT: All right. Thank you,
21	Ms. Ruble. The court will call Rosemary
22	Morell. Good morning.
23	MS. MORELL: Good morning.

1 THE COURT: Were you able to hear the 2 proceedings here at the front of the 3 courtroom? 4 MS. MORELL: Yes, I was. 5 THE COURT: Were any of the challenges 6 for cause that I read applicable to you? 7 MS. MORELL: No. 8 THE COURT: Are you able to follow the 9 law as it's given to you by the court and 10 apply it to the facts of this case? 11 MS. MORELL: Yes, I am. 12 THE COURT: Is there anything that --13 any problem you would have with the 14 instructions I've given so far, the legal 15 tenets that all of us are required to follow? 16 MS. MORELL: No, not a problem. 17 THE COURT: Okay. I also asked about 18 whether or not you know anything about this 19 case from a source outside of the courtroom. 20 MS. MORELL: No, actually, no, I don't. 21 THE COURT: Okay. The functions of the 22 jury were also discussed. Of course, as 23 individual jurors you're to view this case

22

23

individually. All during the case you have to absorb what's going on and take it in for vourself. You're not allowed to discuss what you think or what you feel or hey, that witness was pretty good, or I didn't like -you can't talk to anybody about that, your fellow jurors, at home, or work, or anything. You have to, as 12 individuals, form your own opinion, your own impression of what the evidence is. And then once everything is completed and you go back to deliberate, then you need to share that individual impression with the others and see if you can create and endorse a unanimous group impression so that you can render a verdict. You have to be able to speak your mind but be willing to accept what the others have to say also. Do you feel you can do those things?

MS. MORELL: Oh, yes. No problem.

THE COURT: Is there any reason you can think of why you should not sit as a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. MORELL: No, no reason.

1	THE COURT: Very well. The state may
2	inquire.
3	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your
4	Honor. Good afternoon.
5	MS. MORELL: Good afternoon.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Mrs. Morell, anything
7	that I brought up that you thought you might
8	have had a different answer than the rest of
9	the jurors on the panel earlier?
10	MS. MORELL: No.
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Comfortable with the
12	fact that it's the quality of the evidence,
13	not necessarily the quantity of the evidence?
14	MS. MORELL: Yes.
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: You mention in your
16	questionnaire that your son was shot.
17	MS. MORELL: No. He was shot at.
18	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Shot at. Was he
19	killed?
20	MS. MORELL: No.
21	<b>MS. CANTALAMESSA:</b> Okay. Was someone
22	arrested in response to him being shot at?
23	MS. MORELL: No.

1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Did they
2	investigate that?
3	MS. MORELL: No. It was just a car
4	followed him into the gas station, and for
5	whatever reason, they just started shooting
6	at the car my son was in, but they left
7	before even police could get there.
8	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. And what
9	agency was that?
10	MS. MORELL: We were in Campbell, so it
11	would have been Campbell Police Department.
12	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. How long ago?
13	MS. MORELL: Fifteen years ago.
14	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Any feelings
15	left from that case that you still hold maybe
16	against the police or against whether it
17	would be either for the state or for the
18	defense at this point in time?
19	MS. MORELL: No. Just the time element,
20	it just it happened so quickly that there
21	was nothing much for the police to do.
22	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. But you don't
23	hold that against anyone and can set it aside

1	in listening and judging the evidence in this
2	case?
3	MS. MORELL: No.
4	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think have
5	you been retired from the Department of Job
6	and Family Services for
7	MS. MORELL: Twenty-three years.
8	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. So you just
9	retired a little over a year ago?
LO	MS. MORELL: Yes.
L1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Anything, being that
L2	you worked for Mahoning County, and now
L3	you're retired from Mahoning County, anything
L4	cause you concern whether you would side for
L5	or against the state, anything like that?
L6	MS. MORELL: No. It was just a job.
L7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. What did you
L8	do for them?
L9	MS. MORELL: I did several things with
20	the last job that I had. I worked in the
21	social services determining eligibility for
22	low income families that can get child care.
23	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And you raised four

1	kids?
2	MS. MORELL: Right.
3	MS. CANTALAMESSA: So you can use those
4	same tools that we've talked about in judging
5	the credibility of the witness?
6	MS. MORELL: Right.
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: What about the law as
8	it relates to direct versus circumstantial
9	evidence? Can you follow that rule when it
10	says direct and circumstantial are of equal
11	weight?
12	MS. MORELL: Yes.
13	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Any specialized gun
14	training, anything like that?
15	MS. MORELL: No. As a child my father
16	had guns, and my brothers were hunters, but
17	it's not something that agreed with me.
18	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Any reason why you
19	don't think you should sit on this case?
20	MS. MORELL: Not that I can think of.
21	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. I have nothing
22	further, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Meranto.

1	MR. MERANTO: Thank you. Afternoon,
2	Ms. Morell. You worked at what did you do
3	down at the Department of Job and Family
4	Services?
5	MS. MORELL: I came on to work at the
6	front desk, worked as an aide, and finished
7	out as a child care worker where I determined
8	eligibility for the low income families who
9	needed child care.
10	MR. MERANTO: Okay. So you had some
11	decision-making process toward the end with
12	regard to who got benefits, didn't get
13	benefits, who qualified?
14	MS. MORELL: Right.
15	MR. MERANTO: And you had to make those
16	decisions. Were you comfortable with that?
17	MS. MORELL: Oh, yeah.
18	MR. MERANTO: Because sometimes you had
19	to tell people no, and they weren't really
20	happy about it.
21	MS. MORELL: I didn't have any problem
22	telling anybody no or yes. I just had to
23	follow the rules. Everybody had to qualify.

The rules are the same for everybody, even though a lot of people didn't think they were.

MR. MERANTO: Very similar here. The judge has rules to follow, and we all gotta follow them; correct?

MS. MORELL: Right.

MR. MERANTO: So you were very fair handed?

MS. MORELL: I thought so.

MR. MERANTO: Okay. You've been listening to everything we've been talking about, I'm sure. You probably have no problem hearing me. Did you ever find yourself thinking, well, you know, it's not really fair that the state has to present all this evidence and do all this stuff, and Mr. Ferrara, Meranto, and Ms. Weibling, we don't have to do anything? Did that ever cross your mind even for a moment?

MS. MORELL: No, because you're either -- you have to have a reason to do something, so if you're accused of something,

1	somebody has to prove it.
2	MR. MERANTO: So the state brought the
3	charges, and it's only fair that they have to
4	prove it to you?
5	MS. MORELL: Right.
6	MR. MERANTO: Beyond a reasonable doubt.
7	And this reasonable doubt thing's a pretty
8	serious level. Do you get that impression
9	from all the discussion you have about it?
10	MS. MORELL: Oh, yeah.
11	MR. MERANTO: That it's not just a
12	feeling like he's guilty. You gotta really
13	believe it in your heart.
14	MS. MORELL: Right, because that is
15	what nobody knows anything.
16	MR. MERANTO: And so right now you
17	believe he's not guilty; correct?
18	MS. MORELL: Have to, yes.
19	MR. MERANTO: You're a blank slate.
20	You're open to hearing what may or may not
21	come from this courtroom; correct?
22	MS. MORELL: Correct.
23	MR. MERANTO: Thank you.

1 THE COURT: Thank you. Is Ms. Morell 2 passed for cause by the state? 3 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor. 4 **THE COURT:** By the defense? 5 MR. MERANTO: Pass for cause, Your 6 Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. We'll turn to 8 the defendant for the exercise of your second 9 peremptory challenge. 10 MR. MERANTO: We would thank and excuse 11 Ms. Tracy, Juror No. 3. 12 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Tracy, thank 13 you. William Wright, take Seat No. 3, 14 please. Good afternoon. I guess it's 15 afternoon. I think that's the hint they're 16 trying to give me, that they want to go to 17 lunch. We're going to go pretty soon. 18 were you able to hear all the proceedings 19 here at the front of the courtroom? 20 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: Can you tell me from what 22 all you've heard, is there any reason you 23 can't sit as a fair and impartial juror in

1 this case? 2 MR. WRIGHT: No. 3 THE COURT: Do you know anything about 4 this case from an outside source? 5 MR. WRIGHT: No. 6 THE COURT: Will you follow the law as 7 it's given to you by the court and apply that law to the facts of this case? 8 9 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Do you understand the facts 11 are simply what's presented to you here in 12 the courtroom, not what somebody else writes 13 or reports or tells you? 14 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. 15 It's important during the THE COURT: 16 course of the case that you understand that 17 you can't talk with anybody about this case. 18 You can't read any newspaper or anything 19 about it. You have to decide the case 20 strictly upon what's presented here in the 21 court. 22 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. 23 All right. So you can be THE COURT:

fair and impartial, and there's no reason you can't serve; is that correct?

3

MR. WRIGHT: Correct.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

\_ -

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: All right. So we're going to question this juror. I'm going to let the rest of you in the back go. This instruction is applicable every time that you leave the courtroom, that you are not to discuss the case at all among yourselves or with anyone else. You're not to permit anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence. must not form or express any opinion about the case. We're going to ask that you be back in the courtroom no later than 1:30. We're going to resume at 1:30 so you can get something to eat and refresh yourselves, and we'll complete the selection of the jury this afternoon. You're welcome to go to lunch together if you like, but you please can't discuss the case. If anybody's discussing it or talking about it, you have to avoid that conversation. Thank you, folks. See you in a little bit.

1	(WHEREUPON, some of the prospective
2	jurors left the courtroom, some remained, and
3	the proceedings continued as follows:)
4	THE COURT: So Ms. Cantalamessa, do you
5	wish to question this prospective juror?
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Just briefly, Your
7	Honor.
8	THE COURT: Thank you.
9	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Good afternoon,
10	Mr. Wright.
11	MR. WRIGHT: Good afternoon.
12	MS. CANTALAMESSA: You were working for
13	a steel mill?
14	MR. WRIGHT: Correct.
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And what one is that?
16	MR. WRIGHT: RG Steel.
17	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Working there, did
18	you have to be a member of the union?
19	MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
20	MS. CANTALAMESSA: You have three kids
21	at home. You guys are busy, huh?
22	MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh.
23	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And anything going on

1 in your life which would cause you not to be 2 able to pay attention to the evidence and the 3 testimony during this case? 4 MR. WRIGHT: No. 5 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Anything that I 6 brought up which you felt you would've had a 7 different answer than any other member of the 8 panel? 9 MR. WRIGHT: No. 10 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think you 11 could follow the law as the judge gives it to 12 you, especially regarding direct versus 13 circumstantial evidence, the fact that 14 they're of equal weight? You're okay with that? 15 16 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. 17 MS. CANTALAMESSA: And can you abide by 18 that; it's the quality of the evidence, not 19 necessarily the quantity of the evidence? 20 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. 21 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Any reason sitting 22 there right now that you would be siding with 23 either the state or the defense before you

1	heard anything?
2	MR. WRIGHT: No.
3	MS. CANTALAMESSA: I have nothing
4	further. Thank you.
5	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Meranto.
6	MR. MERANTO: Thank you. Hi,
7	Mr. Wright. How are you?
8	MR. WRIGHT: Good. How are you?
9	MR. MERANTO: Good. Thank you. You
10	ever have to settle any disputes between
11	12, 12, and 13. I'm not there yet. I can't
12	even imagine. 12, 12, and 13 years old, are
13	those the ages of your kids?
14	MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.
15	MR. MERANTO: How do you do that?
16	MR. WRIGHT: Very carefully.
17	MR. MERANTO: Girl, boys?
18	MR. WRIGHT: Two girls and a boy.
19	MR. MERANTO: Are they twins then?
20	MR. WRIGHT: The boy and the girl are
21	twins.
22	MR. MERANTO: Do they dig in, I mean,
23	during disputes, or is one easier to roll
	II

1 over for the other one? I mean, how exactly 2 does that work? Because kids are all 3 different. At least that's mine. 4 MR. WRIGHT: The girls are pretty 5 straight forward. They'll come out honestly 6 and tell me what's going on. The boy, he's a 7 tough one that -- he wants to argue. 8 MR. MERANTO: Send him my way when the 9 time comes. 10 MR. WRIGHT: Absolutely. 11 MR. MERANTO: When you say argue, is he 12 just -- I mean, does he argue in the face of 13 logic even sometimes? 14 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. 15 MR. MERANTO: Because he just wants to 16 keep going? 17 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. 18 MR. MERANTO: Have you ever gotten in a 19 situation with him where you go, look, that 20 just is completely ridiculous? Now you gotta 21 go do what I -- I mean, have you ever gotten 22 to that point with him? Like, I heard your 23 argument, and it's ridiculous, it doesn't

1

make sense?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. MERANTO: I think you did it, that's the way. Do you think you can -- are you comfortable with, like, logically sitting out and reasoning something out, giving somebody the benefit of the doubt but then saying, look, okay, bottom line is here's the way it is, and that's the decision I'm making? you comfortable with that?

> MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

MR. MERANTO: Okay. Would you be comfortable with that in the face of some people that like your son, differ with your point of view?

Well, yeah. MR. WRIGHT: I mean, yeah, I wouldn't judge just because he's my son or any other kid that would come to my house.

Well, I guess what I'm MR. MERANTO: asking you is, let's say you're selected as a juror, and you go back there, and there's some discussion with regard to how a piece of evidence came in --

1 MR. WRIGHT: Right. 2 MR. MERANTO: -- or didn't. And you're 3 having that discussion, and you have a 4 different point of view than maybe six, 5 seven, eight other jurors. 6 MR. WRIGHT: Sure. 7 MR. MERANTO: How would you handle that? MR. WRIGHT: Well, I think that's the 8 9 purpose of having all 12 of us together is to 10 be able to discuss it together. We're not 11 all going to see everything the same way. 12 MR. MERANTO: I mean, you seem like a 13 calm, kind of soft spoken guy, but you're 14 going to stand up for yourself and make your 15 points in there? 16 MR. WRIGHT: Sure. 17 MR. MERANTO: Do you have a problem with 18 the fact that the state has to prove this to you and we don't -- Mr. Ferrara and I don't 19 20 have to do anything but sit there? MR. WRIGHT: 21 No. 22 MR. MERANTO: You understand, and you're 23 comfortable with that? Do you believe in

1 that? 2 MR. WRIGHT: Sure. 3 MR. MERANTO: Thank you. Thanks, 4 Mr. Wright. 5 All right. Thank you. THE COURT: Is 6 Mr. Wright passed for cause by the state? 7 Yes, Your Honor. MS. CANTALAMESSA: 8 **THE COURT:** By the defense? 9 MR. MERANTO: Pass for cause. 10 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and 11 gentlemen, we're going to recess at this 12 time. I'd like you to go with the bailiff to 13 the jury room and report back there shortly 14 before 1:30 so we can resume at that time. 15 The instruction I gave before the other 16 jurors were excused is the same instruction that you're subject to. Please follow those 17 18 admonitions and get a nice little stretch, 19 and we'll see you in a little bit. 20 you. 21 (WHEREUPON, the Court recessed at 12:20 22 p.m., November 18, 2013 and reopened at 1:30 p.m., November 18, 2013 and the proceedings 23

1 continued as follows:) 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. 3 Okay. We had completed the voir dire of 4 Mr. Wright. He was passed for cause. 5 we would return to the state for the exercise 6 of your third peremptory challenge. 7 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, the state would like to thank but excuse Juror No. 10, 8 9 Ms. Firmstone. 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 11 Laura Farris, please take Seat No. 10. 12 MR. MERANTO: Your Honor, may we 13 approach? 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 (WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among 16 court and counsel off the record and out of 17 the hearing of the prospective jurors and 18 court reporter, after which the proceedings 19 continued as follows:) 20 THE COURT: So Ms. Farris, were you able 2.1 to hear the proceedings here at the front of 22 the courtroom? MS. FARRIS: Yes, I was. 23

1 THE COURT: And there were a lot of 2 questions asked by the court and by counsel. 3 Were there any of those things that raised 4 your attention, raised a red flag or 5 something that indicated something you should 6 talk to us about? 7 MS. FARRIS: I've heard about the case. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Were any of the 9 challenges for cause applicable to you? 10 MS. FARRIS: No. THE COURT: And were these news sources 11 12 from where you heard about the case? Just 13 yes or no? 14 MS. FARRIS: Yes, plus. 15 **THE COURT:** And others? 16 MS. FARRIS: Uh-huh. 17 All right. We're going to THE COURT: 18 have you come back to my office while we discuss that matter. I'll need the parties 19 20 and the court reporter there, and the bailiff 2.1 will bring you at the appropriate time. 22 (WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel, 23 Defendant, Prospective Juror No. 10, Laura

1 Farris, and court reporter enter the chambers 2 of the Court, and the following proceedings 3 were had out of the hearing of the 4 prospective jurors:) 5 THE COURT: Hi. 6 MS. FARRIS: Hi. 7 THE COURT: So what is it that you've 8 heard about the case? MS. FARRIS: Well, I work at GM, and my 9 girlfriend had told me -- she also works at 10 11 General Motors. She goes, I got hired in 12 She says, well, maybe the person that 13 you're going to hear the trial on used to be 14 at General Motors. And then that's basically 15 And then she told me about the case a it. 16 little bit, about how it was a security guard 17 and his wife and his daughter that got killed. 18 19 So I read you the indictment THE COURT: 20 this morning describing what crimes the state 2.1 alleges the defendant committed. 22 MS. FARRIS: Okay. 23 THE COURT: I named this defendant, and

1 I told you it when I read the indictment. So 2 those are things that are alleged against 3 this defendant. 4 MS. FARRIS: Okay. 5 Are those the kind of things THE COURT: 6 that you've learned or you've heard, that 7 three people were murdered and that --8 MS. FARRIS: Yes, that's what I heard. 9 **THE COURT:** And that someone is supposed 10 to have done it? 11 MS. FARRIS: Correct. 12 THE COURT: Well, what else? Is there 13 anything on top of that? 14 MS. FARRIS: Just that a baby was 15 crawling around in blood, and --16 I think that was in the THE COURT: 17 newspaper this morning. 18 MS. FARRIS: Well, I didn't read the 19 newspaper this morning. This is what --20 THE COURT: See, the newspaper, you 21 know, they want the right to print and have 22 free access and all of that, and then they --23 they actually impede the right to a fair

1 trial by doing that because what they say in 2 the paper is just bologna. 3 MS. FARRIS: Well, I would have to hear 4 the facts before I would make a decision on 5 anything. 6 Well, we would hope that, THE COURT: 7 and, you know, any responsible citizen should 8 feel the same way. 9 MS. FARRIS: Right. 10 THE COURT: You can make up your own mind? 11 12 MS. FARRIS: Right. Absolutely. THE COURT: But more difficult than 13 14 that, because we're human is, once we hear 15 something or we see something or somebody 16 tells us something, then somebody else maybe 17 tells us something different, and it's a 18 little tougher for us. 19 MS. FARRIS: Correct. But in life, 20 people always judge other people. Like, oh, 21 don't talk to him because of this. I'm like, 22 well, I don't even know that person so I have 23 to get to know that person before I can judge

1 him myself. That's the way I look at life. 2 I don't really listen to what anybody else --3 I listen, but I make my own judgment. 4 THE COURT: I have friends that I try to 5 get them to listen to me. Yesterday we were 6 talking about one of the rules of golf, and 7 man, it's like you couldn't talk to them. 8 MS. FARRIS: Right. 9 I suppose it's because the THE COURT: 10 rule worked against him that he didn't like 11 the rule very much. 12 MS. FARRIS: Right. But rules are there 13 for a reason. You have to follow them as 14 I --15 THE COURT: My kind of girl. 16 MS. FARRIS: Well, 12 years of Catholic 17 education, you are going to follow the rules. 18 THE COURT: There you go. So I have 19 another question for you. Your name is 20 Farris. I know Farrises that went to Cardinal Mooney also. Are you a Cardinal 21 22 Mooney Farris? 23 MS. FARRIS: My husband, Johnny.

1	George, and John.
2	<b>THE COURT:</b> Eddie and I went to
3	MS. FARRIS: Okay. Well, I'm married to
4	the little one, to Johnny.
5	THE COURT: When did he graduate?
6	MS. FARRIS: '77.
7	THE COURT: Eddie was '70?
8	MS. FARRIS: Correct.
9	THE COURT: He graduated with my wife.
10	MS. FARRIS: My sympathies.
11	THE COURT: So is there anything about
12	what you've learned or heard about the case
13	that you think would affect your ability to
14	be fair and impartial?
15	MS. FARRIS: No. I will listen to all
16	the evidence, and whatever it is, then make
17	my decision.
18	THE COURT: Have you ever you said
19	you talked with your girlfriend about this.
20	Did you ever talk with any members of your
21	family about it that you recall?
22	MS. FARRIS: Oh, well, we were out to
23	dinner on Friday night with Ed, Phyllis, my

1	husband, and another couple, and they're
2	like, oh, I hope you don't get on that case.
3	I said, yeah, me, too. But that was it. You
4	know, we were talking a little bit about it;
5	you know? But it was the same stuff that I
6	had heard from my girlfriend earlier.
7	THE COURT: Just pretty much what's been
8	in the newspaper?
9	MS. FARRIS: Pretty much, yes, because I
10	didn't see it in the paper, so I only read
11	the paper at work, and I didn't read it. I
12	was off Friday.
13	THE COURT: What you know about it is
14	what other people have told you?
15	MS. FARRIS: Right. Hearsay.
16	THE COURT: That's exactly what it is.
17	It's even worse than what's in the paper.
18	MS. FARRIS: Because you really don't
19	know. It's what every you know, other
20	people say.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Are you comfortable
22	working on this case?
23	MS. FARRIS: I am.

1 THE COURT: Maybe comfort's not the 2 right word. Are you able to do this? 3 MS. FARRIS: Yeah. I want to be honest. 4 You know what, I'm going to listen to 5 everything and then make my decision on what 6 is presented in front of me, not what I've 7 heard before. 8 All right. THE COURT: Thank you. 9 (WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 10, 10 Laura Farris, left the chambers of the 11 court.) 12 MR. MERANTO: Judge, she is Ed Farris' 13 daughter-in-law. His name is going to come 14 up in this case. 15 THE COURT: Yeah. 16 MR. MERANTO: She can't serve. 17 THE COURT: Why can't she serve? You don't even know if she knows Ed Farris. 18 19 She said Ed, George and --MR. MERANTO: 20 George and Mary. It's her father-in-law. 21 just died a couple of years ago. 22 She did say that, yeah. THE COURT: You 23 don't know when she got married.

1 MR. MERANTO: He only died a couple 2 years ago. She obviously didn't -- she's not 3 a newlywed. 4 **THE COURT:** I didn't ask her those 5 things. I asked her if she knew anything 6 about this, if she talked with her family 7 about it, trying to segue into that which you 8 brought up at side bar, but that has nothing 9 to do with publicity. I'm not going to ask 10 her about that. I'm conducting voir dire on 11 publicity. 12 MR. MERANTO: All right, but what 13 happens when it comes up and she raises her 14 hand in the middle of trial? 15 THE COURT: She's not going to raise her 16 hand in the middle of trial. If you have a 17 concern about that, then you should ask her about it on voir dire. I don't know what 18 19 evidence is coming in. 20 MR. MERANTO: I know, Judge. All right. 21 I know. 22 I mean, you want me to do THE COURT: 23 all of this. I'm trying to accommodate

1 everybody. 2 MR. MERANTO: I know. You are. Thank 3 you. 4 THE COURT: But I can't do all of this. 5 I don't know the case. I know what I read in 6 the paper. You guys know what witnesses, 7 what evidence is coming in. I truly don't. All I know is what's been brought to my 8 9 attention. 10 MR. MERANTO: Because I've gotta ask 11 her, was that your father-in-law? Did you 12 have a relationship with him? Did you know 13 that there may be evidence with regard to his 14 name? THE COURT: Well, what's the problem 15 16 with you asking that? 17 MR. MERANTO: Okay. All right. 18 MS. DOHERTY: I wouldn't say evidence. 19 THE COURT: I have no information about 20 it. 21 MR. MERANTO: Maybe I should have a 22 thicker skin. I called Mary Farris and 23 George Farris when I first got this case and

1 saw those names, and I said, hey, I'm not 2 trying to throw the guy's name out there, but 3 his name comes up prominently in this case. 4 They go, well, we appreciate that, but you do 5 what you have to do. 6 MS. DOHERTY: Why don't you just bump 7 her? I mean --8 THE COURT: That's legitimate inquiry. 9 If somebody -- if somebody's name is being 10 mentioned, they're going to get up and say, 11 you know, we got Paul Gains is our 12 prosecutor, and --13 MR. MERANTO: I know. Where do you draw 14 the line? There's, like, a million 15 THE COURT: 16 other people that work over there. But they 17 go through that whole list of names and ask, 18 does that make any difference to you? What's 19 the difference with you doing that? 20 MR. MERANTO: Okay. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 (WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel, 23 Defendant and court reporter returned to the

1	court, and the following proceedings were had
2	back in the hearing of the prospective
3	jurors:)
4	THE COURT: Ms. Farris, you heard all of
5	these things at the front of the courtroom
6	and the instructions of law and how you
7	should conduct yourself as a juror. Are you
8	satisfied that you can perform those tasks as
9	they've been described to you by the court?
LO	MS. FARRIS: I do.
L1	THE COURT: And will you follow the law
L2	that's given to you by the court and apply it
L3	to the facts as you hear them here in the
L4	courtroom?
L5	MS. FARRIS: I will.
L6	THE COURT: Is there any reason why you
L7	cannot sit as a fair and impartial juror?
L8	MS. FARRIS: I don't think so, no.
L9	THE COURT: Very well. The state may
20	inquire.
21	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your
22	Honor. Good afternoon, Mrs. Farris.
23	MS. FARRIS: Hello.

1 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Is there anything 2 that I brought up that you thought you 3 would've had a different answer than the rest 4 of the panel? 5 MS. FARRIS: No. 6 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you set aside 7 whatever you think aggravated murder should be and just base your decision on the law as 8 9 the judge gives it to you? 10 MS. FARRIS: Yes, I will. MS. CANTALAMESSA: How about the law 11 12 with regard to -- the judge is going to tell 13 you that direct evidence and circumstantial 14 evidence are of equal weight. Can you abide 15 by that? 16 MS. FARRIS: Yes. 17 MS. CANTALAMESSA: What about when I 18 talked about quality over quantity? It's not 19 necessarily that there's going to be a lot of witnesses, but you have to look at the 20 2.1 quality of the evidence. Can you do that? 22 MS. FARRIS: I can. 23 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you have any --

you work at General Motors; right?
MS. FARRIS: Yes.
MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you have any
training, any gun training, or any scientific
training, anything like that?
MS. FARRIS: No.
MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you have any
reason to think that fingerprint evidence or
DNA evidence is just junk science, anything
like that?
MS. FARRIS: No.
MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you watch any of
those shows, CSI, Law & Order, anything like
that?
MS. FARRIS: No.
MS. CANTALAMESSA: It's hard not to
because they're on every channel.
MS. FARRIS: I work afternoons.
MS. CANTALAMESSA: You get to see that
good daytime TV, or at least the morning
shows.
MS. FARRIS: I don't have time.
MS. CANTALAMESSA: Is there any reason

1	whatsoever that you couldn't start every
2	witness on an equal level until you at least
3	hear their testimony before judging their
4	credibility?
5	MS. FARRIS: I can.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And can you keep an
7	open mind throughout the entirety of the case
8	and don't make any decision until the
9	evidence is closed?
10	MS. FARRIS: Yes.
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And can you promise
12	to use your reason and your common sense?
13	MS. FARRIS: Yes.
14	MS. CANTALAMESSA: That's all the
15	questions I have, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Meranto.
17	MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	Hi, Mrs. Farris. How are you?
19	MS. FARRIS: Hello.
20	MR. MERANTO: Now, are you George and
21	Mary's sister-in-law?
22	MS. FARRIS: Yes.
23	MR. MERANTO: So Mr. Farris, Ed, they

1	call him Papa Farris, was your father-in-law?
2	MS. FARRIS: Correct.
3	MR. MERANTO: Do you I know you're
4	probably not aware, but are you aware that
5	his name was mentioned early on in this case
6	in the '70s?
7	MS. FARRIS: No, I'm not.
8	MR. MERANTO: Would that cause you a
9	problem to deliberate on this case if there's
10	some evidence about him?
11	MS. FARRIS: No.
12	MR. MERANTO: It wouldn't at all?
13	MS. FARRIS: No.
14	MR. MERANTO: Okay. Well, you
15	understand, once again, and I'm sure you were
16	listening to all of this, that you have an
17	obligation with regard to Mr. Ferrara to hear
18	the evidence fairly and decide just based on
19	what you hear in here?
20	MS. FARRIS: Correct.
21	MR. MERANTO: Okay. While once again we
22	have no obligation to put on any evidence,
23	but obviously or certainly to solve the

case. I mean, the state charged Mr. Ferrara, and they have to prove their case; correct?

MS. FARRIS: Correct.

MR. MERANTO: And you agree with that?

MS. FARRIS: I do.

MR. MERANTO: There may be some evidence presented which could lead someone to believe that maybe Mr. Farris Sr. might have been involved, and certainly was a suspect potentially at the time. I mean, absolutely was a suspect at the time. And given that, could you tell me with 100 percent certainty that you won't consider that with regard to, well, you know, if I find Mr. Ferrara guilty, then, you know, then certainly my father—in—law had nothing to do with it? Do you know what I mean?

MS. FARRIS: Is anything 100 percent?

MR. MERANTO: Absolutely not. But you have -- you have to be 100 percent with regard to telling me that you're going to give Mr. Ferrara his full and fair day in court, and you're going to hold the state to

1	its burden.
2	MS. FARRIS: That I will do.
3	MR. MERANTO: And that's not going to
4	cloud your judgment at all?
5	MS. FARRIS: No.
6	MR. MERANTO: Okay. Nothing else.
7	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Is
8	Ms. Farris passed for cause by the state?
9	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: By the defense?
11	MR. MERANTO: For cause, Your Honor,
12	pass.
13	THE COURT: All right. Then we'll
14	return to the defense for the exercise of
15	your third peremptory challenge.
16	MR. MERANTO: We would thank and excuse
17	Ms. Farris.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Farris, thank
19	you. Melissa Wheatley, good afternoon to
20	you.
21	MS. WHEATLEY: Good afternoon.
22	<b>THE COURT:</b> Were you able to hear the
23	proceedings here at the front of the
	II

1 courtroom? 2 MS. WHEATLEY: Yes, I was. 3 THE COURT: There were several 4 challenges for cause read by the court when 5 we began this morning. Did any of them apply 6 to you? 7 MS. WHEATLEY: No, they did not. 8 You heard the instructions THE COURT: 9 of law given by the court. Are you okay with 10 the instructions thus far given? 11 MS. WHEATLEY: Yes, I am. 12 THE COURT: And will you follow the 13 instructions of law I will give you 14 throughout the case, and at the end of the 15 case, and apply that law to the facts of this 16 case? 17 MS. WHEATLEY: Yes, I will. 18 THE COURT: Do you understand the 19 importance of keeping an open mind until 20 you've heard everything that there is, 21 including the opinion of your fellow jurors 22 when you reach deliberations? 23 Yes, I will. MS. WHEATLEY:

THE COURT: Are you able to tell them what your feelings are? You're not inhibited to talking with other folks about how you feel?

MS. WHEATLEY: No. I'm perfectly capable of that.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you heard anything about this case from outside sources?

MS. WHEATLEY: I have not.

**THE COURT:** Pardon?

MS. WHEATLEY: I have not.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, everyone is instructed not to view the newspaper or television or attempt to find anything out about the case during the course of the trial from now on. But sometimes things like that happen. You know, if it's on the news and you're eating breakfast, and you hear something, you have to avoid that. You have to — and the reason for that is we're not interested in the opinion of someone who's not involved in the case. You folks are

2.1

involved. You're going to hear everything and know everything there is.

And you see none of them are here now.

They come in and out and act like they're here the whole time and get a lot of their information from others rather than being involved in it themselves. And their opinion means nothing. They don't — they're not subjected to the same trial that we're putting you folks through to make sure you can do this. So do you understand the importance of deciding this matter for yourself and not letting anyone influence how you decide?

MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there any reason why you cannot sit as a fair and impartial juror?

MS. WHEATLEY: No, there's not.

THE COURT: Very well. State may inquire.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon, Mrs. Wheatley.

1	MS. WHEATLEY: Good afternoon.
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: You were a principal?
3	MS. WHEATLEY: I was.
4	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Of what school?
5	MS. WHEATLEY: The Youngstown Academy on
6	the east side.
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Were you a teacher
8	before that?
9	MS. WHEATLEY: I started I was there
10	for eight years, and I was a teacher and
11	ended up being the head of the school for
12	four years.
13	MS. CANTALAMESSA: What kind of things
14	did you teach?
15	MS. WHEATLEY: I was elementary
16	education, so I taught everything.
17	MS. CANTALAMESSA: You talk in your
18	questionnaire about your friend or your
19	cousin
20	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
21	MS. CANTALAMESSA: who was in a
22	domestic dispute?
23	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.

1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Was there police
2	involved in that?
3	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
4	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Were you involved in
5	any way in going to court with her or
6	MS. WHEATLEY: It's in Columbiana
7	County, and I was asked to be called as a
8	witness if it did go to that, but it hasn't.
9	It's still pending.
10	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Were you present when
11	that happened?
12	MS. WHEATLEY: I was not.
13	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And all that's going
14	on in Columbiana County?
15	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
16	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Because of that
17	situation and your involvement with your
18	cousin, do you think you would side with one
19	side or the other, being the state or the
20	defense?
21	MS. WHEATLEY: No.
22	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you promise to
23	keep everyone on an equal level until you

1 hear their testimony when judging the 2 credibility of witnesses? 3 MS. WHEATLEY: Yes. 4 MS. CANTALAMESSA: What about do you 5 have any gun knowledge or training in 6 weapons, anything like that? 7 MS. WHEATLEY: I do not. My oldest son 8 is in the Army, and he is a fire support 9 specialist, but that has nothing to do with 10 me. 11 MS. CANTALAMESSA: None of that training 12 rubbed off on you? 13 MS. WHEATLEY: No. 14 MS. CANTALAMESSA: What about are you 15 able to follow the law and the instructions 16 as the judge gives it to you and keep out of 17 your mind what you think the law should be? 18 MS. WHEATLEY: Yes. 19 MS. CANTALAMESSA: The judge will read 20 you an instruction like I've been saying that 2.1 circumstantial evidence is to be equally --22 of equal weight as direct evidence. Are you 23 okay with that?

1	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: What about DNA or
3	fingerprint evidence? Do you have any reason
4	why you don't think that's reliable?
5	MS. WHEATLEY: I do not.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: I have nothing
7	further. Thank you.
8	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Meranto.
9	MR. MERANTO: Thanks. Good afternoon,
10	Ms. Wheatley. How are you?
11	MS. WHEATLEY: Fine, thank you.
12	MR. MERANTO: You're not getting bored
13	back there, are you?
14	MS. WHEATLEY: No.
15	MR. MERANTO: Have you ever made, like,
16	a big appliance purchase or something?
17	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
18	MR. MERANTO: You have? Did you shop
19	around, do any research? Or how did you make
20	the purchase?
21	MS. WHEATLEY: Definitely did research.
22	MR. MERANTO: You did? Okay. Did you
23	ever walk in and have a salesman try and give

1	you the hard sell and trying to get you to
2	walk out that day with something?
3	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
4	MR. MERANTO: And how did you handle it?
5	MS. WHEATLEY: If I had already made up
6	my mind, I would listen, but it wouldn't
7	waiver.
8	MR. MERANTO: So you want to know
9	something for yourself before you make a
10	decision?
11	MS. WHEATLEY: For the most part, yes.
12	I'm an educator. It's important.
13	MR. MERANTO: I have one of those in my
14	family, too. So also a rule follower, I
15	would assume?
16	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
17	MR. MERANTO: The judge tells you,
18	that's the way it is, even though you might
19	not quite agree with it?
20	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
21	MR. MERANTO: And you're able to apply
22	those standards, shopping, teaching, to
23	what's going on here?

1	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
2	MR. MERANTO: And right now you've got a
3	blank slate. If we send you back for a
4	verdict, verdict's not guilty; right?
5	MS. WHEATLEY: Correct.
6	MR. MERANTO: Okay. Thank you,
7	Ms. Wheatley.
8	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Meranto. Is
9	Ms. Wheatley passed for cause by the state?
10	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: By the defense?
12	MR. MERANTO: For cause, Your Honor,
13	yes.
14	THE COURT: All right. Then we'll
15	return to the state for the exercise of your
16	fourth and final peremptory challenge.
17	MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I have one
18	second, Your Honor?
19	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
20	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, the state
21	would like to thank but excuse seated in
22	Juror No. 11's seat right now, Mrs. Morell.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Morell, thank

1	you. Joseph Barber. How are you today?
2	MR. BARBER: Good, Your Honor. How are
3	you, sir?
4	THE COURT: I'm all right. Are you able
5	to hear the proceedings here at the front of
6	the courtroom?
7	MR. BARBER: Yes, sir.
8	THE COURT: Is there any reason you
9	can't sit as a fair and impartial juror in
10	this case?
11	MR. BARBER: I believe there is, yes.
12	THE COURT: Okay. I don't want you to
13	disclose what that is at this point. Do you
14	know anything about this case?
15	MR. BARBER: I've heard things.
16	THE COURT: I can't hear you.
17	MR. BARBER: I've heard things.
18	THE COURT: All right. Then we'll
19	retire to my chambers to discuss those
20	matters.
21	(WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel,
22	Defendant, Prospective Juror No. 11, Joseph
23	Barber, and court reporter enter the chambers

1	of the Court, and the following proceedings
2	were had.:)
3	THE COURT: So what have you heard?
4	MR. BARBER: Well, basically just
5	basically what I've read in the papers and
6	stuff like that. But unfortunately or
7	fortunately, whatever way you look at it, I
8	happened to work with Mr. Ferrara for a
9	period of years at GM.
LO	THE COURT: Yeah? So you know him?
L1	MR. BARBER: I do.
L2	THE COURT: When was the last you saw
L3	him?
L4	MR. BARBER: Oh, probably 1983,
L5	somewhere in that area, Judge.
L6	THE COURT: Okay. So your relationship
L7	with him before was just work related or
L8	social or what?
L9	MR. BARBER: Work related.
20	THE COURT: Why do you think that would
21	cause you trouble in deciding whether he's
22	guilty or not guilty of these offenses?
23	MR. BARBER: I just believe it may cloud

1	my judgment working with the fellow. I don't
2	know that I can be fair and honest at that
3	point.
4	THE COURT: Well, okay. Will you step
5	out of the room or just outside the door
6	there, Ryan?
7	THE BAILIFF: Sure.
8	THE COURT: Close the door when you're
9	outside there.
10	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 11,
11	Joseph Barber, left the chambers of the
12	court, and the proceedings continued as
13	follows:)
14	THE COURT: So any objection to excusing
15	this guy?
16	MS. DOHERTY: No, Your Honor.
17	MR. MERANTO: No objection.
18	MS. CANTALAMESSA: No.
19	THE COURT: He just doesn't want to do
20	it, obviously. Okay. I'll excuse him for
21	cause.
22	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 11,
23	Joseph Barber, returned to the chambers of

1 the court, and the proceedings continued as 2 follows:) 3 THE COURT: Mr. Barber, the parties and 4 I have discussed that situation, and we're 5 going to excuse you for cause. 6 MR. BARBER: Thank you, sir. 7 THE COURT: So you can go back upstairs. 8 Ryan will give you a card, and you can take 9 it up to the jury room, and they'll give you 10 further instructions. 11 (WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel, 12 Defendant and court reporter returned to the 13 court, and the following proceedings were had 14 back in the hearing of the prospective 15 jurors:) 16 THE COURT: All right. The court has 17 excused Mr. Barber for cause. Margaret 18 Starkey. Good afternoon. 19 MS. STARKEY: Good afternoon. 20 THE COURT: You're the one that was 2.1 standing up when I came in. I like you. 22 MS. STARKEY: I was trying to be 23 respectful.

1	THE COURT: That was very nice. Were
2	you able to hear the proceedings here at the
3	front of the courtroom?
4	MS. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: And was there anything that
6	I asked regarding challenges for cause that
7	applied to you?
8	MS. STARKEY: No, not at all.
9	THE COURT: Will you follow the law
10	given to you by the court and apply it to the
11	facts of this case?
12	MS. STARKEY: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Do you understand your role
14	as a juror, as an individual, and then as a
15	member of the group and what those duties
16	impose upon you?
17	MS. STARKEY: Yes, I do.
18	THE COURT. Are you able to fulfill
10	THE COURT: Are you able to fulfill
19	those duties?
19	those duties?
19 20	those duties?  MS. STARKEY: I hope so.

1	
1	case. Were you?
2	MS. STARKEY: Not really.
3	THE COURT: Okay. When you say not
4	really, that's one of those things that perks
5	up the ears of a lawyer, you know, because
6	it's not like
7	MS. STARKEY: I've never heard of
8	Mr. Ferrara before.
9	THE COURT: Okay. What about the case?
10	Have you heard anything about the case?
11	MS. STARKEY: No. Just the incident,
12	but not any charges that were brought against
13	anybody.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Would the fact that
15	you know about the incident, where is that
16	from? From the paper or from friends, or
17	from the news or what?
18	MS. STARKEY: A family member of mine.
19	THE COURT: Pardon?
20	MS. STARKEY: A family member of mine.
21	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, we
22	better go back to my office and discuss that.
23	(WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel,

1	Defendant, Prospective Juror No. 11, Margaret
2	Starkey, and court reporter enter the
3	chambers of the Court, and the following
4	proceedings were had:)
5	THE COURT: All right. How are you?
6	MS. STARKEY: I'm good. How are you
7	doing?
8	THE COURT: Okay. Can you tell me what
9	it is you've heard about the case, please?
10	MS. STARKEY: My father worked at the
11	General Motors Lordstown plant, and recently
12	he spoke with somebody he used to work with.
13	They're both retired. They had just said
14	that new evidence had come up in the case.
15	And I looked it up to see what happened, but
16	I really didn't read anything other than
17	Mr. Marsh and his family were killed.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MS. STARKEY: And I know it happened in
20	Canfield, but other than that, I don't know
21	even how they were killed.
22	THE COURT: Do you know anything about
23	Mr. Ferrara?

MS. STARKEY: I know Mr. Marsh was a security quard at Lordstown, but no.

THE COURT: You don't know anything about Mr. Ferrara?

MS. STARKEY: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So the important inquiry is whether or not what you've learned about it or found out about it outside of the courtroom you can set aside as if you've never heard that and not use that information in any way to decide the issues of this case?

MS. STARKEY: Right. Yes.

THE COURT: Can you do that?

MS. STARKEY: I believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. It's something you're probably not used to doing. Maybe you are.

Maybe I look at that the wrong way. Because sometimes we hear things and find out later on it's a bunch of malarkey. You know, sometimes it's just not accurate. But we can't test what we hear later against that we heard before. Like, you can't test the evidence against what your father—in—law or

1 whoever it is told you. 2 MS. STARKEY: Right. 3 THE COURT: You've got to forget what 4 anybody told you or what anybody said about 5 the case. Do you think you can do that? 6 MS. STARKEY: I can. My dad really 7 didn't say anything other than there was an 8 unsolved case back in the early '70s when he 9 first started working at General Motors, and 10 it was just a big thing out there that they never knew who did it. But he never said 11 12 that he knew who did or anything like that. 13 THE COURT: Okay. MS. STARKEY: 14 I just didn't want to tell 15 you I'd never heard of it because I did hear 16 of it happening. I just don't know what 17 happened or who. 18 Fair enough. So you feel THE COURT: 19 you can serve as a fair and impartial juror 20 in this case? 21 MS. STARKEY: Yeah. I don't know 22 anybody who has anything to gain or not gain 23 from the case.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. You're
2	excused then.
3	MS. STARKEY: Okay.
4	THE COURT: Back to the courtroom.
5	You're excused.
6	(WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel,
7	Defendant, Prospective Juror No. 11, Margaret
8	Starkey, and court reporter returned to the
9	court, and the following proceedings were had
10	back in the hearing of the prospective
11	jurors:)
12	THE COURT: All right, Ms. Starkey. We
13	are again here in the courtroom. Is it fair
14	to say that you can be fair and impartial in
15	your service in this case?
16	MS. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Very well. The state may
18	inquire.
19	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your
20	Honor. Good afternoon, Ms. Starkey.
21	MS. STARKEY: Good afternoon.
22	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Is there anything or
23	any reason why you think you wouldn't be able

1	to give police officers or doctors or
2	scientists the same consideration when
3	judging their credibility as any other
4	witness?
5	MS. STARKEY: No.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you promise to
7	keep everyone on an equal playing field until
8	you at least hear their testimony?
9	MS. STARKEY: Yes.
10	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you promise to
11	keep an open mind throughout the entirety of
12	the case and not render a decision or a
13	verdict until the close of the evidence?
14	MS. STARKEY: Yes.
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you promise to
16	use your reason and your common sense when
17	judging the evidence from the witness stand?
18	MS. STARKEY: I will.
19	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And you have two
20	kids?
21	MS. STARKEY: I do.
22	MS. CANTALAMESSA: So you've been able
23	to use the same tools we've been talking
	II

1 about when judging the credibility of, you 2 know, whether or not your kids broke 3 something, you can use those same tools you 4 use with your children with the witnesses on 5 the witness stand, can you not? 6 MS. STARKEY: I hope so. 7 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you think of any 8 reason why you should not sit on this case? 9 MS. STARKEY: No. 10 MS. CANTALAMESSA: You've already told 11 the judge that you would follow the law as 12 the judge gives it to you. Can you promise 13 as well to follow that rule or that piece 14 of -- that definition that says direct 15 evidence is of equal weight as circumstantial 16 evidence? 17 MS. STARKEY: Yes. MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. I have nothing 18 19 further. Thank you. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Meranto. 21 MR. MERANTO: Thanks, Judge. 22 Ms. Starkey, how many times have you heard me 23 ask about being fair to Mr. Ferrara? Enough

1	to last you the rest of your life?
2	MS. STARKEY: Yeah.
3	MR. MERANTO: You get it, though; right?
4	We're supposed to have an equal shake. And
5	just because he's been charged with something
6	doesn't mean anything now.
7	MS. STARKEY: Right.
8	MR. MERANTO: And you agree with that;
9	right?
10	MS. STARKEY: Absolutely. Yeah.
11	MR. MERANTO: Okay. Thank you.
12	MS. STARKEY: You're welcome.
13	THE COURT: All right. Is Ms. Starkey
14	passed for cause by the state?
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: By the defense?
17	MR. MERANTO: Pass for cause.
18	THE COURT: Thank you. We'll move to
19	the defendant for the exercise of your fourth
20	and final peremptory challenge.
21	MR. MERANTO: Your Honor, we're
22	satisfied with the jury as it is composed at
23	this point.

1 THE COURT: All right. So I need 2 everyone back in my chambers, and I'd like Juror No. 4, Ms. Crump. 3 4 (WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel, 5 Defendant, Prospective Juror No. 4, Florida 6 Crump, and court reporter enter the chambers 7 of the Court, and the following proceedings 8 were had:) 9 THE COURT: Ms. Crump, my bailiff 10 informed me that you told him that you have 11 concert plans on Wednesday night? 12 MS. CRUMP: Yes. 13 THE COURT: And you told him that after 14 lunch or something? 15 MS. CRUMP: Right. 16 You probably should've told THE COURT: 17 us before that, because when we're picking a 18 jury and exercise of peremptories and 19 determining who should be on, who should not 20 be on and all that, all that changes 2.1 depending upon who's sitting there. I'll do 22 my best to accommodate you. 23 MS. CRUMP: Okay.

But I can't promise you I 1 THE COURT: 2 can let you go. It's your birthday that day? 3 MS. CRUMP: My birthday was Saturday, 4 but my in-laws are -- this is my treat, my 5 birthday present. I tried to contact the 6 office, I asked them what should I do, and I 7 asked someone earlier when I first came in up 8 at the office to, you know, I told them the 9 circumstances. So this was, like, the first time I had a chance to talk to him about it. 10 11 Because I had called the office, like, last 12 week, and they told me that I would have to 13 speak with you. 14 **THE COURT:** So what's the latest you 15 could be here Wednesday? 16 Well, I don't -- they want MS. CRUMP: 17 to have dinner, but if I can't get out to 18 dinner then I just can't. That's not the 19 most important part. The most important part 20 is getting to the concert. 21 THE COURT: When's the concert? 22 MS. CRUMP: It's at 7:30 in Cleveland. 23 THE COURT: Well, normally we go until

4:00 or 4:30, and, you know, I don't have a problem trying to accommodate you.

Everybody's happy with you sitting as a juror. I just can't promise you that if I have a witness from North Carolina or something that's here, and is here and has to go back that night, I've got to accommodate that. Unfortunately, that's not viewed as an emergency, but we should be able to accommodate you is what I would tell you.

MS. CRUMP: Okay.

THE COURT: We should be able to get you out of here probably by 4:00 or so. That's what we'll try and do.

MS. CRUMP: Okay.

THE COURT: You're okay with that? I mean, I don't want you being — that you would hold it against anybody. Or if you're going to hold it against anybody, it's got to be me because I'm the one that's got to make the decisions. It's not either of the parties.

MS. CRUMP: No, sir. I understood that

1	when I got the jury summons.
2	THE COURT: Well, that's fair enough.
3	That's great. Okay. Well, we'll do what we
4	can do.
5	MS. CRUMP: Thank you, sir.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
7	(WHEREUPON, Prospective Juror No. 4,
8	Florida Crump, left the chambers of the
9	court, and the proceedings continued as
10	follows:)
11	THE COURT: So I plan on keeping her
12	unless there's somebody that feels different
13	about that.
14	MS. DOHERTY: I'm fine, Judge.
15	MR. MERANTO: I don't have an objection
16	if you wanted to let her off. I mean, I
17	don't.
18	THE COURT: I don't want to let her off.
19	MR. MERANTO: I know.
20	THE COURT: And I'll tell you why,
21	because jurors do this all the time. They
22	don't tell people. I'm the one that's got to
23	decide, and if the jury office told her

anything, it's when you go down there, you better let him know that.

MR. MERANTO: Yeah.

THE COURT: Because I'm the one who decides who stays on this jury. The fact that she waits until that time to disclose it to my bailiff is — that's her tough luck as far as I'm concerned. At the same time, I don't want her — I don't want to deny her. I just know that things don't always go the way you plan them. So —

MS. DOHERTY: Judge, if it -- if it makes a difference, our out of state witnesses should be done way before that.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MERANTO: Okay.

THE COURT: We should be okay that way.

I was planning on keeping her. We're going to pick alternates now anyhow. So push comes to shove, we'll deal with that. So because of her situation, just be aware that the alternate selection is very important.

MR. MERANTO: Okay.

1 THE COURT: I don't think I would excuse 2 her and put an alternate in unless everybody 3 agreed to do that under the circumstances, 4 but you each get a peremptory in the 5 selection of alternates. 6 MR. MERANTO: And we may not even be dealing with it is what you're -- okay. 7 8 THE COURT: Exactly. 9 (WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel, 10 Defendant and court reporter returned to the 11 court, and the following proceedings were had 12 back in the hearing of the prospective 13 jurors:) 14 THE COURT: All right, ladies and 15 gentlemen. You've been selected as the jury 16 who will hear the factual issues of this 17 case. Will you all please stand now and 18 raise your right hands? 19 (WHEREUPON, the prospective jurors were 20 administered the oath or affirmation at 2:20 p.m., November 18, 2013, after which the 2.1 22 proceedings continued as follows:) 23 Very well. Please be THE COURT:

seated. The next order of business is to select an alternate juror. We should be able to select one alternate. Each of the parties is entitled to a peremptory challenge in the selection of an alternate juror.

The alternate is like a pinch hitter in a baseball game. You travel with the team. You practice with the team, dress with the team. You attend all the team functions. The only difference is you may not be a part of the group that actually deliberates and decides the case because this jury will be doing that, barring any dire emergency.

If a dire emergency does occur and I have to excuse someone, then the alternate would take that person's place and deliberate the case the same as one of the regular panel members. So you need to give us your full and undivided attention throughout the trial and participate as if you will be deciding the case.

So we will call Jennifer Makosky. How are you today?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. How are you?
2	THE COURT: I'm good, thank you. I
3	think you're the first to ask that. I'm
4	okay. The court would ask if you were able
5	to hear all of the proceedings here at the
6	front of the courtroom?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
8	THE COURT: And did you understand the
9	role of alternate as it's described?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Are you comfortable in that
12	role?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Were there any challenges
15	for cause that were applicable to you?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
17	THE COURT: There was a lot of
18	discussion about the law and the conduct of
19	jurors and the different things that the
20	lawyers ask about how you should think about
21	the case, how you should evaluate things.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
23	THE COURT: Do you have any issues with

those things that have been presented to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: There's also discussion about any publicity about the case. Have you been exposed to any publicity or conversation about the case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: So if that would happen, there's going to be -- I've got people out in the hallway, media out in the hallway waiting to get in. It's kind of fascinating because every case that we try is a big deal. Most important case in the whole world. While we're doing it nothing could be more important. But they don't always show up. Sometimes it's important to them. Sometimes it's not. But they'll be writing stories. They may be in here from day to day, that type of thing.

And I should tell all of you here and now, they're not permitted to photograph you. They're not permitted to expose you in any way. And, in fact, it's improper for them to

1	do that. So much so, I'd put them in jail if
2	they did. So they don't mess with you.
3	Don't be concerned about that at all. But
4	they will write and report, as they should.
5	You have to avoid any publicity about the
6	case from now on. You have to make sure that
7	you're not exposed to that influence by that
8	in any way. Can you follow that instruction?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
10	THE COURT: And then as far as
11	deliberating with the other jurors, making
12	your voice heard?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: You're okay with that, too?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yep.
16	THE COURT: Can you think of any reason
17	why you should not sit as a fair and
18	impartial juror in this case?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
20	THE COURT: Very well. The state may
21	inquire.
22	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your
23	Honor. Good afternoon.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Ms. Makosky, you
3	mentioned in your questionnaire that you had
4	your house broken into and your car broken
5	into?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Was that both of them
8	two times?
9	<b>PROSPECTIVE JUROR:</b> Yeah. Separate
10	occasions.
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Were those all in
12	Campbell?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. We were
14	renovating a house in Youngstown. It was
15	broken into. We had two firearms stolen out
16	of the house.
17	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Did they ever catch
18	anybody?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
20	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you have a CCW
21	license?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. My boyfriend
23	does.

1 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you have any 2 firearm training? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 4 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Let's go back to the 5 first set of questions. Because they never 6 found anyone in those situations, do you hold 7 any ill will towards the police or the 8 justice system or anything? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 10 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Do you think sitting 11 there right now that you would tend to side 12 with either the state or the defense because 13 of that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 14 No. MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you promise to 15 16 keep the police, doctors, scientists, all on 17 an equal level until you hear their testimony 18 before deciding how much or how little 19 credibility to give them? 20 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR:** Yes. 2.1 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can you promise to 22 keep an open mind like the judge said 23 throughout the entirety of the case if you

1	were to sit and render a verdict as one of
2	the main jurors before deciding anything?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
4	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Any religious, moral,
5	or ethical reasons why you couldn't sit in
6	judgment of someone else?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
8	MS. CANTALAMESSA: You can follow the
9	instructions that says direct evidence is of
LO	equal weight as circumstantial evidence?
L1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
L2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: I have nothing
L3	further. Thank you.
L4	THE COURT: Thank you. The defense may
L5	now inquire.
L6	MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
L7	Hi, Ms. Makosky.
L8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi.
L9	MR. MERANTO: Do you work as a nurse?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I'm going to
21	school for it.
22	MR. MERANTO: You're going to school?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

1	<b>MR. MERANTO:</b> Do you do any do they
2	call them clinicals still?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I have one more
4	prerequisite, and then I'm going to nursing
5	school.
6	MR. MERANTO: Oh, okay. Do you like the
7	sciences?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
9	MR. MERANTO: Is it interesting to you?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
11	MR. MERANTO: Do you watch any of these
12	shows that involve this kind of forensic
13	science or anything?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I always miss
15	them. I never catch them.
16	MR. MERANTO: Okay. How long have you
17	been in college?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About three years
19	total.
20	MR. MERANTO: Doing okay?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
22	MR. MERANTO: Good, decent grades?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, yeah.

1 MR. MERANTO: Some students better than 2 others? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. 4 MR. MERANTO: Pretty much agree that's, 5 you know, that's what makes the world go 6 round; everybody's different, everybody has different talents, different skills? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 8 Yes. 9 MR. MERANTO: Okay. Just because 10 somebody comes in, let's say, wearing a 11 uniform, policeman or something, have anymore 12 credibility in your mind than anybody else? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 13 MR. MERANTO: How about someone 14 15 that's -- they say, well, I'm a scientist? 16 You still going to listen to what they have 17 to say and analyze it based on what you know 18 and how you do things? 19 Yeah, I'll listen to PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 20 what he has to say. 21 MR. MERANTO: Okay. So you're not just 22 going to blanketly accept anything that's 23 told to you?

1	<b>PROSPECTIVE JUROR:</b> No. I'm going to
2	weigh everything that comes along with it.
3	MR. MERANTO: Just because somebody sits
4	on the witness stand, you're not going to
5	believe it's necessarily true; right?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I'm going to
7	listen to what he has to say and take it from
8	there.
9	MR. MERANTO: Thank you.
10	THE COURT: Is Ms. Makosky passed for
11	cause by the state?
12	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: And by the defense?
14	MR. MERANTO: Pass for cause, Your
15	Honor.
16	THE COURT: Does the state have a
17	peremptory challenge?
18	MS. CANTALAMESSA: No, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Does the defense have a
20	peremptory challenge?
21	MR. MERANTO: No, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: All right, Ms. Makosky.
23	Will you please stand and raise your right

hand?

\_

(WHEREUPON, the alternate juror was administered the oath or affirmation at 2:26 p.m., November 18, 2013, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: Very well. Please be seated. I have to read that because in 1975 when I started as a bailiff, we had an oath that we gave to jurors that I know by heart because we gave it forever. And our legislature decided they're going to change the oath. I don't know why. So that's what we have to do now is read you that oath and have you do that.

So those of you ladies and gentlemen in the rear of the courtroom are not going to be needed for service in this case. We would like to thank you kindly for your patience and your service here today. This jury has been selected, so you're excused to go back up to Mr. Jackson's office, and he'll give you further instructions. Thank you kindly.

(WHEREUPON, the remaining prospective

jurors left the courtroom, and the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen. I'm going to tell you why you are here. You're here because there are charges made against this defendant by the State of Ohio. You've heard what those charges are, and the defendant has denied the truth of those charges. So you are here to decide what the truth is.

In order to do that you should determine the credibility or the believability of the witnesses. And, in fact, I'll give you an instruction on credibility which I'll give you now and I'll give you at the end of the case also. Credibility instruction includes the fact that people may be completely honest in their rendition of what they think occurred, but they could be mistaken. They could be completely inaccurate and untruthful. Those are things you have to decide.

And so what the credibility issue for

you to determine is with each person that testifies is whether or not that person should be believed and what weight you should give to their testimony. It's not a scientific thing. It's something that you do every day in deciding whether or not somebody's telling you the truth. You see it in the news all the time where somebody will tell you something one day and something different the next day.

So you are the sole judges of the facts of this case and the credibility or believability of the witnesses and the weight to give to the evidence. To weigh the evidence you must consider the credibility of everyone who testifies, and you should apply the tests of truthfulness which you use in your daily lives to determine whether or not someone is telling you the truth. These tests include the actual physical appearance of the witness upon the witness stand; the witness' manner of testifying; the reasonableness of the testimony; the

opportunity that witness had to see and hear and know the things concerning which he or she testifies; the witness' accuracy of memory; frankness, or lack of it; intelligence; interest in the outcome of the case and bias, if any; together with all the facts and circumstances surrounding the testimony.

Applying these tests and any tests you normally use to determine whether or not someone is telling you the truth, you will assign to the testimony of each witness such weight or value as you deem proper. You are not required to believe the testimony of any witness simply because he or she was under oath. You may believe all or part or none of the testimony of any witness. It is entirely within your province to determine what testimony is worthy of belief and what testimony is not worthy of belief.

So your mission is to find out the truth of this case. It is an adversarial system.

These parties obviously disagree, or we

2.1

wouldn't be here. You're here to resolve the disagreement.

Because it is adversarial, each of them may object to what the other does, and that normally will be done in open court where a lawyer will stand up and say objection. And that calls upon me to make a ruling. An objection has to be made by interrupting what's going on. It's not rude. It's not improper. In fact, if you don't object on time, you blow the objection. You can't just sit there and let it happen and say now I object. You have to object while it's going on, and I have to rule while it's going on. So don't be offended if the lawyers interrupt one another to object.

I do not allow speeches on objections.

I don't allow, you know, an attempt to influence you by arguing to me what's up. If indeed there is a discussion that has to be made or had about an objection, we'll do it over there at side bar so you can't hear it because that is a legal decision I have to

make. It's not a factual decision that you have to make.

The lawyers are well prepared, and they've worked hard on this case already. We've met several times since the case was brought to discuss the various issues of the case. So you can count on them to be prepared and do their job, as you're expected to do your job. Your job is to absorb everything that is presented to you without judging it as you're absorbing it. Take it in. Hold it. Put it together with everything else that you hear, and at the appropriate time, figure out what it is that should happen.

So your ability to pay attention is very important. You need to be focused. You need to stay awake. You need to dedicate yourselves for this mission.

The court does not allow you to ask questions. So if the witness is up there and the lawyers sit down and say we're done with this witness, and you have a question, you

can't say, hey, I'd like to know this or that. It won't happen, so don't attempt it. Don't think about it. What's presented to you is evidence. What's not presented to you is not evidence. And either one of them can say things to you, production of evidence or the non-production of evidence in determining what happened in this case.

Additionally, you're not permitted to take notes. I'm a note taker. I've always done that. And what happens when I'm taking notes, somebody will ask a question, an objection will be made, and I don't know what happened because I'm paying attention to writing the note instead of paying attention to what's going on. You can't do that. You can't be distracted in any way.

You need to observe these people,
because you have to -- you have to judge a
witness' credibility. You can't do that
while you're taking notes. You have 12
persons here, so if you do miss something
that's being presented, your collective

memory will serve to resolve that lapse of memory and is sufficient for you to recall what happened.

Again, I repeat that even though we're taking a record of these proceedings, you're not going to get that record. Sometimes juries will go back and say, we want Witness No. 1's testimony written up and sent back here, a transcript. Well, that won't happen, so pay attention as we're doing all of this.

It's important that you are on time.

And we do respect your time. We will move these matters as expeditiously as possible.

There are things that occur during a trial that delay the normal flow of a trial. If a novel issue comes up, if something happens, we have to change plans.

We may have to go back into my office to discuss what's up. We may have to take a recess to discuss what's up. And those things normally need to be discussed out of your hearing. But for the most part we'll move pretty well, and you need to hang on.

It's a roller coaster ride when they present everything to you that you need to hear in as efficient a method as possible.

The court does have other duties. I have several other cases, as I mentioned before, but those are not going to be addressed while we're in this case. This is what I'm doing. This is the very most important thing in the whole world to me. It should be the very most important thing in the whole world to you. It certainly is to these lawyers and the parties in this case, so please treat it that way.

Again, we'd like to thank you for any sacrifice that you're making to be here.

It's very important that you serve as jurors and that you are a part of seeing to it that justice is done. It's certainly the most important function you can serve as citizens of this country, short of serving in the United States military.

Your conduct is very crucial. Your undivided attention is demanded, so you have

to avoid any distractions. You're here to see to it that justice is done. That's a high calling. That's a big deal. So do your best to do your duty.

It's okay to have fun, too. You'll note that I'm sometimes irreverent in my fun and try to have a good time. It does break the tension. It doesn't mean that this isn't a serious matter. It just means that we need to have fun while we're doing it. Usually we do a better job if we can do that.

I should also tell you that the lawyers are all fine people. As I indicated, they're friends of mine, but they're not permitted to talk with you now. So if you run into them in the hallway or out at Johnny's restaurant tonight or whatever, they can't talk with you. It's inappropriate for them to do that other than say hello to you, that type of thing. When the case is over, of course, you can spend all the time with them that you like, but not until the case is over.

The function of the jury is kind of

2.1

fascinating. The goal is to select 12 people from every different type of background and belief and experience and put you all together here, no one known to the other, and have you listen to the evidence of this case and be impressed as you may be individually, 12 different ways, 13 different ways, and then to go back into the jury room and be locked in there after we've thrown all this information at you and instructed you in law that it's taken us years and years and years to learn and understand, and tell you make sure that you do the right thing and render justice in this case.

And somehow if you do it as we prescribe, that you come here as individuals, you avoid any influences from any source, you pay attention to everything, and you think this through and evaluate it, and then you listen to what the other jurors have to say, and all 12 of you can agree one way or another, then you have to know it's the right thing. You have to know we did it the right

2.1

way and that justice is served. So that's the goal. That's what we want from you. And if you fulfill it that way, we'll be very proud of your work in the case, and it will be an experience that you'll remember fondly the rest of your lives.

So it's very important that you be fair and attentive throughout the trial. You are not to discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone else. You must not permit anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence. And you must not form or express any opinion about the case until it is submitted to you.

More difficult for you to understand is that you may not discuss this case among yourselves until it's finally submitted to you or with members of your family, or with your friends, your people that you work with, because as we know as human beings, whenever we're talking about something and we talk with someone else about it, what they have to say influences how we think and how we feel.

MAHONING COUNTY YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

You have to avoid that during the trial.

You should explain this rule to your family and your friends. Tell them you've been instructed not to discuss the case, and I'm sure they'll respect what you're doing. When it's over, you can talk to anybody you like. You could all go to dinner together and talk it over. You could talk to the media about it. You could write a book if you'd like. Anything's okay when it's done. But until that time, you need to follow these instructions.

You're not permitted to investigate the case in any way. You can't go to the scene. You can't ask questions about it. You can't do anything at all. It's highly improper for you to do that.

Likewise, no one must discuss the matter with you or attempt to influence you in any way. If anyone does, that has to be reported to me immediately. That's a criminal offense, and it has to be dealt with immediately and assuredly.

I've already indicated there may be newspaper, television, radio coverage.

Again, you don't need to worry about you or your identity being exposed in any way through the media. You are not to be photographed. You're instructed not to read, view, or listen to any report in the newspaper, radio, or television on the subject of this trial, nor to allow anyone to disclose any of that information to you.

We should complete this case this week, and so that's pretty much all that we're asking of you at this time. The lawyers next will present opening statements to you, but we're going to take a recess before we do that.

The court instructs you again, please, I have to repeat this, during your absence from the courtroom not to discuss this case at all among yourselves or with anyone else. Please do not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence. Do not form or express any opinion about the case.

2.1

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 Your headquarters will be the jury room. 2 Mr. Martino will conduct you to and from the 3 jury room. You're okay to move about outside 4 of the jury room out in the hallway. 5 Probably best not to come down this way 6 because the parties are busy. The witnesses 7 are down this way, and the court has business 8 down this way. But if you need something, 9 there's a buzzer in the jury room. You can 10 ring it, and Ryan will magically appear and 11 answer any questions that you may have. All 12 right. We'll be in recess until 3:00. 13 (WHEREUPON, a brief recess was had, 14 after which the proceedings continued as 15 follows:)

THE COURT: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. The trial will now begin with the opening statements of counsel. The lawyers' statements are very helpful, ladies and gentlemen, but they're not evidence. So what they're going to tell you is what they think the evidence will show or what the evidence won't show, and it will help you understand

the case as it is presented to you. But again, what they say to you is not evidence. All right. The state may begin.

MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Doherty.

MS. DOHERTY: May it please the court, counsel, Detective Mondora, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. On December 14th, 1974, the bodies of Benjamin Marsh, he was 33, Marilyn Marsh, she was 32, Heather Marsh, she was 4 years old, their bodies were found in their home in Canfield, Ohio.

You are going to hear and learn a little bit about Ben and Marilyn and their family.

You're going to learn that Ben and his brother, his older brother, Bill, grew up in the area. And Ben graduated from high school in 1959. He went to the Navy. He was in the Navy for about four years, and he had planned to go into his father's business, which his dad was a barber.

He was going to do that. He started doing that, but it turned into the 1970s, and

quite frankly, hair was getting longer. Late '60s, I should say. Hair was getting longer. The barber business wasn't working out quite as well as it had. So Ben Marsh got a job at GM in Lordstown.

In the meantime, in 1964, he married Marilyn. Her last name was Fowler at the time. He married Marilyn. They had two children. Heather was born in 1970. Christopher was born in 1973.

Ben, his job at GM was in security. He worked in security. He at the time of his death was a sergeant in the security department at GM. GM employed thousands of people at the time, and they had literally their own security force, and Ben was part of that. That's where he worked.

Marilyn was a teacher. She taught at a school for the blind. Once she had the children, she wasn't teaching. She was staying home. They bought a house, and they lived in Canfield at 5540 Turner Road in Canfield.

And at that time, Canfield was certainly less populated. The area where this took place, it was a quiet area, pretty remote.

Not a lot of houses around like there are today. So a couple acres, pretty quiet.

On the morning of December 13th, 1974,
Ben had gotten home from work. He worked
midnights. He worked 11:00 to 7:00 in
security. And he got home that morning, and
that was his routine. He would get home. He
would go to sleep. He had been working all
night. On that morning, Marilyn had a
dentist appointment approximately 10:00,
10:30. And because Ben was sleeping, she
took the children -- she took Heather, and
she took Christopher who was one, just had
turned one, to Ben's parents' house who lived
about 15 minutes away so that Ben's parents
could watch the kids and Marilyn could go to
her dentist appointment, which she did.

She returned from the dentist, picked up the kids, 11:30 or so, and went home. She was going to go home to see Ben. She had

2.1

gotten a few groceries.

And you'll hear the house described, but I'll tell you, it's a ranch house. It's a ranch. There is a garage. They had a Genie garage door opener.

This is December. There's snow on the ground. December 13th. Quite a bit of snow. And when Marilyn arrived home, 11:30, almost 12:00 noon, she pulled into the garage. She drove an orange Vega. Probably don't see those anymore. She pulled into the garage and was going to unload the kids and the groceries.

They all had winter coats on. Marilyn, both kids. Christopher was not quite walking yet. He was toddling around a little bit you'll hear, but not really walking on his own much.

Marilyn had a few groceries. And it was getting to be lunchtime. She pulled into the garage, probably shut the garage door behind her. The entrance into the house through the garage had a storm door and then a solid

door. There was a back door, a man door, that entered into the garage. But Marilyn, juggling the kids, juggling the groceries, went into the house, which actually led into a dining room, or den kind of room, which then led into the kitchen. Still with the winter coats on, carrying the groceries.

She gets into the house. What she didn't know was that Ben was already dead, or being killed at the time. Their bedroom, the bedroom that Marilyn and Ben shared was at the back of the house, down the hallway from the kitchen area where she entered the house.

Ben was shot four times. He was beaten. He was beaten so severely that the damage to his head actually affected — cracked his skull. But he was also shot four times. And his body was in his bedroom.

We don't know when Marilyn realized that someone else was in the house with her. But they did not have their — they didn't have time to take their coats off. Marilyn still had her winter coat on, shoes. Heather, same

thing. Christopher still had his winter coat on.

Marilyn was shot once in the back of the head in the foyer area right in front of the front door going into the kitchen. Heather was beaten. The coroner will tell you, it's done with a gun. She wasn't shot, but she was beaten. We know that Ben was shot four times. Marilyn was shot once.

And there was a round that went up into the ceiling of that foyer area. This was a .38 that was used, a .38 firearm which held the six bullets. So by the time Marilyn was killed and Ben was dead, there were no bullets left. But Heather was beaten. Christopher was alive. Like I said, he wasn't walking at that point.

This would've been around noon of the 13th of December. Not in the days of cell phones, people weren't in contact with each other constantly like we're used to now. And the next day on the 14th, when Ben didn't go to work, he hadn't called, GM had been trying

to contact him, the house phone, trying to call the phone, no answer. Throughout that day, they tried to reach Ben.

At some point in the early evening of the 14th, about 33 hours later, Frank Boyle, who lived about three quarters of a mile away, who was also an employee at GM, best friends with Ben, their families were together all the time, Frank Boyle received a call that — from GM asking him to go to the house, see what's going on. Why didn't Ben come to work? Why didn't he call?

So early evening, it's dark, deserted kind of area, very quiet, Frank Boyle, who you'll hear from, went to the house on Turner Road. When he arrived, Ben's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marsh, were also there, because they also had not been able to reach anyone from the family since the day before. The garage door was closed. The garage door going in — the car garage door was closed. The house was dark. The front door was locked, including the screen door.

Now, Mr. Marsh, Ben's dad, had a key to that front door, but he and Frank Boyle couldn't get through the screen door. So the only thing they could think of to do was take that door off because they knew they had to get into that house. It was dark. They could see movement, but they didn't know what was going on in the house. So they, in fact, took that screen door off of the front of the house, and Mr. Marsh used his key to make entrance.

And when they entered, it was the foyer, and the movement that they had seen was Christopher. And he was alive, but he was covered in his mother's blood. And Frank Boyle and Mr. Marsh walked into that scene right in the foyer. Marilyn Marsh was dead. Heather Marsh was dead. Mr. Marsh went to check on Ben, determined that he was dead.

Frank Boyle immediately picked up
Christopher. They noticed that there were
three bottles. Marilyn had apparently been
getting bottles ready for Christopher, even

2.1

before she took their coats off. It was almost noon, and the bottles were there on the counter.

And Mrs. Marsh was actually still outside waiting in the car, but she did come in. Mrs. Marsh and Frank Boyle took
Christopher to Mr. Boyle's house to get him away from that scene. They literally had to cut the clothing off of him. He was covered in blood, still had his winter coat on, and it was dried. They could not take his clothes off. But they did. They cut them off, bagged them up.

And Mr. Boyle went back to the house on Turner Road, to Ben Marsh's house. The police were called, called from the Marsh's residence. And then, as now, the Mahoning County Sheriff's Department had jurisdiction in Canfield, or had jurisdiction in the outer areas. So the law enforcement agency that responded was the Mahoning County Sheriff's Department, and they did. They responded, arrived at that scene, and learned that they

MAHONING COUNTY YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

had a triple homicide.

Mr. Marsh and Mr. Boyle gave the police the information that they had at the time that they arrived, what they found. And the Sheriff's Department began their investigation, and it turned out to be a 40-year investigation. 1974, a long time ago.

Again, as now, the agency BCI, we call it BCI, it is the Bureau of Criminal Investigation and Identification. It is a state agency that provides crime scene They provide fingerprint processing. analysis, DNA analysis for law enforcement agencies for the state, and even back in 1974, that was their function. And they did have about 30 agents who went to crime scenes when requested by departments that maybe didn't have as much ability, the good cameras, that kind of thing. So BCI many times was called in to assist in processing the scene, and that's what was done in this case.

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

A man named Bernie Albert who was an agent of BCI at the time in 1974 responded. He worked this area of the state, and he had responded to that scene. Obviously numerous law enforcement personnel were already there, detectives.

And a lot of these names you'll hear, unfortunately, a lot of the investigating officers are deceased. Detective Nemeth was the primary detective investigating this case. He worked for the Sheriff's Department. So it really would've been his job to call in whoever he needed to help assist. One of the deputies who had been with the Sheriff's Department for about a year and a half I think by then is a Mike Finamore, and he responded as well. Again, this wasn't a situation where anyone had cell phones, so it happened that deputies would call in, and they would be told to go out to whatever scene it was.

And you'll hear from Deputy Finamore. Actually, he's not a deputy anymore. He's

retired and went on to do other things in law enforcement. He is retired. But he responded to that scene, and he'll walk you through it. He'll tell you what he saw. He will identify the photographs that we have to explain to you just what happened here.

One of the things that he was responsible for was to assist Bernie Albert in processing that scene. And he had been working with the Sheriff's Department for some time and had been with detectives at crime scenes. He was trained as all the police officers were at that time through OPATA, which is the Ohio Peace Officer's Training, and he worked with Bernie Albert in collecting evidence. And he'll tell you that he got there around 9:30 p.m. that evening, and that Mr. Albert arrived about 11:00 p.m. He was called in from a little bit farther away.

But they began processing the scene, and the first thing that Deputy Finamore did was take Mr. Albert to the point of entry. And

2.1

2.1

he'll tell you that the back door, that man door I described going into the garage, because there was so much snow, they were able to see that there was one set of footprints that led to that door around the back of the house from the driveway area. And that door had three panes of glass. The bottom pane of glass was broken.

The door then going into the house, the one with the storm door, where Marilyn would've entered into the house, had been kicked in. They could see clearly a footprint, shoe print on that door, and the screen door, the storm door, had been propped open, possibly by Marilyn, because when the police arrived, that door was propped open. She had kids. She had groceries. May not have even realized that that door had been opened like that.

He took them through the kitchen area, through the foyer area to locate where the bodies were. They began looking for anything that the killer would've left at that scene

to identify who had done this. And starting with that entry door into the garage, Bernie Albert processed that door. You're going to hear about fingerprints. You're going to hear about how fingerprints are lifted.

Along with Mike Finamore, who was there with him, Bernie Albert dusted the door.

And at this point, Bernie Albert and Mike Finamore are literally just going through the house trying to find anything that they could use to identify who had done this. And they start with that back door. They process the door. Mr. Albert in the presence of Mike Finamore is able to lift a number of prints. And we'll talk to you about that.

They'll testify as to how that is done. It literally is a matter of taking those prints from that door. They dust it with powder. They tape over it, lift those prints, which is a piece of evidence, place them on a white piece of cardboard.

Mr. Finamore will talk to you about the

2.1

process that took place all through the house, other doors that were examined, other doors that had prints lifted.

Now, obviously Benjamin Marsh lived in that house. His prints are going to be located in various places on doors, on refrigerators. But they were looking for anything they could find to tell them who did this.

They collected one projectile. And you'll hear about ballistics and revolvers and the fact that revolvers do not leave shell casings. But the projectiles, one projectile was found in the bedroom where Ben was, and one projectile, there was a hole in the ceiling, in the foyer area. And Mr. Finamore and Bernie Albert spent hours up in that attic trying to find that bullet, which they did.

The processing of that scene probably was a little different than what you would expect to hear today. This was 1974. There wasn't talk of DNA then. There wasn't talk

of touch DNA, anything like that. What those law enforcement officers focused on were fingerprints. Once the entire scene was processed, evidence was collected, fingerprints were lifted.

The BCI agents that actually collect the prints and the deputy, this deputy who assisted, they aren't the one who is actually doing the examination and the comparison. So those prints, any prints that were lifted, were ultimately then examined by an agent and an analyst at BCI who would be able to look at prints, latent prints, lift it from a scene, and compare those with known prints. Somebody if they had their prints on file, they would compare them.

Autopsies were performed on Ben,
Marilyn, and Heather. And from Ben, three
bullets, fired rounds were recovered. From
Marilyn, a fragment of one fired round was
recovered. The cause of death for Ben,
obviously multiple gunshot wounds; four. But
he was also beaten. The cause of death for

Marilyn was gunshot wound to the head. And Heather was beaten about the head and face.

Many law enforcement officers worked on this case at the time. And because there was no computerized system to examine prints, to look at any kind of a database, they just were simply unable to do that. It just didn't exist. So the only option that they had, because they had good prints that they wanted to compare, prints off of that back door, they literally looked at people in the area who had been arrested. They looked at people who had maybe committed a similar crime.

And it turned out, there were about 160 different times, different people, people that they were interested in maybe because they knew that they had committed some kind of crime in the Mahoning County area. So they compared all of those prints over the next couple years. Never had a match. Of all of the people that they looked at, tried to investigate, never had a match for the

OFFICIAL SHORTHAND REPORTERS
MAHONING COUNTY YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

1 prints.

A couple years later, the case went cold. Not the detectives — not that they gave up, but they literally had no ability to do a larger search. They just didn't have the ability to do it. I don't think it was ever out of their minds, but they literally just ran out of leads.

They had those prints. They knew they were significant. They knew they were important. They had a cigarette butt from the scene as well. It was collected probably a couple days later, but again, they just didn't have any leads.

In 2009, Detective Mondora and Detective Benigas were asked by the sheriff to open up the cold case. Give it some fresh eyes.

Look at the case. See if there is anything that can be done at this point, given that we have more technology now, given that we have a broader scope to be able to examine it.

Detective Mondora and Detective Benigas did just that. They contacted BCI. There

are a number of BCI offices. One is in London, Ohio. One is in Richfield. And they determined from reviewing the paperwork of all of the files connected to this case that the evidence, the physical evidence, the fingerprints, had been kept at BCI in London all of this time, because that's where they were taken when they were being compared all through the few years after this occurred.

So Detective Mondora and Detective
Benigas contacted BCI in London, and they
talked to an analyst named Robin Ladd, and
she informed them that yes, in fact, we have
those prints. This is our system. We have a
vault. We kept those prints all of these
years secure in the event that maybe someday
we may be able to do something with them.

Because fingerprints became computerized in the years following these murders, Robin Ladd was able to actually enter the lifted prints from that back door into a database. And what resulted was a match to James Ferrara.

Now, James Ferrara, once the detective started looking, he worked at GM at the time that Benjamin Marsh worked there, about 1970 to 1983. He worked at GM. He was a union committeeman. And they decided that their next step should be, talk to James Ferrara, get his actual prints.

Now, granted, the computerized system connected those prints to the latent lifts, but BCI, our analyst, wanted his prints lifted, and that's what they did. They contacted James Ferrara. They obtained his fingerprints.

And they talked to him about whether or not he knew Benjamin Marsh. He didn't know Ben Marsh, never been to his house. He told them he had never been to his house. He didn't know Ben Marsh. He didn't know the family. Never been there. Never been there.

He's charged with three counts of aggravated murder. And the way that the charges read, and I know the judge talked to you a little bit about it, purposely causing

2.1

2.1

the death while committing or attempting to commit either an aggravated burglary and/or an aggravated robbery. The aggravated burglary obviously is gaining entrance, trespassing into that home to commit a criminal offense. In this case, James Ferrara went in there to kill Ben Marsh, ultimately killed Marilyn and Heather.

The aggravated robbery, Detective -Officer Finamore will tell you, as well as
Mr. Boyle, nothing was ransacked in that
home. The TV was still there. Ben's
paycheck was still on the counter. Small
amounts of money were still there. But in
order to leave that scene, James Ferrara took
Marilyn's Vega, her orange Vega. That was
the only thing missing from that scene.

One set of footprints into that back door. And the conclusion can be that he was either dropped off, or somebody was waiting for him, but for whatever reason, that someone left, and after this entire family was killed, other than Christopher, the only

MAHONING COUNTY YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

2.1

way to leave was to take that Vega. The Vega was discovered hours later after the discovery of the bodies, so more than 33 hours later at a K-mart in Austintown in the parking lot. That is the aggravated robbery.

The judge talked to you a little bit about how you would deliberate in this case. There are 12 of you for a reason. You have to make not only an individual decision about whether or not the defendant is guilty or not guilty based upon all the evidence that you hear, but you have to make a collective decision. And that takes 12 of you, and it has to be unanimous.

You are going to hear from a number of witnesses who will describe the scene.

They'll describe the people involved. And they'll describe to you the physical evidence that was gathered that connects and puts

James Ferrara at that house breaking in and killing that family.

We ask you to pay very close attention. Do not make any decisions until you are told

to do so by the judge when you are all collectively deliberating together. Your common sense. Use your reason. Use the skills that you use every day in evaluating the testimony and the evidence. Attorney Cantalamessa talked to you a lot about credibility, and that's what you're going to determine. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Doherty.
Ms. Weibling?

MS. WEIBLING: May it please the court, counsel, Detective Mondora, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. As you heard before, my name is Kristie Weibling, and I along with Mr. Meranto represent Mr. Ferrara.

I think you can now appreciate how important your job is here today and for the rest of this week. And in performing this job, you're going to hear a lot about these horrible crimes that took place. And we are not here today to tell you that these crimes did not take place. We agree, they took place, and it's extremely unfortunate that

these crimes happened.

But it is your job as jurors to put that aside and listen to all the evidence that is presented to you. And at the conclusion of this case, you have to decide whether the state proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Ferrara was involved in these crimes.

You're going to hear a lot about fingerprints. You're going to hear about fingerprints that were found on the outside of the garage door. That's a door that leads into the garage. Inside of the garage, there's another set of doors that leads into a house. It is inside that house where these crimes took place. Because in 2009 a computer said, oh, these prints are — these prints that were found on this outside garage door belonged to Mr. Ferrara, you — the state wants you to believe that those are, in fact, his prints.

As you heard, this investigation went on for several years, 1974, 1975, 1976. During

this time period, there were a lot of police officers, detectives, and other investigators that worked on this case. And in working on this case, and doing their investigation, they came up with a list of 167 suspects.

Mr. Ferrara was never mentioned in that list of 167 suspects.

In addition to coming up with this suspect list, these investigators kept detective notes. They kept detailed notes about the investigation, what their thoughts were, why they looked at various pieces of They also had meetings where the evidence. group of them got together, and they They discussed potential discussed the case. theories about the case. And they put all these documents together, and guess what, Mr. Ferrara's name is never mentioned in any of these detective notes, never mentioned in any of these meetings that all these investigators had that got together to discuss this case.

You're also going to hear about a key

23

2.1

piece of evidence. This piece of evidence is a cigarette. This cigarette was found inside the house where the crimes were committed. You're going to hear that the detectives and investigators on this case felt that the people who were involved in this crime most likely left that cigarette in the home. You're also going to hear that there was a partial print on the cigarette, and that there was some DNA on the cigarette. There has never been a match to the partial prints on the cigarette.

Now, back in 1970, there was no ability for the investigators to analyze the DNA that was on the cigarette. In the mid '80s that technology was developed, and in 2010, you know, we got a fingerprint, so why not see if we can get the DNA on this cigarette, and then we've got a slam dunk. So the cigarette is sent to a lab. The DNA is analyzed. And guess what, the DNA on the cigarette is not Mr. Ferrara's.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, after

1 carefully listening to all of the evidence 2 that's presented to you, you have this very 3 large task of taking a look at all the 4 evidence. Your job here today is not to 5 determine that these crimes were committed. 6 Your job is to determine whether or not the 7 state met its burden and proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Ferrara was 8 9 involved in these crimes. We would ask that 10 you listen carefully to the evidence, and we 11 appreciate your time and service. Thank you 12 very much. 13 Thank you. All right. THE COURT: 14 Let's have the state call your first witness. 15 Your Honor, the state MS. DOHERTY: 16 calls Bill Marsh. 17 THE COURT: I don't want you to 18 photograph any of these witnesses until I 19 determine whether or not they're willing to 20 be photographed. 2.1 THE BAILIFF: Judge, this witness 22 objects to being photographed. 23 THE COURT: This man does not wish to be

photographed. All right, sir. Good afternoon. Raise your right hand, please.

WHEREUPON, the State called

WILLIAM MARSH,

who, being first duly sworn, testified
as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. DOHERTY:

THE COURT: All right, sir. Walk over this way and come up to the witness stand, please. Thank you. These are the ladies and gentlemen of our jury, and they need to hear and understand everything you have to say. So I'd like you to speak loudly and clearly enough when you answer a question. You're welcome to use the microphone if you care to.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Please answer all the questions out loud.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

- 1 Q Good afternoon.
- 2 **A** Good afternoon.
- 3 **Q** Could you state your name and spell your
- 4 | first and last name for the record, please?
- 5 **A** William Marsh; W-I-L-L-I-A-M, M-A-R-S-H.
- 6 Q All right. Mr. Marsh, I'm going to ask you a
- 7 | few questions. First of all, where did you grow up?
- 8 **A** I grew up here in Youngstown, Ohio.
  - **Q** And did you have a brother?
- 10 **A** Yes, I did.
- 11 **Q** What was his name?
- 12 **A** Benjamin.
- 13 **Q** What was the age difference between you and
- 14 | Ben?

- 15 **A** Five years.
- 16 Q Your parents, did they work in the area as
- 17 | well?
- 18 **A** My father was a barber. He had a shop on
- 19 Market Street, corner of Market and Elmwood Avenue. My
- 20 mother was a school teacher and taught school until my
- 21 brother and I came along, and then she -- when we got
- 22 old enough, she substituted.
- 23 **Q** Where did you go to high school, you and your

1 1	l L l '	$\overline{}$
	brother	/
	DIOCITOI	•

2

- **A** South High School.
- 3 **Q** And what year did your brother graduate from
- 4 | high school?
- 5 A My brother?
- 6 **Q** Uh-huh.
- 7 **A** He graduated in 1959.
  - **Q** So that would've made you 19 --
- 9 **A** '54.
- 10 Q Okay. What did Ben do after high school?
- 11 **A** After high school, he went into the service,
- 12 into the Navy.
- 13 **Q** And primarily, if you recall, where was he
- 14 stationed?
- 15 **A** He was stationed out of Rhode Island.
- 16 **Q** How long was he in the Navy?
- 17 **A** He was in for four years.
- 18 Q Once he left the service, what did he do
- 19 then?
- 20 **A** He returned to Youngstown.
- 21 **Q** And did he begin working right away?
- 22 **A** He went to barber college and then went to
- 23 work for my father.

- **Q** All right. And your dad, had he had that 2 business, that barber shop for a lot of years?
  - **A** As long as I know.
- Okay. And was Ben going to take over that business?
  - A That was the plan, but it was at the time when hairstyles were starting to change for men, and my dad was nearing the age of retirement, and he didn't want to make a change, and most of his customers were ones who were into that styling. Ben didn't feel that he could support his family on what he was making in the barber shop, and at that time they were hiring at General Motors, and he went over there and put in his application and was hired.
- **Q** All right. In the meantime, did he get married?
- **A** Yes, he did.
- **Q** What year was he married?
- **A** 1964.
- **Q** And who did he marry?
- **A** He married Marilyn.
- **Q** What was Marilyn's last name prior to
- 23 marrying Ben?

- 1 A Fowler.
- 2 **Q** And was she from this area as well?
- 3 **A** She was from up in the Cleveland area.
  - **Q** And how did they meet?
- They met through a mutual friend. He was going to Allegheny College, and they met through this friend.
- 8 **Q** Okay. And when they married, did they marry 9 locally in this area?
- 10 **A** Yes, they did, up in North Royalton, Ohio.
- 11 Q Now, you said that Ben was hired in at GM.
- 12 Do you recall approximately what year that was?
- 13 **A** I'm not really sure.
- 14 **Q** Okay. Did Ben and Marilyn have children?
- 15 **A** Yes, they did. They had two.
- 16 **Q** All right. And what were their names, and
- what year were they each born?
- 18 A Heather was born first, and then Christopher.
- 19 Heather was born in '60, and Christopher was born in
- 20 | '63 I think it was. '63 or '64.
- 21 **Q** Okay. Let me jump you ahead about a decade.
- Heather would've been four in 1974; correct?
- 23 **A** Right.

- 1 **Q** All right. So she would've been born in '70; 2 does that sound right?
- 3 **A** Yes. Yes. Yeah.
- 4 **Q** Okay. And Christopher --
- 5 A Was born three years later.
  - **Q** Okay. So 1973?
- 7 **A** Right.
- 8 Q All right. Where did Ben, Marilyn, and the
- 9 kids live?

- 10 **A** Well, they were born here in Youngstown. Ben
- and Marilyn were married, and prior to his getting out
- of the service, and they lived here in Youngstown and
- 13 move into their home in --
- 14 **Q** Canfield?
- 15 **A** Canfield.
- 16 Q All right. And what was Ben's job at
- 17 Lordstown at the GM plant?
- 18 **A** He was a security officer.
- 19 **Q** And do you know what rank he attained by
- 20 1974?
- 21 **A** He -- I don't know whether he ever made
- 22 permanent sergeant or not, but he filled in as a
- 23 sergeant on a temporary basis.

- 1 **Q** Okay. And where were you living at the time?
- 2 **A** At the time I was living out in Fresno,
- 3 | California.
- 4 Q All right. And let's -- I guess let's talk
- 5 about from, you know, 1970, 1972, where did you and
- 6 your family move from and to?
- 8 Ohio.
- 9 **Q** So in 1974, you had -- you had relocated in
- 10 | Toledo?
- 11 **A** It was either '74 or '75.
- 12 **Q** All right. The families, your family, Ben's
- 13 family, your parents were obviously still living in
- 14 | 1974; correct?
- 15 **A** That is correct.
- 16 **Q** All right. And where did your parents live
- in relation to Ben's and Marilyn's home in Canfield?
- 18 **A** They lived over near Mill Creek Park on
- 19 Gladwae Drive. It was probably maybe a 15, 20-minute
- 20 ride.
- 21 **Q** Okay. And even though you were living in
- 22 Toledo, did the families get together as families do?
- 23 **A** Yes, we did. In fact, we were down for

- 1 Heather's birthday party.
- 2 **Q** And approximately when was that?
- 3 **A** It was just shortly before the --
- 4 **Q** Okay. Shortly before they were killed?
- 5 **A** Right.
- 6 Q Okay. All right. At that time, was
- 7 Christopher -- he was about one year old; is that
- 8 right?
- 9 A He was one year old, yes.
- 10 **Q** In December of 1974?
- 11 **A** Yes.
- 12 **Q** Was he walking yet?
- 13 A He was just starting to toddle. He, you
- 14 know, would take a few steps and go down.
- Okay. And the birthday party you talked
- 16 about, where did that take place?
- 17 **A** At Ben and Marilyn's home.
- 18 **Q** And was that the last time you actually saw
- 19 Ben, Marilyn, and the kids?
- 20 **A** Yes.
- 21 **Q** You had indicated that Ben worked in
- 22 security. Did you ever discuss his job with him?
- 23 A No, I didn't, because when I'd ask something

- 1 he'd say that's something I can't talk about.
- 2 **Q** All right. And at anytime prior to his death
- 3 did he express concerns about his job?
- 4 A No, not really.
- 5 **Q** Okay. Concerns about anything going on at
- 6 work?
- 7 MR. MERANTO: Objection.
- 8 THE COURT: Sustained. Don't answer the
- 9 question.

#### 10 | BY MS. DOHERTY:

- 11 **Q** How did you learn that Ben and Marilyn and
- 12 Heather had been killed?
- 13 **A** Telephone call.
- 14 **Q** And who contacted you?
- 15 **A** I believe it was Dan Fowler that called me.
- 16 **Q** And that would've been Marilyn's father?
- 17 **A** Correct.
- 18 **Q** And they were still living at that time as
- 19 well?
- 20 **A** That is correct.
- 21 **Q** Were you aware of Marilyn's activities the
- 22 morning of December 13th?
- 23 **A** Yes, I was. They -- she had a dental

2.1

appointment, and when she had something like that, she would take the children over to my parents' house, and they'd baby-sit. And then she returned to pick the kids up and stop on the way home, got some groceries. And she was planning on dropping those groceries off and going over to Ben's aunt's house in New Castle. They did things together like craft work or baking cookies or whatever.

- Q Okay. And what shift at the time of his death did Ben work at GM?
- **A** That I can't tell you.
- Okay. That's fine. When you learned that they had been killed, what did you do?
  - A I took and made arrangements for my children because we hadn't lived that long in Toledo, and we had neighbors next-door who were older than we were, but they had no children of their own. But we had become friendly with them, and we asked them if they would watch the children while my wife and I drove to Youngstown.
  - And do you know what day that was? Say it in the context of Marilyn having taken the children to your parents' house on the 13th of December that

morning for her dentist appointment, and they were found the 14th. When did you arrive?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

- Q If you know. You can answer.
- **A** Would you repeat that, please?
- Q When you learned that they had been killed, do you know when you arrived in Youngstown in relation to when they were found?
- 11 **A** I would say it was on Saturday afternoon.
- 12 **Q** All right.
  - A Because she -- she had left the children with mom and dad on Friday.
- 15 **Q** All right.
- And after as soon as we got the call from dad Fowler, we made the arrangements and left immediately.
- 19 **Q** All right. Tell us about Christopher. Was 20 Christopher injured as a result of this incident?
- 21 **A** Yes, he was. He had a slight head 22 concussion.
  - **Q** And who raised Christopher after his parents

#### 332 DIRECT/MARSH 1 were killed? 2 Α He was raised by a member of the family. 3 O And how old is Christopher today? 4 A Forty years old. 5 Are your parents still living? Q 6 No, they are not. A 7 How old was Ben at the time of his death? Q He was 32, I think. 8 Α And how old was Marilyn? 9 Q 10 Α She was -- I think she was a year or less 11 younger than him. 12 All right. And what about Heather? Q 13 A Heather was 4. 14 MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, may I 15 approach? 16 THE COURT: You may. 17 (WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 4 was 18 marked for identification.) 19 BY MS. DOHERTY: 20 I'm going to hand you what's been marked as 21 State's Exhibit 4. Could you look at that, please, and

# OFFICIAL SHORTHAND REPORTERS MAHONING COUNTY YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

tell us if you recognize what is in that photograph?

This is a picture of the family. Ben in his

22

23

Α

#### 333 DIRECT/MARSH 1 service uniform, Marilyn, Christopher, and Heather. 2 Q And that photograph is actually kind of a 3 collage of all of them; correct? 4 Α That is correct. 5 MS. DOHERTY: Can I have one minute, 6 Judge? 7 THE COURT: You may. (WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among 8 9 counsel off the record and out of the hearing 10 of the Court, jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:) 11 12 BY MS. DOHERTY: 13 Mr. Marsh, you were aware that your father 0 14 and Mr. Boyle found your brother's body and the family; 15 correct? 16 That's correct. Α 17 Did your dad smoke cigarettes ever? Q 18 Α Yes, he did. 19 All right. Q Your Honor, I don't have 20 MS. DOHERTY: 21 any further questions. Thank you.

Mr. Meranto?

THE COURT: Do you have any questions,

22

1	MR. MERANTO: No questions, Your Honor.
2	Sorry for your loss.
3	THE COURT: All right, sir. You're
4	excused. Thank you. Leave that right there.
5	Okay. Next witness, please.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, the state
7	calls Frank Boyle.
8	THE BAILIFF: Judge, this witness does
9	not object to being photographed.
10	THE COURT: Does not?
11	THE BAILIFF: Does not.
12	THE COURT: Do you hear that? Does not
13	object. Bring him to the podium. Raise your
14	right hand, please.
15	
16	
17	* * * *
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

1	WHEREUPON, the State called
2	
3	FRANK BOYLE,
4	
5	who, being first duly sworn, testified
6	as follows:
7	THE COURT: All right, sir. Please be
8	seated up here in the witness chair. So
9	these are the ladies and gentlemen of the
10	jury. They need to hear and understand
11	everything you have to say, so please speak
12	loudly and clearly enough for them to
13	understand you, and please answer all the
14	questions out loud. You can use the
15	microphone if you wish. It will help amplify
16	your voice. Okay?
17	THE WITNESS: Yes.
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION
19	BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:
20	<b>Q</b> Good afternoon. Would you please state your
21	name for the record?
22	A Frank Boyle.
23	Q And Frank, do you live here locally?
=	<b>~</b>

22

23

Α

Q

Pardon?

How old are you?

- 1 A Seventy-five.
- 2 **Q** And are you married?
- 3 **A** No. My wife's -- I'm widowed.
  - **Q** Do you have any children?
- 5 **A** Yes.

- 6 Q And did you know Ben Marsh?
- 7 **A** Yes.
- 8 **Q** How did you know him?
- 9 A He -- I worked at General Motors, and Ben got
- 10 hired there a few years after me, and we were in the
- 11 same department. We was in plant security.
- 12 **Q** When did you start at GM?
- 13 **A** I started in '65.
- 14 **Q** And do you know when Ben started?
- 15 **A** I'm not sure, but maybe four years later. I
- 16 don't know for sure.
- Somewhere around '68, '69?
- 18 **A** Yes.
- 19 **Q** Where did Ben Marsh live in relation to where
- 20 you lived?
- 21 **A** Ben lived approximately anywhere from a half
- 22 to three-quarters of a mile from where I lived.
- 23 Q Okay. Did he live on Turner Road?

- Ben lived on Turner Road. I lived on Herbert Road.
- 3 **Q** Is that house that you went to the evening of December 14th, 1974, was that 5540 South Turner Road?
- 5 **A** Yes.
- 6 **Q** Is that Ben's residence?
- 7 A Yes, it is.
- 8 **O** And who did he live there with?
- 9 **A** With his wife and two children.
- 10 Q Okay. Was their house in Mahoning County,
- 11 Ohio as well?
- 12 **A** Yes.
- 13 **Q** Who was his wife?
- 14 A Marilyn.
- 15 **Q** And what were their -- what were their
- 16 children's names?
- 17 **A** Heather and Christopher.
- 18 **Q** How often would you see Ben and his wife
- 19 during that time?
- 20 **A** Quite often. Ben was actually my best
- 21 friend, and we visited back and forth quite often. I
- 22 worked with Ben all the time.
- 23 **Q** Did your wives get together --

- **A** Yes.
- **Q** -- as well?
- **A** Yes.
- So you worked with him, and you got together socially with him?
- **A** Yes.
- Would you ever go to his house and do things, and vice versa, they would come to your house?
  - A Yes.

- You said Ben came to work with you in security; is that right?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** What kind of things would you do in security at GM?
  - A Well, we were responsible for naturally the security and the fire part of the plant. We did fire patrols, and as a security officer you would stand at the door and check people's badges when they came to work. When they left you had to open their lunch bucket, and you checked them and visualized to see if they had anything on them going out, you know, for the theft. And the perimeter of the plant we had to do.
  - Q How big of a security force did GM have at

1	+ h ~+	time?
_	lliat	CTIME:

- A I couldn't tell you exactly how many there was of us, but it was probably 30.
- **Q** And did everyone work different shifts? Was 5 there --
  - **A** Yes. There was three shifts in security.
    - **Q** Did you work the same shift as Ben back then?
    - **A** Sometimes, yes.
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** And what was that?
- **A** The Masonic Lodge.
- **Q** Besides thefts obviously people aren't carrying cars out in their lunch box. What kind of thefts are you investigating?
- MR. MERANTO: Objection.
- **THE COURT:** Hold on. Let me hear the question again once.
  - (WHEREUPON, the record was read as requested.)
    - THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

      Rephrase the question, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

Q To investigate these thefts you talked about, what kind -- besides checking people's lunch box, what other things would you do as part of your security job?

MR. MERANTO: Objection, Judge.

THE COURT: Overruled.

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

**Q** Go ahead.

A We checked the perimeters and the outside fences where the repair yard was because there has been — there had been parts and radios and different things like that throwed over the fence and stolen that way.

**Q** Was there any kind of illegal activity that you were investigating while working there?

A No, I wasn't.

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A I wasn't investigating anything. From time to time we did get, you know, some information on things that we would check out.

Q I'm going to take you back to December 14th of 1974. You get a phone call; is that right?

- **A** Yes.
- $\mathbf{Q}$  And who did you get a phone call from?
- **A** Plant security, General Motors.
- **Q** What was the nature of that phone call?
- They said that Ben hadn't came to work. I don't really remember whether it was a couple days or what it was, but he missed his shift, and he didn't
- 8 call in.
- **Q** Was that unusual for him?
- **A** Oh, yes. Ben wouldn't miss work.
- **Q** What did you do in response to that phone
- 12 | call?
- **A** I told them that I would go to his house.
- **Q** And did you?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Did you go immediately after?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** You got off the phone? You said you lived
- 19 about a half mile?
- **A** Yes. Half mile to three-quarters.
- **Q** Did you drive to his house?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** And what time of day was this?

- It was -- it was dark. It was just in the evening. I don't know the exact time. I would say between 7:00 and 8:00, something like that.
- **Q** Okay.
- **A** That area.
- **Q** Was anyone at the house when you arrived?
- **| A** Yes.

- **Q** And who was that?
- Ben's dad and mother had just pulled in just

  ahead of me, and his dad had just gotten out of the car

  when I pulled in.
- **Q** Can you describe Ben's house, the outside and the driveway?
  - A Yeah. It was a one floor plan house. The driveway was on the left side of the house.
- **Q** Did it have a garage?
- **A** Yes, the garage was on the left. Straight ahead of the drive.
- **Q** Was it a two-car or one-car garage?
- **A** Two.
- **Q** When you arrived there -- how long would you 22 say the driveway was from the street up to the house?
  - A Thirty to thirty-five yards, I guess.

3

- Okay. Would you say it's about the length of this courtroom; shorter, longer?
  - **A** It was as long as this courtroom.
- Q Okay. You said that Ben's mom and dad were there. They pulled in just before you; is that right?
  - **A** That's right.
- I want to take you right back to that position. What do you notice about the house when you pull up?
- 10 **A** It was dark. The mercury light outside was on. It's out by the driveway.
- 12 **Q** Okay.
- 13 **A** It was on, but no other lights on the house.
- 14 **Q** And you said this was evening already? It was already dark out?
- 16 **A** Yes.
- 17 **Q** Was the garage door opened or closed?
- 18 **A** Closed.
- 19 **Q** What do you do next?
- 20 **A** Ben's dad and I went to the front door. His mother waited in the car. We couldn't get in. Ben's dad had a key for the front door, but he didn't have
- 23 one for the screen door.

- Were you able to -- because it's a ranch house, were you able to see in any of the windows?
- Yeah. I looked in the windows, and you could see light from the mercury light shined in some, so you could see just a little, and we seen some movement close to the floor.
- **Q** Could you tell what it was?
- 8 A No, I couldn't tell what it was.
- **Q** What did you do when you were at the door?
- **A** We took the -- we had to take the screen door off the house so that Ben could open it, Ben's dad could open the door.
- **Q** And did you say that was because that screen door was locked?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** It was locked?
- **A** It was locked.
- **Q** You didn't have a key to that house; right?
- **A** No.
- **Q** Ben's dad did?
- **A** Ben's dad did.
- **Q** Tell me what happened once he unlocked that
- 23 door.

4

- - **Q** Where was Marilyn laying?
- She was laying in the foyer. Most of her body was in the foyer, headed, like, in the doorway to the kitchen.
  - **Q** And where was Heather?
- 9 A Heather was a little behind that. Almost
  10 straight in front of the doorway, but to the right a
  11 little in the door.
- 12 **Q** When you got Christopher, saw Christopher, 13 where was he in relation?
- 14 He was close to his mother, Marilyn.
- 15 **Q** What did you do with Christopher?
- I picked him up, and at that time Ben's

  mother came in and Ben's mother -- I went in the living

  room with Ben's mother and Christopher, and I was with

  her. And then Ben's dad went looking for Ben.
- 20 **Q** Did you ever see Ben when you were at that house?
- 22 **A** No.
- 23 **Q** During that time, did they have a dog?

1	Α	Yes.

- 2 **Q** Where was the dog?
- 3 **A** In the basement.
- 4 **Q** How did you know that?
- Because the dog had -- I don't know if it was mange. It had some kind of infection that they had to have his hair shaved, and they had medicine on him. So they kept him in the basement during this period of time because they didn't want the medicine to get on
- 10 the furniture.
- 11 **Q** And was there a door from the basement to the upstairs?
- 13 **A** Yes, there was.
- 14 **Q** Was the dog around on the first floor, or was
  15 he still in the basement when you got there?
- 16 **A** He was in the basement.
- Did you ever go around back, to the back of the house that night?
- 19 **A** Later.
- 20 **Q** Okay.
- 21 **A** Later after I came back.
- 22 Q Okay. When you have Christopher and you and
- 23 Mrs. Marsh take him into the living room, what do you

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

- 1 guys do with Christopher?
- 2 **A** Well, I held him most of the time.
- 3 Mrs. Marsh was pretty upset, and she kept saying,
- 4 | "Why?" And I tried to console her.
- And tell me about what -- about Christopher, about his clothing.
  - A His clothing was covered in blood, and his and a lot of it was dried blood. I ended up taking him to my house.
  - **Q** What was he wearing, if you remember?
- 11 **A** It was like a snowsuit.
- 12 **Q** And when you're consoling Ben's mom, is -13 how long do you stay there before you take Christopher
  14 to your house?
  - Well, I was there for a little while because Ben's -- Ben's dad went to check for Ben, and then I asked Ben's dad if Ben was there, and he said yes, and he's dead. And the deputies came, and I asked if I could take Christopher down to my house and get the
- 20 clothes off of him and clean him up, and they allowed
- 21 me to do that. I took Mrs. Marsh and Christopher down
- 22 to my house.
  - **Q** Back in December of 1974, did the Marshes

- 1 have one car or two cars?
- 2 **A** Ben had a truck, and Marilyn had a car.
  - **Q** Were both of those cars in the garage?
- 4 **A** No.

3

- 5 **Q** When you got there that night?
- 6 **A** No.
- 7 **Q** Was either of them in the garage?
  - **A** The truck was there.
- 9 **Q** Is that the -- was that truck driven
- 10 primarily by Marilyn or by Ben?
- 11 **A** Ben.
- 12 **Q** Back when you would hang out with Marilyn and
- Ben and their kids, and your wife, you got to know
- 14 Heather pretty well, didn't you?
- 15 **A** Yes.
- 16 Q And what -- can you describe Heather, what
- 17 kind of four-year-old she was?
- 18 **A** For a four-year-old, Heather was really
- 19 smart. Everyone always said how smart she was. And
- 20 she was like a sister to my kids. She was just a sweet
- 21 little girl.
- 22 **Q** When Ben's dad comes back up from the back
- room and tells you about Ben, what do you do next? Who

- 1 calls the police, if you remember?
- 2 **A** I did. I first -- I didn't know the police
- 3 | number or anything, so I found a phone book, and I
- 4 found Canfield Police, and I called Canfield Police,
- 5 and they told me they can't help me; call the Sheriff's
- 6 Department. So then I ended up with the Sheriff's
- 7 Department number, and I called them from the house,
- 8 kitchen phone.
- 9 **Q** With the kitchen phone. Do you remember
- 10 where in the kitchen that phone was?
- 11 **A** It's on the wall next to the entrance in from
- 12 the garage.
- Okay. You take Christopher to your house.
- 14 What do you do at that point?
- 15 **A** At that point, well, we had to cut his
- shoelaces to get his shoes off because the blood was
- dried so much on them, and then we got the rest of his
- 18 clothes off of him. My wife washed him up, and she
- gave him something to eat, but I don't really remember
- 20 what it was.
- 21 **Q** Did you go back to the house?
- 22 **A** Yes, I did.
- 23 **Q** And what do you do when you get there?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

19

20

- - **Q** Did you help them walk around and look for anything?
    - A I did go around with them, but and they went on the roof and looked for a weapon throwed up there or anything. They did that kind of thing, so —
    - **Q** Did you notice anything about the house that you thought was out of place or anything ransacked?
  - A No, the house was not ransacked.
- 11 **Q** How could you tell?
- - **Q** Was there anything of value left out?
- I don't really remember anything of value. I know Ben's paycheck was on the counter, the sink, but I don't know of any other valuable things laid out.
  - **Q** Do you know whether or not Ben had any weapons?
- 21 **A** Yes, he did.
- 22 **Q** And do you know what kind of weapons?
  - A He had purchased a .357 magnum, and I don't

- 1 know what other guns he had, but I know he had that as 2 a handgun.
  - **Q** You said he purchased a .357. Had he recently purchased it before December?
- **A** Not too long before that, yes.
  - Q Did he express any concern as to why he --
  - A Well, he said that if anyone broke in his house, he would have a -- he would be able to defend them.
- **Q** Do you know where he kept those weapons?
- **A** Yes. He kept it locked up in a closet, and 12 he kept it locked up.
- **Q** And where was this closet at?
- **A** In the bedroom, his bedroom.
- **Q** After you gave your statement to the police 16 that evening, did you do anything else? You said later 17 on you walked around the back of the house. Is that 18 after the police were done?
- **A** No. I walked with -- no.
- **Q** Okay.
- **A** I was with them.
- **Q** Tell me what you saw.
- **A** The back door was -- had the glass broken out

- of it, and it was open. And then the door from the garage into the kitchen was open.
- 3 Q Did you ever walk back into Ben's bedroom?
- 4 **A** After he was murdered?
- 5 **Q** Right.
- 6 **A** No.
- You've been over to his house before that evening; correct?
- 9 **A** Yes.
- 10 **Q** So you knew the layout of that house?
- 11 **A** Yes, pretty much.
- 12 **Q** You worked at GM for how many years?
- 13 **A** How many years total?
- 14 **Q** Yeah.
- 15 **A** Nineteen.
- 16 Q And you said you started in 1965; is that
- 17 right?
- 18 **A** Yes. When I started it was still under
- 19 construction.
- 20 Q Okay. What shift did you work during the
- 21 | time Ben worked there?
- 22 **A** Pretty much all three shifts.
- 23 **Q** Okay. Do you know what shift Ben worked when

1 he was working?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A He was -- most of the time he was on my shift. Whatever shift that I worked Ben also worked.

But then I took the supervisor's job, and Ben stayed in

security. And I was a supervisor when this happened.

**Q** Do you know what shift Ben was working in

December of 1974?

A Yeah. He was on midnight turn.

**Q** What would midnight have been?

**A** 11:00 to 7:00.

Q 11:00 to 7:00. Did you, while working at GM, did you ever know James Ferrara?

**A** No, not that I know of.

**Q** When you work at GM, do they have union committee people?

A Yes.

Q And what do they do?

A Well, they were to represent the hourly employees, and they would handle committee calls. They would come around if the person on your line had a committee call in, they'd come around, and you'd put an ARO or utility man or someone on the job and let that employee go with his committeeman to a break area or

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I MNAYAWAY ENAW WANEAU EO EALK EA	
1 wherever they wanted to talk to	LO IIIII.

2 Does that have to do with grievances? Does that have to do with if you're filing a grievance?

A Yes. Most of the time they file grievances.

**Q** And did these committeemen, they helped the employees write these grievances? Is that what they were --

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

Q How did someone become a committeeman?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

13 **THE COURT:** Sustained.

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

**Q** Do you remember their dog's name?

**A** Thor.

**Q** What kind of dog was it?

**A** German Shepherd.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I approach the

witness, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

Q Mr. Boyle, I'm going to hand you some

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

23

1 pictures that I would like you to identify.

MR. MERANTO: Excuse me, Your Honor. I don't know what pictures.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Yeah. They should be shown to you before they're shown to the witness.

MR. MERANTO: They did mention it to me before, Your Honor. Sorry.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 8 was marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

- Q I'm going to hand you what's been marked as State's Exhibit No. 8. Would you take that for me?
  Okay. Could you tell me what that is, Mr. Boyle?
- A That's Heather.
- Q Is that a fair and accurate representation of what she looked like when you walked in that foyer?
- 18 **A** Exactly.
  - Q Okay.
- MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I continue to
- 21 approach, Your Honor?
- THE COURT: You may.
  - (WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 7 was

	DIRECT/BOY	YLE
1		marked for identification.)
2	BY MS. CAI	NTALAMESSA:
3	Q	I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 7.
4	Can you to	ell the jury what that is?
5	A	That's Marilyn.
6	Q	Okay. Is that a fair and accurate
7	representa	ation of how Marilyn looked laying in the
8	foyer that	t evening?
9	A	That's where she was.
10		(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 12 was
11		marked for identification.)
12	BY MS. CAI	NTALAMESSA:
12 13	BY MS. CAI	NTALAMESSA: I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 12.
	Q	
13	Q	I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 12.
13 14	<b>Q</b> Can you to	I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 12. ell us what that is?
13 14 15	Q Can you to A Q	I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 12. ell us what that is? Again, that's Heather.
13 14 15 16	Q Can you to A Q	I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 12. ell us what that is? Again, that's Heather. Is that a different view of Heather that
13 14 15 16 17	Q Can you to A Q evening for	I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 12. ell us what that is? Again, that's Heather. Is that a different view of Heather that rom a different perspective?
13 14 15 16 17	Q Can you to A Q evening f: A Q	I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 12. ell us what that is? Again, that's Heather. Is that a different view of Heather that rom a different perspective? Yes.
13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Can you to A Q evening f: A Q	I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 12. ell us what that is? Again, that's Heather. Is that a different view of Heather that rom a different perspective? Yes. And is that a fair and accurate

approach with the last three?

THE COURT: Yes. You should just hand
them to him and have him pick out the
numbers. You don't have to wear yourself
out.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: I need the exercise.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 24 &

34 were marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

- Q I'm going to hand you three photographs, State's Exhibits 24, 30, and 34. Okay? The first one, State's Exhibit 24, can you tell us what that is, Mr. Boyle?
- **A** That's Marilyn.
- **Q** And that's a fair and accurate picture?
- **A** Yeah. She's beat up there.
- **Q** And the next one, State's Exhibit -- can you read the number on the back? I'm sorry.
- **A** Thirty.
- **Q** Tell us what that is.
- **A** That's Marilyn.
- $\mathbf{Q}$  And State's Exhibit 34 for us, please.
- **A** Heather.
- **MS. CANTALAMESSA:** Can I have one

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1	second, Your Honor?
2	(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among
3	counsel off the record and out of the hearing
4	of the Court, jury and court reporter, after
5	which the proceedings continued as follows:)

MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I continue to approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 42 was

marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

- Q I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit No. 42.
- 13 Can you tell me what that is?
- 14 **A** That's Marilyn.
- 15 Q Is that Marilyn, or is that --
- 16 **A** Oh, that's Ben. Yeah.
- 17 Q Okay. I'm sorry.
- 18 **A** I'm sorry, too.
- 19 **Q** That's all right.
- 20 **A** That's Ben.
- 21 **Q** And is that a fair and accurate picture of
- Ben as he looked back in December after December 14th,
- 23 1974?

# 360 DIRECT/BOYLE 1 Α Yeah. His face wasn't beat up like that. 2 Q Thank you. 3 MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I have one 4 second, Your Honor? 5 (WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among counsel off the record and out of the hearing 6 7 of the Court, jury and court reporter, after 8 which the proceedings continued as follows:) 9 BY MS. CANTALAMESSA: 10 When you walked in that fover back on Q December 14th, 1974, you said Christopher was in a 11 snowsuit. Was -- were Marilyn and Heather also wearing 12 13 winter clothing? 14 Α Yes. 15 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Nothing further, Your 16 Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 17 18 Mr. Meranto. 19 20 21 22 23

#### CROSS/BOYLE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

#### CROSS EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

- Q Mr. Boyle, my name's Tony Meranto. I'm going to ask you some questions. I'll be pretty brief with you. That dog was a German Shepherd?
- A Yes.
- Q Did you have occasion to be at the house -- you said you guys were good friends -- when the dog wasn't ill, whatever?
- 10 **A** Yes.
- Okay. What kind of dog was it? Big German
  Shepherd?
- 13 **A** Big.
- 14 **Q** How was it with people, the German Shepherd, 15 if you know?
- 16 A He was a dog that I would say would protect
  17 the family pretty well because he -- he would scare me
  18 sometimes.
- 19 **Q** But he was locked in the basement because of what was going on?
- 21 **A** Right, because of his --
- 22 **Q** And you were a friend of Ben's, and you knew
- 23 that?

#### CROSS/BOYLE

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

- Q In 1974, I'm sure the Sheriff's Department who was investigating this interviewed you, did they not?
- A They -- the Sheriff's Department is the department that was there, yes.
  - Q Yes. So they interviewed you about pretty much a lot of what you just told Ms. Cantalamessa; correct?
- 10 **A** Yes.
- Okay. About your -- you went to the scene, and you viewed the scene. Did they talk to you about anything else? Did they ask you, you know, if you had any ideas with regard to the actual crime?
  - A No.
  - **Q** They didn't ask you?
- 17 **A** Well, if they did, I would've answered them
  18 no, because I don't know -- I didn't know anything
  19 about it.
- MR. MERANTO: Okay. Thank you. That's all.
- 22 **THE COURT:** Anything else from the state?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Nothing, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you. You're excused. Okay. It's probably a good time to call it a day. That all right with everybody? How about you folks? That all right with you?

JURORS: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you for a good day, ladies and gentlemen. It was a busy day for you with a lot of information. We need you to be bright eyed and bushy tailed tomorrow, so please get some rest tonight.

Please also follow the instructions I've given you. You have to avoid any publicity about the case. Avoid any conversation with your family or friends about the case. Please let them know you've been instructed by the court not to discuss the case until it's completed. You're not to discuss this case at all among yourselves or with anyone else, nor to allow anyone to discuss the case

1 with you or in your presence. Please do not 2 form or express any opinion about the case. 3 Have a good night. We've see you tomorrow 4 morning, and we'll start at 8:30 a.m. We'll 5 be in adjournment. 6 (WHEREUPON, the Court recessed at 4:28 7 p.m., November 18, 2013 and reopened at 8:29 a.m., November 19, 2013 and the proceedings 8 9 continued as follows:) 10 THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and 11 gentlemen. We're going to resume the trial 12 The state is in the process of 13 presenting its evidence to you. They have 14 several witnesses as I understand, so we might as well get started. Call your next 15 16 witness, please. 17 Thank you, Your Honor. MS. DOHERTY: 18 The state calls Mike Finamore. 19 THE COURT: Does he object to being 20 photographed? Did you ask him? 2.1 THE BAILIFF: I did not, Judge. 22 THE COURT: There may be media that 23 appears and want to film what goes on in the

courtroom, and you're to be asked whether you object to being photographed or filmed for news media purposes.

THE WITNESS: I do not, sir.

THE COURT: Please raise your right

hand.

WHEREUPON, the State called

8

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

### MICHAEL FINAMORE,

10

## who, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please be seated in the witness chair. These ladies and gentlemen of the jury are seated there. They need to hear and understand everything you have to say, so please speak loudly and clearly enough for them to understand your testimony, and please answer any questions asked of you out loud.

> THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You've got to talk louder than that.

> MS. DOHERTY: That's why I'm standing

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1 back here, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm here, but I couldn't hear him. He's right next to me. So please make sure he talks loud enough. Maybe you can get him to do it.

MS. DOHERTY: I will try.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

- Q Tell us your full name and spell your last fame for the record, please.
- A It's Michael W. Finamore. Spelling of last name is F-I-N-A-M-O-R-E.
  - Q And Mr. Finamore, where do you reside? Where do you live?
  - A Right now in Hertford, North Carolina.
- 16 **Q** I'm going to ask you I guess career-wise,
- what did you do? What was your career?
- 21 **Q** All right. Let me stop you right there.
- 22 What was that program?
- 23 **A** I basically worked all functions of the

sheriff's office. I worked a little bit of the investigative bureau. I worked in the record room. I worked in the jail in the process of booking prisoners. In some cases I would accompany a jailer — bring the prisoners back and forth to court. I rode in the patrol division. So it was just basically to observe all functions of law enforcement.

**Q** All right. And you said specifically with the investigative unit. What did you do there?

A I went out with them on a lot of follow-up investigations and cases. I did a lot of surveillance work with them. They would go out in the evenings and do a lot of follow-up work, and being young and single at that time I spent a lot of time with them.

**Q** And what training was required for you to work in the Mahoning County Sheriff's office at that time?

At that time I was an intern. When I went to the commission as a deputy I was required to take the Ohio peace officer basic police training program which was a 300-hour program through Youngstown State University.

**Q** And what types of course work was required

through the OPATA program?

- A All functions of law enforcement, history of law enforcement starting from history all the way up through the Ohio Revised Code, crime scene processing, the laws of arrests, search and seizure. Just, again, all facets of law enforcement.
- **Q** Evidence collection and scene processing, what does that mean?
- A That is obviously arriving at a crime scene. It's securing the crime scene, identifying what could be evidence related to the particular crime that you've been called to investigate, and properly securing that evidence, identifying it and turning it into the evidentiary process, which would be either go through the detective bureau or criminal BCI, sometimes the FBI lab, depending on the nature of the case.
- Q I'm going to ask you first about evidence collection. What type of specific training through OPATA did you receive in terms of collecting evidence?
- A We received training how to properly secure evidence so it's not damaged or ruined, I guess you would say. How to properly mark it, identify it, date it. We learned how to lift latent prints. We learned

2.1

how to take roll paint impressions of fingerprints.

Again, we learned how to properly, whether it be ballistics, secure things again, so we have a basic understanding of what analysis was going to be done on that particular piece of evidence and treat it in the manner that you — basically wouldn't ruin the ability to analyze it.

Q Okay. How long were you with the Mahoning County Sheriff's Department?

A From February of '73 until March of 1978.

And throughout that time with the Sheriff's Department, what was your job? You said you started off kind of doing everything. What did you end up doing there?

A I started off as a special deputy assigned to the investigative bureau. I was the first deputy under 21, so the sheriff made me the first deputy under 21. He pretty much limited my commission at that point strictly to work with the investigative bureau. I then went full-time. I worked in the jail as a jailer. I then transferred out to the patrol division. Then I went back into the detective bureau where I retired — I left as a detective/sergeant when I moved on to the

1 state patrol.

Q All right. And at that time then you said you went to the state patrol?

A Correct.

Q And what did you do there?

A State patrol I started off as a trooper. I then spent eight years in the training academy where I instructed law enforcement — basic police training program, both law enforcement and troopers; then proceeded into administration where I served as lieutenant in charge of patrol posts, captain planning analysis. I was a major in charge of all of our policy development, research. In the last six years I retired as a lieutenant colonel, and I was an assistant superintendent over all the administrative functions of the patrol.

All right. And currently what is your job?

Right now I serve as director of operations
for a company who provides protection and preparedness
consulting and those type of functions for both private
and public sector companies.

**Q** All right. I'm going to specifically ask you about 1974 and what you were doing at that time.

MR. MERANTO: Objection, Your Honor.

May we approach on the record?

THE COURT: Yes. You can approach.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among Court and counsel out of the hearing of the jury and defendant as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. We are on the record at side bar at the defendant's request.

MR. MERANTO: I would like to object at this time to the testimony of Mr. Finamore. I believe that it's clear from what he just testified to that his qualifications in 1974 do not qualify him to testify to what he's about to testify; that is, the fingerprint collection and submission, the individual who actually took the fingerprints not being available. And I would like that objection to be continuing throughout his testimony.

**THE COURT:** Do you folks wish to say anything?

MS. DOHERTY: Judge, only that he has already indicated that he went through the 300-hour OPATA course at that time, and that

2.1

he was trained specifically in collection of fingerprints.

MR. MERANTO: Actually, what he said on the record is that he was trained in taking inked rolled fingerprint impressions, which is what they take when you're arrested at the jail. He doesn't say anything about the actual collection of evidence and being trained on lifting latent prints from a crime scene, and that's specifically what he's about to testify to; and I don't think he's qualified to do so.

MS. DOHERTY: He did say latent prints, just so you know. He did say latent prints as well.

MR. MERANTO: I didn't hear him say it.

THE COURT: Well, do you two want to debate somewhere else? This is a hearing on the record, and I don't need to hear all of that. I have an objection, and I have your position. That's what I need. So while all of this is going on, I will state for the record that I'm completely unimpressed with

OPATA training as qualifying him as a fingerprint expert of any kind. However, the case law that I researched, not that was submitted to me by either party, indicates that the objection should be overruled at this time. I don't know what he's going to say here today. I know what he said before, and I know that I made a comment about it before, but the objection at this point's overruled. Now, as far as a continuing objection is concerned, I'm delighted to afford that to you.

MR. MERANTO: I just don't want to keep interrupting.

THE COURT: Because I understand how it works in a trial, but our Court of Appeals does not recognize a continuing objection as far as I know, so you just need to be cautious in that regard. I do believe that the record from the other day and your objection now should preserve your entire objection to this, but —

MR. MERANTO: I understand.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: -- I don't have the

authority to tell you that I will recognize a

continuing objection, for what it's worth.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. DOHERTY: We agree, too, if that

MS. DOHERTY: We agree, too, if that matters.

(WHEREUPON, the proceedings continued, back in the hearing of the defendant and the jury as follows:)

THE COURT: All right. The objection's overruled. You may proceed.

MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, Your Honor.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

Q Mr. Finamore, again, back to 1974, specifically December of 1974, what were your duties at that time?

A I was a road deputy at that time.

And was there a specific area or areas that the Mahoning County Sheriff's office patrolled and had jurisdiction over?

A Sure. We patrolled all the unincorporated areas of the county. Generally an area like Youngstown that has a large, competent police department, we would

- not spend our resources there. We stayed out in the townships where our primary responsibilities were.
  - **Q** And would Canfield have been one of those areas that you patrolled as well?
  - A Canfield Township; correct.
  - Q Canfield Township. All right. How were you notified or called to the scene at 5540 Turner Road in Canfield on December 14th?
  - A In December, '74, we did not have pagers. We did not have cell phones. We would periodically call in. Basically portable radios even somewhat came in to play in the early '70s. Again, being single, many times I would go out with the detectives in the evening and ride, do follow-up work and do additional work. So when I called in that evening I learned that they were on the scene of a triple homicide, and I asked if they needed assistance, and they said yes, go ahead to the scene. I'm sure they could use help.
  - **Q** And for the record, what was the address that you responded to?
- **A** I believe it was 5540 South Turner Road.
- **Q** All right. And is that in Canfield Township?
  - A Yes.

- 1 **Q** Mahoning County, State of Ohio?
- 2 **A** Yes.
- 3 Q Approximately what time on December 14th,
- 4 | 1974 did you arrive, if you recall?
- 5 **A** Approximately 9:30.
  - **Q** P.M.?

- 7 **A** Correct.
- Describe what was going on at the scene of that home when you arrived.
- 10 A Detective Nemeth was there, Trooper -- or I'm
- 11 sorry, Deputy Catheline and Deputy Chance, Sergeant
- Hunt. They were there securing the scene, waiting for
- BCI to come to process the crime scene, and just
- 14 collectively discussing the complexity of the case.
- All right. And let me ask you, what is BCI,
- 16 so the jurors know what that is?
- 17 **A** It would be the Ohio Bureau of Criminal
- 18 Identification.
- 19 **Q** And what was the role of BCI and law
- 20 enforcement at that time?
- 21 **A** The purpose of the Bureau of Criminal
- 22 Identification, one, they ran the crime lab, both in
- 23 Columbus and regional crime labs, which one is in

Richfield that would cover this particular area. They also housed the fingerprints and did the fingerprint analysis in London, Ohio at their main headquarters, and then they would provide field agents to process crime scenes, because the sheriff's office did not have their own crime lab at that point. Many small police departments do not have their own crime lab, so that was a service that was provided by the Bureau of Criminal Identification at the time. Similar to the way the FBI would come out and support local law enforcement as well.

Q Describe for the jury, please, the scene once you went inside that house. What was in there?

Well, the victims were still there. There was a lot of blood, especially around Marilyn Marsh, the female. She was partially laying from the foyer into the kitchen. Obviously after suffering her wounds she bled excessively. I was not there at the time, but the son, Christopher, was in the house by himself for a period of a considerable amount of time. The blood was smeared where Christopher had crawled around his mother. The four-year-old girl, Heather, was laying in the foyer near the entrance to the living room, face

up. Initially we thought she was shot between the
eyes. It turned out to be a puncture wound in the
autopsy. But obviously signs of being beaten. Again,
there was blood where she bled somewhat excessively
after receiving her injuries. And then I went down the
hall into the bedroom. We found Mr. Marsh where he was
shot and obviously beaten. There was a lot of blood.
Obviously signs of a severe struggle. And he was laid
back on the bed with his feet near the floor.
Q All right. I'm going to ask you about the

outside of the house. Well, first of all, describe, I guess, the structure of the house. What was it?

A It was a somewhat long, I guess — at that time it appeared to be just a long ranch home. The garage on the left, you would go from the garage into the family room. They kind of used it as a dining room. There's a table and casual chairs there. It appeared to be added onto the home. You then stepped up into the kitchen. That entryway appeared maybe one time. It was an external entrance. And then they added on and kind of connected the garage and the home. It became an interior door into the kitchen. You would then proceed north through the home through the

kitchen, into the foyer. To the right would be the front door. To the left you went into the living room. You went down the hallway, there was a bath on the right, a bedroom, kind of facing the bedroom door. You made a slight jog in the hallway, there was another bedroom to the left there, and then the hallway dead ended into what would be considered the master bedroom.

In the master bedroom of that home it was kind of like a T. The left side was kind of a casual area. It had some, if I remember right, just some sewing equipment, casual chair. Just kind of a sitting, reading area. To the right, that was kind of like an alcove. There was two closets on the right, and then the bed sat back in that alcove.

Q All right. The closets that you described, tell us more about those.

A There was a single door closet. It was locked. Mr. Marsh was a -- I don't know if he was an avid hunter or shooter, but he did have sporting arms. That closet was designed to somewhat be a gun closet. It was locked at that time. There were signs where it appeared he was trying to get into that closet. To the left of that was a standard little wire door closet,

- 1 which was obviously meant for clothing.
- 2 **Q** You indicated there were signs that he had
- 3 tried to get into that closet. What signs were those?
  - A There were some blood smears on the door and
- 5 the lock area.

- 6 Q And was that door still locked, that gun
- 7 closet? Was it still locked when you arrived?
- 8 **A** Yes.
- 9 MS. DOHERTY: Judge, may I approach?
- THE COURT: You may.
- (WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 60 was
- 12 marked for identification.)
- 13 | BY MS. DOHERTY:
- 14 **Q** Mr. Finamore, I'm going to hand you what's
- been marked as State's Exhibit 60. Can you describe
- 16 what that is for the court, please?
- 17 **A** Yes. This is a hand drawn sketch, diagram of
- 18  $\blacksquare$  the home.
- 19 **Q** All right.
- 20 **A** With the one exception of it showing the
- 21 hallway being straight here, and the hallway has a
- 22 slight jog in it.
- 23 **Q** Do you recognize that document? Have you

1 seen that before?

A I have seen this in the investigative notes. This diagram was used — it was for a follow-up meeting with a lot of the agencies that were involved in the investigation.

Q Okay. Well, does it — does it accurately reflect, other than the slight jog in the hallway, the layout of that home, as well as the positions of Marilyn Marsh, Ben Marsh, and Heather Marsh?

A Yes, it does.

Q All right. You described the doorway entering from the garage into the home. Tell us about that. Was it one door, two doors, what?

A It was a storm door, and then a wood door. And the wood door obviously showed signs that it was kicked in. It even had a partial footprint on that particular door.

**Q** And what about the storm door when you arrived?

**A** It was ajar.

Q All right. And you said there were signs it had been kicked in. Anything other than the print, the footprint, bootprint, whatever, on that door?

- A There was damage to the lock area from the forced entry. Also at that time, not knowing exactly what relevance it had, it appeared to be some tool marks on the door, and those were identified, but, again, that was just at the time not knowing what they were.
  - Q Okay. But it did appear that the door had been -- that door had been kicked in?
  - A Yes, it was.
- **Q** Was there an entrance to the home through the garage around the back of the house?
- **A** Yes, there was.
- **Q** And describe the weather at that time on 14 December 14th, 1974.
- **A** There was snow on the ground. It was I guess for Ohio a typical winter day.
  - **Q** And were you able to observe anything in that snow going around to the back of the house?
- **A** Yes. There was one set of footprints that 20 went from the front driveway area, around to that door.
- $\mathbf{Q}$  And tell the jury then about that back door.
- 22 First of all, does it -- where does it go, that door
- 23 into the house? Where does it go first?

<b>A</b> The	back door would	d've been a wal	lk-through
pedestrian do	or leading into	the garage, or	r if you were
in the garage	it would take	you out to the	backyard of
the home.			

- Q So one set of footprints leading to that door. Describe the condition of that door.
- A The door had three panes of glass. The bottom pane immediately over top of the lock area was broken out to where it appeared that the intruder reached in, opened the door, and then pushed the door open and proceeded into the garage and then forcibly forced the door going into the home by kicking it.
- **Q** Let me grab that exhibit from you.

MS. DOHERTY: Judge, can we approach briefly?

THE COURT: All right.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among court and counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

Q All right. Mr. Finamore, displayed on the

2.1

screen is State's Exhibit 60. Is that the diagram you just described?

A Yes, it is.

And do you recognize that diagram as being consistent with the layout of the house, other than the jog in the hallway that you said?

A Correct.

**Q** And describe for the jury, I guess, what they're seeing in terms of the entrances and where the entrances are.

A You see the driveway down to the lower left, and that would be the front of the garage. And the footprints in the snow came from the front of that home area and went back around. That would be -- I believe it would be the southwest corner of the home. The house kind of ran parallel to Turner Road. The house kind of is from the garage to the bedroom is kind of south to north. That little mark there on the -- I guess it would be that northwest corner of that garage, that is depicting that walk-through pedestrian door.

If you come up the driveway and go into the garage, that entryway to the right there, that is the entryway -- it's showing that is an open doorway, but

1 that was a door -- a storm door and a wood door. 2 is the door that was kicked in. As you went through 3 the family room from that door towards the kitchen, 4 that door going in the kitchen is probably a little bit 5 more to the right, and it has a little bit of a step 6 up. And then you again proceed through the kitchen. 7 There's the fover there, the living room. And when you go down the hallway, there is a -- if you slide that 8 9 bedroom, the bedroom on the east side, if you slide that up a little bit -- one thing also missing in there 10 11 would be the home's bathroom was right there on the 12 right side of that hallway going down the hallway. 13 And as I am directing you, what does this Q 14 represent? 15 Α That would be the bed where Mr. Marsh was 16 found. 17 And what does this area represent marked No. Q 2? 18 19 Α That would be where Heather was found. 20 Q And No. 1 in the foyer area? 21 Α That would be Marilyn Marsh's location. 22 MS. DOHERTY: Can I approach, Judge? 23 You may. You should ask THE COURT:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

before you start, but you may.

MS. DOHERTY: I know. I'm sorry.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 1, 2 &

5-15 were marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

I'm going to hand you a stack of photographs. And I would like for you to look at the back, tell us what the exhibit number is, and then if you recognize what the photograph depicts, tell the jury what it is. Okay?

A Yes.

Q That will just keep me from having to keep walking.

A Okay. The photo labeled Exhibit 1 is a picture of the back door, that walk-through door from the backyard into the garage.

Q All right.

A The photo labeled No. 2 is a photo of that same door showing the broken glass, and it was taken from inside the garage.

**Q** Thank you.

A Exhibit 5 is the pictures of standing in that family room area, looking into the kitchen, that door

2.1

relating to the kitchen.

Exhibit 9 is a photo of the stove area and the counter area showing where there were a couple baby bottles on the counter.

Exhibit 10 is another photo showing the kitchen counter, across from the stove. It would be to the right of the kitchen sink area, and showing the various items that were on the counter at that time.

Photo Exhibit 6 is taken from standing in the kitchen, looking out into the foyer, and it is a photo showing the location of Marilyn Marsh.

Photo 7 is a photo standing in the foyer, looking into the kitchen door, and that is also showing a photo of the location of Marilyn Marsh of -- from the foyer perspective.

I believe this is Exhibit 60. Exhibit 60 would be a photo if you were coming out of the kitchen door and starting to walk towards Heather is a picture showing the location of Heather.

THE COURT: That can't be right.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

Q I know. Let me interrupt you for a minute. Look again at that number on the back. Does it say 60?

<b>A</b> I'm sorry.	I guess it'	s 12.
---------------------	-------------	-------

- 2 Q Okay. I thought that had to be wrong.
  - A Okay. I'm sorry. It is 12.
  - **Q** All right. Tell us again what that is.
    - A That is a photo looking from the kitchen door down towards the hallway leading to the bedroom, showing the position of Heather.

No. 8, this is a photo of as if you were coming from the master bedroom, walking back towards the kitchen, and showing a picture of the location of Heather from that perspective.

Photo 11 is a photo of -- there was a -- a bullet went through the ceiling of the foyer, and this is a photo of that bullet hole in the foyer ceiling.

area, it would be that area to the left, just above the word bedroom, and that is showing just the casual sitting area that the family had there. And also in that photo, or in this photo, it shows a projectile, spent projectile that was found on the bedroom floor near that north wall.

Q And let me address the diagram, State's Exhibit 60. As far as the photograph that you have in

- 1 | your hand, would that be in this area of the bedroom?
- 2 **A** As far as the projectile?
  - **Q** Yes.

3

16

17

18

19

- 4 **A** That's correct, yes.
- 5 **Q** All right. Go ahead. Sorry.
- Exhibit 14 is a photo, if you come in the master bedroom and turn right, it is a photo looking at the bed and showing the position of Ben Marsh on the bed.
- Is there anything in that photograph
  specifically on the floor next to Ben Marsh, or can you
  not see it in that photograph?
- 13 **A** There is a set of slippers in the photo.
- 14 **Q** And are you able to see the closet doors in that photograph that you described as well?
  - A The photo is taken from the person taking the photo would've been standing right in front of that gun closet door. So it's not visible in this photo, but the clothes closet is. The closet doors, the clothes closet.
- 21 **Q** Okay. Go ahead.
- 22 And then Exhibit 15 is a close-up view of Ben
  23 Marsh as he was laying back on the bed in the master

- 1 bedroom.
- 4 in on that bed.
- 5 A He is laying back on his left side. His feet
- 6 down on the floor, almost as if sitting in this
- 7 position and then going over onto his left shoulder
- 8 with his feet still hanging off the side of the bed
- 9 towards the floor.
- 10 **Q** You had indicated that Ben Marsh had been
- 11 | shot; correct?
- 12 **A** There were signs of bullet wounds, yes.
- 13 **Q** And you indicated also that he had been
- 14 | beaten?
- 15 **| A** Yes.
- 16 **Q** Was that visible to you at that time?
- 17 **A** Yes, it was. Very visible.
- 18 **Q** Do those photographs, the exhibits that you
- 19 have just identified, accurately reflect the Marsh home
- 20 on December 14th, 1974 when you were there?
- 21 **A** Yes, they do.
- 22 **Q** All right. BCI, you had mentioned a few
- 23 minutes ago what BCI is. Was BCI then called to that

L	scene	?

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

**A** Yes, they were.

Q And who arrived from BCI? What agent

4 arrived?

A Agent Bernie Albert.

Q And what was your responsibility at that

7 | time?

Nemeth, Sergeant Hunt, continued to go on taking photos, doing some other things. We walked Mr. Albert through the home, showed him basically the scene, did kind of a total walk through and showed him the complexity of it. Showed him where we thought there was evidence. And then I proceeded to accompany Mr. Albert as he processed the scene and assisted him in any way necessary, whether it be holding the lighting, if he needed equipment, if he needed something moved. So basically just making sure that while Detective Nemeth was tied up with some other

things, that all of our interests in the home were met.

Q All right. And Mr. Albert's -- I mean, he's

there to collect evidence; correct?

A That's his sole responsibility; correct.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	Q And this may sound silly, but back in 1974,
2	DNA wasn't even a thought to anybody, was it?
3	A No. They were just probably then getting
4	into doing some work with blood at that time, but DNA
5	was not even on the charts.
6	Q All right. And so what were fingerprints?
7	A Well, fingerprints were, you know, because of
8	all the prior court testimony, from time to time were
9	the most conclusive
10	MR. MERANTO: Objection.
11	THE COURT: Quit answering when there's
12	an objection, please. Let me hear the
13	question again.

# (WHEREUPON, the record was read as requested.)

THE COURT: He can answer if he knows. The objection's overruled.

A Fingerprints at that time because of the court cases that were ruled, I mean, they were some of the best and most conclusive evidence that you could have.

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

you begin -- where did you and Mr. Albert begin in that evidence collection process? What part of the house?

A I remember starting back where Mr. Marsh was and working back to the point of entry because we did find a partial footprint in the bedroom. I remember pointing back to him and recalling that that is somewhat similar to the same print that is on the door. And we went back through the house so that he would then make sure we got that print off the door as well.

When you were assisting Mr. Albert, where did

Q Okay. So let me start there then. You had described in one of those photographs that there was a projectile laying in the bedroom on the floor near the sitting area; is that correct?

A Yes.

**Q** And was that projectile collected?

**A** Yes, it was.

**Q** And did you witness Bernie Albert collecting that projectile?

**A** Yes.

Q All right. The area entering that bedroom, what was done to process that area, the doorways, et

1 | cetera?

A Those areas were all dusted for latent fingerprints.

Q And tell the jury what a latent fingerprint is.

A latent fingerprint would be a print left that really isn't fully visible to the naked eye. It is revealed by a dusting process where the dusting powder adheres to the oils, sweat, salts, things that are left by sweaty fingers. And then they become — they become revealed by that powder sticking to those.

**Q** And then what is done once a print is revealed?

The print is then lifted by using an adhesive tape. They are some premade lifters, different sizes, but if you don't have those, just a plain roll of clear tape that you use. You basically put the tape over the ink, or the dusted impression. You pull that back up, and then you place it onto a contrasting card. So if you're using black fingerprint powder you would put it on a card where you could then get contrast. If you were using white powder you would probably put it on a black or a dark gray card.

- And what specific process or color of powder and card were used in the processing of the Marsh home?
  - A He was using the standard black powder and standard white card stock backing.
  - **Q** And did you observe Bernie Albert obtaining and lifting those fingerprints from that door area into the bedroom?
  - **A** Yes.

2.1

- **Q** What would Mr. Albert do once a print was 10 lifted and placed on that card?
  - A He would initial, identify it, and date it, and he would identify the location where it was removed from.
    - Q In the foyer area, you described a bullet hole in the ceiling.
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** What was done in order to retrieve any projectile that had gone up there?
  - At the completion of going through the first floor of the home, Agent Albert and I went into the attic and spent several hours going through every little the insulation in the home was had what they call craft paper facing on it, and the age of the

home, that paper had deteriorated over time and was brittle from being in the unheated attic. So looking at the angle that the projectile had come up through the ceiling, we started from there and started to work our way back through the attic, and every time we saw a -- a cut or a break in that paper, we then would just gradually feel our way in and around that insulation. And we did that for several hours until that projectile was found.

- **Q** And who were the two persons that were up there looking for that projectile?
- **A** Agent Albert and I.
  - Q The foyer area where the bodies of Heather Marsh and Marilyn Marsh were located, you described those photographs and where their bodies were. Where was that bullet hole in the ceiling in connection to where they were?
  - A Probably almost right between them. Maybe as you're looking at the diagram there, where you see Heather, if you would just a little bit to the left of Heather's head, you know, above that. And just a short distance off of there's a arched entryway into that living room, so it was just if you're facing

- north again, it would be just to the right of that
  arched entryway and probably just a foot or so I would
  estimate this side of Heather's head.
  - Q Okay. The kitchen area, do you recall anything -- I think you indicated already that Christopher, the baby, was gone when you arrived; correct?
  - A That's correct.
- **Q** Was there any indication of bottles or anything on that counter?
  - A Yes, there was baby bottles over on the small counter to the right of the stove.
    - Q And were they full? Did they have formula or whatever in them?
  - **A** They were full.
  - Q The doorway then entering into -- and again,
    I'm kind of working my way back out like you did. Tell
    us about the doorway entering from the garage into the
    dining room, family room area.
    - A That doorway, it's a wood door. They had at some point taken the glass out of that door and put in apparently a piece of plywood.
    - Q So you couldn't see through that door?

A No, you could not. They had covered the
front the inside of that door with paneling that
matched the paneling in the room. So if you were in
the kitchen and looked at that wall, the door was
covered and almost looked like it was part of the
paneled wall, but the glass had been replaced with
wood.

- Q And as far as any processing by Mr. Albert with you, what was done to that door?
- A He dusted for latent prints on that door and also for the what appeared to be a shoe or boot impression on the door.
- And what process was used -- you've already talked about lifting latent fingerprints. What process is used to lift a boot print or shoe print?
- A He was able to get that print to reveal itself using the standard powder that he was using. So it was listed just as if any other fingerprint would be lifted.
- Q And were there prints once the door was being processed, were there prints visible -- fingerprints visible on that door as well?
- A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

21

22

- The process used that you've described, was that done in your presence by Bernie Albert to lift the prints off of that door?
  - Α Yes, it was.
  - Now moving to the garage door entering from outside, tell us about that door. You've already described the glass was broken. What was done to process that door?
  - Agent Albert dusted that door for prints as well, and those were revealed, again, were lifted and identified, marked and processed as all the lifts in the home were.
- 13 And were you watching him do this?
- 14 I was present with him as the assistant as he A 15 was doing things. Yeah, I -- probably in this 16 proximity with him as he was going through the home.
  - You said this proximity. What proximity? Q
- Similar to what I am with the stenographer, A 19 just being right next to each other and talking and 20 conversing as he was doing his job.
  - Okay. And the fingerprints that were lifted Q from that door, I'm going to call that the door of the garage, did you observe him lift those and place those

1	prints	onto	white	card	stock	that	you	described?
---	--------	------	-------	------	-------	------	-----	------------

2 A Yes, I did.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- **Q** And what did he do once those prints were placed on that white card stock?
  - A He labeled them, dated, initialed them as he did with all the prints that were taken.
    - **Q** All right.

MS. DOHERTY: Judge, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. MERANTO: Judge, I'm going to object to this point in regard to --

THE COURT: I don't know what he's going to say. So you're objecting to the publishing of this exhibit to the jury in any fashion; is that right?

MR. MERANTO: Correct, Judge, and the identification he would make. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. It's overruled.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you.

MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, Judge.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 41A &

41B were marked for identification.)

BY MS. DOHERTY:

# OFFICIAL SHORTHAND REPORTERS MAHONING COUNTY YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

Q	I'm going to har	nd you what I	have marked as
State's E	xhibit 41A and 4	1B. First of	all, if you
could loo	k at those and se	ee if you reco	gnize what they
are and ex	xplain that to the	he jury.	

A Exhibit 41A would be the partial shoe or boot print taken off of the -- removed from the door going from the garage door into that family room/dining room area.

**Q** And how is it that you can recognize what that is?

A Agent Albert's initials, the date, and also he has labeled it where it came off of was the door of the house.

MR. MERANTO: Objection. Move to strike.

THE COURT: Overruled.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

• And specifically how is that door described on that particular item that you're looking at?

A Door off garage.

**Q** And did you watch Mr. Albert put that information, place that information, date, area, his initials, on that particular card?

- 1 **A** Yes.
- 2 **Q** State's Exhibit 41B?
- A 41B is a -- the lifted impression off of what appeared to be a boot or shoe print off of the master bedroom floor.
- And again, that appears to be -- if you can describe it, that appears to be on a different type of paper -- or stock. Describe what that is, the difference.
- 10 **A** He used -- in this particular one he used the standard card stock. On the one coming off the floor he had put this on a clear piece of plastic.
- 13 **Q** All right. And --
- 14 **A** That's the only difference.
- So just a different way to retrieve that piece of evidence, fair to say?
- 17 **A** Yes.
- 18 **Q** And do you recognize that exhibit as well,
- 19 41B?
- 20 **A** Yes.
- 21 MS. DOHERTY: Can I approach again,
- 22 Judge?
- 23 **THE COURT:** Yes.

1	(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 43A,
2	43B, 43C & 43D were marked for
3	identification.)
4	BY MS. DOHERTY:
5	Q I am going to hand you State's Exhibits 43A,
6	43B, 43C, and 43D. And I would ask you to look at
7	those and see if you can identify those for the jury.
8	A Yes. All four of these would be the lifts
9	that Agent Albert took as we proceeded through the
10	home.
11	MR. MERANTO: Objection. Move to
12	strike.
13	THE COURT: Overruled.
14	MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Judge.
15	BY MS. DOHERTY:
16	<b>Q</b> And I'm going to ask you specifically about
17	those. Describe 43A. Is there just one print on
18	one fingerprint on there, five? What? What is it?
19	<b>A</b> 43A actually has seven lifts on this
20	particular card.
21	<b>Q</b> And how are those specific lifts and the
22	areas where they came from delineated on that card?
23	<b>A</b> They were all labeled and dated and initialed

1 by Agent Albert.

- **Q** And was that labeling and initialing done in your presence?
  - **A** Yes, it was.
- On 43A, describe where those particular prints were lifted from.
  - Another print is from the door to the guns, that closet door. There's a print or prints that were taken off of the top bedroom door, the inside of the top bedroom door. The door off of the garage, the storm door off of the garage, the door off the garage, and then another one which is the door off garage.
  - Q And just be sure -- or just so you can explain this to the jury, the door off -- described as door off the garage is that back door; correct?
- **A** That's correct.
- **Q** Entering from outside into the garage?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** And then the door of the garage is from the garage into the house?
- **A** Correct.
- **Q** I flipped that around. You explain it. I'm

1 wrong.

8

9

10

11

- 2 **A** The door off the garage is the door going 3 from the garage out to the backyard.
- 4 **Q** Okay.
- And the -- the door off the garage is the storm door and the door going from the garage into the family room.
  - Q Okay. And all of the prints that you've described on that card, those were done in your presence, witnessed by you, and placed onto that particular card; correct?
- 12 **A** Yes, they were.
- 13 **Q** State's Exhibit --
- MS. DOHERTY: Can I approach again?
- 15 **THE COURT:** Yes.
- 16 BY MS. DOHERTY:
- 17 **Q** I think 43B. 43B, what is that?
- 18 **A** 43B is a lift off of the door with the guns.
- 19 **Q** All right. 43C.
- 20 **A** 43C, there are three prints on this card.
- Bathroom door framing, a lift off of the framing of the
- 22 hall shelf, and off of the front door frame.
  - Q All right. And you have one more exhibit

- 1 there; correct? 43D?
- 2 **A** Yes, 43D.
- 3  $\mathbf{Q}$  And what is that one?
- 4 A 43D is a latent, almost a full hand print off of the side of the refrigerator.
- 6 Q All right. And again, State's Exhibits 43B,
- 7 C, and D, were they done -- were they lifted and taken
- 8 as evidence in your presence?
- 9 **A** Yes, they were.
- 10 Q By Bernie Albert? You watched him do it;
- 11 correct?
- 12 **A** Correct.
- 13 **Q** And do they all indicate where they were
- 14 lifted from?
- 15 **A** Yes, they do.
- 16 **Q** I'm going to take you back just for a second
- 17 to the bedroom. You had talked about -- and that's
- 18 where Ben Marsh was found. I know that some prints
- were lifted from that bedroom door. Was there any
- 20 blood visible on either the outside or the inside of
- 21 that door going into the bedroom?
- 22 **A** Yes, there was blood splatter there, and then
- 23 some of the smearing on the closet door, the gun closet

- 1 door.
- 2 **Q** All right. So the blood spatter, was it on
- 3 | the outside of that bedroom door and the inside?
- 4  $\blacksquare$  A I know it was on the outside.
- 5 **Q** All right. All right. We've heard that
- 6 there was a dog in the house.
- 7 A Correct.
  - **Q** Did you ever see the dog?
- 9 **A** I did not.
- 10 Q Did you know where the dog was during all of
- 11 this?

- 12 **A** It was secured in the basement.
- 13 **Q** The vehicles that the Marshes had, do you
- 14 know what they were?
- 15 **A** The family vehicle was a Chevy Vega, and he
- 16 had a small pickup truck, but I'm not 100 percent sure
- 17  $\parallel$  what the exact make of that was.
- 18 **Q** And was that truck still located at the
- 19 residence?
- 20 **A** The truck was, yes.
- 21 **Q** And where was it?
- 22 **A** It was in the garage, and it had a charger on
- 23 it. He was charging it. He was going to go to work

- that night. He was charging that truck battery because he was having problems with it.
  - **Q** All right. And it was still hooked up?
- 4 A Correct.

3

- And what about the Vega? Did you say what color it is? What color was it?
- 7 **A** The Vega was an orange, kind of a burnt 8 orange.
  - **Q** And was that Vega present at the home?
- 10 **A** It was not.
- 11 **MS. DOHERTY:** May I approach, Judge?
- 12 **THE COURT:** You may.
- (WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 46-48,
- 14 | 50 were marked for identification.)
- 15 | BY MS. DOHERTY:
- 16 Q I'm going to show you State's Exhibits 48,
- 17 | 46, 47, 50, and 51. Can you tell us, describe for us,
- 18 please, what those are?
- 19 **A** These are photos of the Marsh family Vega
- 20 taken at Utsinger's Towing.
- 21 **Q** And where was that Vega located subsequent to
- 22 the homicides?
- 23 **A** It was located abandoned in the K-mart

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 1 parking lot up on Route 18 in Austintown.
- And those photographs I think you said were 3 taken after being towed; correct?
  - Α Correct.
  - And I guess just briefly describe what each one of those are since the jury can't see them.
    - Photo 48 is the right, front passenger door Α forward to include the right, front fender portion of the car.
    - 46 is standing looking at the front, right headlight near the front, right tire and the license plate which is mounted on the front, right corner of the bumper on that model year.
    - 47 is a photo of the interior of the car looking with the driver door open, looking into the car from that perspective.
    - 50 is looking into the front passenger area of the car from the open right passenger door.
    - And then 51 is a photo of the right, rear tire, right, rear fender in probably about three-quarters of the right side passenger door.
    - Okay. And do those photographs accurately Q reflect, other than that they're in black and white,

- 1 | that Vega as it was found at the K-mart plaza?
- $2 \quad | \mathbf{A}$  Yes, they do.
- All right. The blood spatter that was noted in the bedroom area, tell the jury where that was. And I'm not talking about the door this time. I'm talking
- 6 about the bedroom.
- 7 **A** There was a lot of spatter on the bed linens, 8 the bed, the ceiling, and again on the closet door,
- 9 that wall to the right of the bed.
- 10 Q The evidence that was collected from that
- 11 residence, I think you've already described the
- 12 projectiles and the fingerprint lifts. Was a weapon
- 13 | found anywhere near Heather?
- 14 **A** No.
- 15 **Q** Was a weapon found anywhere near Ben?
- 16 **A** No.
- 17 **Q** As you observed the interior of the home, did
- 18 it appear to be ransacked?
- 19 **A** No, it did not.
- 20 Q Did it appear that anything was missing, TV,
- 21 anything like that?
- 22 **A** No, it did not.
- 23 **Q** You've talked about the actual collecting of

2.1

- - **A** At that time, no.
- **Q** All right. Any comparisons done? I mean, 5 I'm talking about just at the house.
  - A Just at the house, probably the only one was the foot impression in the bedroom, visually appeared to be like the foot impression on the door. That was that was probably the only discussion of anything being comparable.
  - Q Okay. But the whole point of collecting that evidence is that it can then go to BCI to be analyzed by an expert; fair to say?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: That's sustained. You're not testifying.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

- Q Tell us what the point is.
- A The point of collecting the evidence is to secure it for future analysis, and sometimes you have to wait until you have a known to compare it to. So it is filed. Some things may be analyzed immediately if there is enough comparable evidence there to link one

piece to another, but that is all done from experts in the lab.

Q All right. And each print that you identified, Agent Albert noted on each one of those individually, correct, where they came from?

A Yes. Correct.

**Q** Have you had the opportunity to see the home and the area in Canfield where this occurred recently?

A Yes, I have.

Q How has the area surrounding the home, I quess, changed, if that's a fair question?

A Well, across the road from the home now there are probably three or four residences that were not there at the time. The home at the time, the south, the west, and the north edge of the properties had pine trees. Those pine trees I would estimate back in the — at that day were about as high as the wood paneling in this room. Today they're probably as tall as the ceiling in this room with 30 some years of growth. The door to the garage from the — going out to the backyard there, that door has been — it's the same door. The glass has been replaced. But it has been sided over. They went ahead and negated that door

1

2

3

4

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

23

- when they resided it. So from in the garage, it's basically a door to nowhere. If you would go out to the back of the house, you would just see a garage -- a sided garage wall now.
- Let me ask you this; I guess I've sort of described that house as kind of desolate out there where it was in Canfield at that time. Would that be fair to say?
  - A Yes, at that time it pretty much was somewhat of a freestanding home with a lot of acreage on both sides of it from across the street.
- MS. DOHERTY: Can I approach, Judge?

  THE COURT: Yes.

#### 14 BY MS. DOHERTY:

- Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 24. Can you tell the jury what that is?
- A Yes. This would be a photo of Mr. Marsh at the coroner's office.
- 20 Q And State's Exhibit 30.
- 21 **A** This would be -- 30 would be a photo of 22 Marilyn Marsh at the coroner's office.
  - Q And State's Exhibit 34?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	A	34	is	a	photo	of	Heather	at	the	coroner	's
2	office.										

And do those photographs -- I realize they were just face shots, but do they represent as the same people that you witnessed and saw in that home deceased?

A Yes, they do.

Q Other than what you have described in processing the scene, did you further investigate this case in any way?

A Just about everybody assisted in some way. I mean, for multiple years.

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: He isn't really saying anything. The question was -- the answer's not responsive to the question, so the objection's sustained.

MS. DOHERTY: I'll withdraw it, Judge.
Thank you. I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Mr. Meranto.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Judge.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MERANTO:

# DI M. MINANIO

- Good morning, Mr. Finamore. You remember I'm
  Tony Meranto. I'm going to ask you some questions. If
  you want me to repeat something, straighten it out,
  just let me know; okay?
  - A Yes, sir.

5

6

7

8

15

16

- Q The state pointed out you've had a long law enforcement career; correct?
- A Yes, sir.
- 9 **Q** But in 1974, just clear it up for me again, 10 what was your training and education at that point?
- I would've been -- had approximately two
  years of criminal justice with the Youngstown State
  University. I had the basic police officer training
  course.
  - **Q** Okay. And let's talk about that OPATA training. You say it was a 300-hour course?
- 17 **A** Correct.
- 18 **Q** That's standard law enforcement course;
  19 correct?
- 20 **A** Correct.
- 21 **Q** Tell me specifically how many hours involved the collection of evidence at a crime scene.
  - **A** I don't recall exactly the length of that

- 1 particular course.
- 2 **Q** Okay. Tell me specifically how much time was
- 3 spent training you to process the crime scene
- 4 specifically for latent prints.
- 5 **A** Probably several hours, I would guess.
- 6 Q Okay. Any specific training manuals or
- 7 anything that you recall that they used or that you
- 8 used specifically in your training regarding those
- 9 issues?
- 10 **A** I recall using standard fingerprint supply,
- 11 | fingerprint cards where we both took turns lifting
- 12 prints, and we took turns rolling each other's prints.
- Okay. I believe also you stated that you
- were an intern for a period of time?
- 15 **A** College intern from the fall quarter of '72.
- 16 **Q** So you were interested and wanted to try and
- 17 | learn; is that correct?
- 18 **A** Yes.
- 19 Q Okay. So on this evening of December 14th,
- 20 in 1974, you were not called to that scene; correct?
- 21 **A** No, I was not.
- 22 **Q** You called and asked if you could go there
- 23  $\blacksquare$  and assist?

- I asked if assistance was needed, correct, in the conversation I had when I called in.
  - Q So you basically -- by the way, did you work that day? Tell me about that day and what you did up to that point.
  - A No. Actually, March of that year, my parents relocated to Nashville, Tennessee. And that would've been it was their first return trip home for the holidays. I was at my grandmother's house with my parents for dinner, and I called in from my grandmother's home in Struthers.
- **Q** Okay. Were you required to call in?
- 13 A No. I would just call in and see if maybe
  14 the detectives were out, and I would join them
  15 sometimes just for coffee.
  - Q You were an aggressive, anxious guy with regard to law enforcement, you wanted to be in the loop? Fair to say?
- **A** I was willing to learn, yes.
- **Q** And you're learning, we agree, at that point?
- **A** Sure.
- **Q** So you go out to the scene, and you say 23 Detective Nemeth is running the show pretty much?

3

6

7

14

15

- 1 | A Him and Lieutenant Crater, yes.
- 2 **Q** Okay. So Lieutenant Crater was there also?
  - **A** At one point.
- 4 **Q** Tell me everybody that was there at the scene with regard to law enforcement.
  - **A** Lieutenant Crater --
    - **Q** And their rank, if you know.
- A Lieutenant Crater, Detective Nemeth, Sergeant
  Hunt, and Deputy Catheline and Chance were just --
- shortly after I got there they went back on patrol.
- Okay. Do you know how long detective -- or excuse me, Deputies Catheline and Chance had been on the department, if you know?
  - A At that time I'm gonna say they had three, four years on. They came on the department probably about the same time, early '70s.
- So is it fair to say you're the person with the least experience there at the crime scene?
- I was there with the least amount of seniority, yes.
- 21 **Q** No rank and the least amount of seniority?
- 22 **A** Correct.
- Okay. And when you got there, I believe you

	1	recall	testifying	at	another	hearing;	right?
--	---	--------	------------	----	---------	----------	--------

A Yes.

**Q** And I believe you stated you got briefed on the case. Tell me exactly what that entailed.

A We just discussed, I mean, just an extremely extensive crime scene. I think it was an extensive crime scene for all of us there. There was just a lot of discussion of what a serious crime this was and how — and the magnitude. You just don't find three bodies every day. So there was a lot of discussion of motive and how could you beat a four-year-old to death. What would be the motive? So there was just a lot of discussion because of the serious nature of the house.

And your involvement in the discussion, I mean, you're a listener? You provide any information? Are they asking your advice?

A No. It was just a general discussion.

Q Now, you arrive at 9:30; correct?

A Approximately 9:30, yes.

20 Q And there's four or five of you guys there.

Is anybody beginning to process the crime scene?

A No.

**Q** Why not?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- Because my understanding at that time, they
  were waiting for BCI to come.
  - Q Well, your understanding. Let me ask you, are you involved in this, or are you just kind of standing around watching what's going on? Because sometimes you say, well, we did this, and now it seems to me you're saying --

MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, I object.

THE COURT: He can answer the question.

It's overruled.

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

- Q So, I mean, why are you not processing the crime scene?
- 14 **A** Because BCI was called to do that.
- 15 Q Okay. Why was BCI called?
- 16 **A** Because that's what they do.
- 17 Q Okay. You guys don't process crime scenes?
- 18 **A** Of that magnitude, no.
- 19 **Q** Well, what magnitude do you process? What
- 20 level do you process?
- 21 A Not to minimize it, but I would say routine
- 22 burglaries, property crimes.
- 23 **Q** So the evidence isn't as important in a

1 | burglary as it is here? Explain the difference.

2 MS. DOHERTY: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Q Go ahead. Explain to me the difference. I don't understand. I mean, evidence is evidence; correct?

A Correct.

I mean, a fingerprint if I steal this projector is the same as a fingerprint if I stab the bailiff; is it not?

A Correct.

Q Okay. So explain to me the difference about why one's serious, why one's not, and why BCI has to come to this crime scene.

A Because the nature of the crime. The penalties, the seriousness, the amount of analysis. It cuts down the chain of evidence. It puts it directly into the lab's hands. And basically we just allow them to handle and treat it the way they know their lab technicians want to do it.

Q Okay. Let's stop there. Let's try and handle those things one thing at a time. The

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

penalties, what in the world — what are you even talking about, the penalties? How do they affect the decision on whether or not BCI is called to these crimes?

MS. DOHERTY: I object.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A If I have a burglary or a theft from an unoccupied structure or home, that is a -- for maybe lack of better words -- a simple burglary, property crime. We aren't dealing with three deaths.

Q Okay. So your deputy in 1974 worked for Mahoning County Sheriff's Department; correct?

A Yes.

**Q** And it's your statement that anybody burglarize or theft, not an important crime, not serious enough to call BCI for?

MS. DOHERTY: I object.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A BCI doesn't have the manpower to come out on every single property crime.

**Q** So do you guys just ignore them then? Do you just ignore those other crimes?

A No. We would try to secure the evidence the

7

8

- best we can and turn that over to the investigative bureau.
- But you're not competent to do so; right?
  You just said that.
- 5 MS. DOHERTY: Objection.

6 **THE COURT:** Overruled.

- A I would be very qualified to take fingerprints.
- 9 Q Okay. You were very qualified to take them.
  10 So tell me now why it's 9:30 and you wait till 11:00 to
  11 start processing the crime scene.
- Because the detective and Lieutenant Crater made that decision.
- Okay. So they just said we're not going to process these crimes?
- 16 **A** Correct. They called BCI.
- But you're qualified to do it. Why didn't they have you do it?
- 19 **A** Because they chose to have BCI do it.
- 20 **Q** Same with Deputy Chance then; right? He's 21 not qualified?
- 22 **A** He would've been qualified to lift prints, 23 yes.

- 1 **Q** Deputy Catheline also qualified?
- 2 **A** Sure.
- 3 Q And what about the sergeant? Sergeant Hunt's
- 4 | there; right?
- 5 A He would've been.
- 6 Q He's qualified, too?
- 7 | A He would've been.
- 8 **Q** And you got a lieutenant and a detective
- 9 there, they're qualified to do it?
- 10 **A** That's correct.
- 11 **Q** But nobody does it?
- 12 **A** BCI did it.
- Nobody from the Sheriff's Department?
- 14 **A** No, they did not.
- Okay. Now -- by the way, how many times have
- 16 you taken prints in the course of your long year and a
- 17 half year at that point in time?
- 18 A Well, in our prior discussion, the number
- 19 that we I guess agreed to last time would've been
- 20 probably 20 to 30.
- 21 **Q** I didn't agree to it. Is that what it is?
- 22 **A** You asked me to make a number. I testified
- 23 that it would be hard to determine, and you tried to

2.1

- get me to pin down a number, and I estimated it to be 2 0 to 30.
  - Q Well, in that year and a half that you were a deputy, how many times were you called to a crime scene because of your expertise?
  - A I was called to a crime scene because I was a deputy certified to respond numerous times.
  - Q So does that mean that you were never called to a crime scene to process evidence?
  - evidence routinely. We were sent there, and we would make the decision to process the evidence. Sometimes we would call the detective squad. They would come out and process it. And then there's times that BCI would process it.
  - Q Okay. Mr. Finamore, I'm going to ask you this question again, please. Listen. How many times during your year and a half leading up to this incident that you were on the Sheriff's Department were you asked to process evidence at a crime scene?
  - A By nature of being sent to a crime scene, a burglary, a robbery, a theft, I would be -- I would make numerous decisions to process that evidence on

1 probably a daily basis.

Q Mr. Finamore, I'm not being -- you are educated and went to college?

A Yes.

**Q** English is your first language; right?

MS. DOHERTY: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q Yes?

A Yes, it is.

Q Okay. I'm going to ask you this question one more time. How many times in the year and a half that you're a deputy, in the department, up to this incident, were you specifically called to a crime scene to process any evidence?

A Every time I was sent to a property crime.

THE COURT: Okay. I want you to answer the question. It's a simple question. How many times were you directed by the department to go to a crime scene and process the scene?

THE WITNESS: As a deputy I was never asked to come and play the role of a detective or a crime scene agent, no.

1	BY MR. MERANTO:
2	Q So that would be never; right? Zero?
3	A Playing that role, never. Zero.
4	Q Because that wasn't your role; correct?
5	You're not a crime scene guy?
6	A I would not be considered a crime scene
7	technician, no.
8	Q Right. I mean, you've got a three couple
9	hours during your OPATA training, that's it; right?
10	A At that point.
11	Q You taken well, that's the point we're
12	talking about, isn't it, in 1974? I mean, it's great
13	what you did after, but you would agree what you
14	learned after didn't help you in 1974 on December 14th,
15	did it?
16	A It would not have, no.

- 17 It didn't, not would not have. Didn't help Q
- 18 you, did it? Couldn't help you?
- 19 Α It did not.
- 20 Q Okay. Lieutenant Crater still alive?
- 21 No, he's not. Α

- 22 Detective Nemeth still alive? Q
  - No, he's not. Α

- 1 **Q** Sergeant Hunt?
- 2  $\blacksquare$  A No, he is not.
- Well, gee, you happen to be the only guy
  that's alive that happened to be at that crime scene
- 5 that night; correct?

- **A** Phil Chance would still be alive.
- 7 **Q** Phil Chance, wasn't he convicted of a crime?
- 8 MS. DOHERTY: Objection.
- 9 **THE COURT:** Overruled.
- 10 **A** Yes, he was.
- 11 **Q** So you've never been convicted of a crime;
- 12 right? You've got a pretty good, distinguished law
- 13 enforcement career, don't you?
- 14 **A** Uh-huh.
- 15 **Q** And you were at the crime scene; right?
- 16 **A** Yes.
- 17 **Q** And basically you were breathing then, you're
- 18 still breathing now, and you're here to testify today;
- 19 correct?
- 20 **A** Yes.
- 21 **Q** Okay. So now that you got through all that
- 22 experience that you have, tell me -- and by the way,
- 23 you volunteered to go to this crime scene; correct?

1		I	asked	if	they	needed	help,	and	they	said
2	sure.									

Q I got you. But your phone didn't ring, and they said, hey, we need some help out here, come on out?

No. Α

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So you volunteered to go out there, Q Okav. and you get there, and it's 9:30, and you guys discussed the crime scene, and you're waiting until 11:00 because BCI's coming there; right?

Α Yes, sir.

So can we agree that basically nobody on the Q Sheriff's Department has got enough experience or qualifications at that point that they don't even want to risk anybody else messing with that crime scene until BCI gets there? Is that fair to say?

> MS. DOHERTY: I object.

If you're going to object, THE COURT: you need to stand, and you need to quit gesturing when you don't agree with the questions and answers that are given.

> MS. DOHERTY: I object.

THE COURT: It's overruled. And if you

22

react again the way that you've been, then
I'm going to do something about it. Sorry.
Go ahead, Mr. Meranto.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

So I'm going to ask you again, nobody there at the crime scene is qualified to process this scene, and that's why the decision is made to wait for BCI; is that not correct?

A I would say that's not correct.

Q Okay. Well, tell me about everybody else's qualifications, because we've already gone through yours. You admit your qualifications exist of -- or excuse me, consist of a couple hours during OPATA training; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Okay. So those are your qualifications.

Tell me about anybody else there at the scene.

A I mean, they had four — four or five years on. Sergeant Hunt had numerous years on. Detective Nemeth had numerous years. They've been to a lot of different training, a lot of specialized training as detectives, Lieutenant Crater did.

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

2.1

- Tell me about Detective Crater -- Crater,

  tell me specifically all the training he had.
  - A Well, I just know that they -- we actively sent officers to Youngstown State, Kent State.

    Subsequent to this event I think I had 30 some certificates from the Northeast Law Enforcement School, Kent State. So how many of those schools they went to,
- I know the -- I know they actively did in-service type
  training and those kind of specialized schools. So I
  can't tell you exactly how many certificates they have.
  - Q Well, in your year and a half they're obviously are these guys calling you regularly and asking you, like, hey, Deputy Finamore, you think I should take this seminar, you think I should get this training? I mean, are they discussing this with you, their education and all that?
- 17 **A** We discussed a lot of that over lunch and coffee a lot of times.
- Okay. You're the go-to guy there, right, is that it, after a year and a half?
  - **A** I never said that.
- 22 **Q** Yeah. Okay. So everybody's obviously
  23 massively qualified to process this scene, but yet you

- guys are all there talking, and you wait for an hour and a half until Bernie Albert arrives; correct?
  - A Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

- Q And you say that you are specifically requested to assist in the collection of the evidence, huh? Right? Yes?
- A I was asked to go ahead and assist Agent Albert; correct.
- And I believe that you said specifically to get his equipment and provide lighting and move stuff if you had to?
- A Correct.
  - Q Well, I mean, why -- why didn't -- you know, this is important; right? You only have a year and a half in. Why didn't Detective Nemeth or Lieutenant Crater want to carry the lights or move the furniture for Mr. Albert? Why do you think that is?

MS. DOHERTY: Objection.

19 **THE COURT:** He can answer if he knows.

A They were busy doing other things. They were -- at the time they were trying to get information on the car, to attempt to locate on the car out. So they were doing a lot of other investigative actions at

- 1 the time.
- 2 **Q** Let's talk about everything that they were
- 3 doing. Tell me about what they were doing. Wait.
- 4 Strike that. You're there from 9:30 until I believe
- 5 you testified 7:30 or 8:00 a.m. the next morning;
- 6 correct?

- **A** That's correct.
- 8 Q Lots of things to do there; right?
- 9 **A** Yes.
- 10 **Q** Until 9:30 -- from 9:30 to 11:00 you're
- 11 really not doing anything. You're talking about, gee,
- what could've happened, what might have happened;
- 13 | right?
- 14 **A** Correct.
- 15 Q And by the way, nobody knows what happened;
- 16 correct?
- 17 **A** There's probabilities. We discussed
- 18 probabilities.
- 19 **Q** There's probabilities. Once again, I'm going
- 20 to ask you, do you know what happened there?
- 21 **A** I know three people were beaten and shot.
- 22 **Q** There you go; okay? That's all you know;
- 23 | correct? Yes?

that were obvious.

A	Yes.
---	------

Q Okay. So from 9:30 to 11:00, nothing much going on; right? What's going on from 9:30 to 11:00?

Tell me.

A lot of assessment of the crime scene.

Again, trying to find information on the car, trying to get — trying to get a handle on the background information on the family. Trying to get information on the family. They had their coats on. Where would they have been coming from? So they were just starting to do a lot or — trying to answer a lot of guestions

And tell me specifically, what were you doing then from 9:30 to 11:00? Which one of those things, what task, what duties were you given from 9:30 to 11:00?

A Specific duty? None that I can think of.

Q None. Okay. All right. So at 11:00

Mr. Albert arrives, and I believe you say you walked --

20 no. Who walked him through the crime scene?

A Detective Nemeth and I. I know Sergeant Hunt was still there at the time. We had introduced ourselves, and obviously he wanted to know what we had,

- and so we said, well, you know, we'll walk you through, and we'll show you.
- You're telling him what you had at the crime scene; is that your testimony?
  - **A** It was collectively.
    - **Q** Collectively?
  - **A** We walked through.
- Q Collectively. Well, collectively, who said specifically what, or were you guys all talking in
- 10 unison like a choir?
- 11 **A** I can't recall exactly.
- 12 **Q** You can't recall?
- 13 **A** Specifically what -- what every word that
  14 Detective Nemeth would say or I would say or Sergeant
- 15 Hunt would say.
- 16 Q You can't recall specifically; right?
- 17 **A** No.
- 18 **Q** So tell me what Mr. Albert did initially.
- 19 A Mr. Albert?
- 20 **Q** Yes. Because you're with him the whole time;
- 21 right?

5

6

- 22 **A** He got his equipment out, and he has his
- 23 fingerprint equipment, his bags, envelopes, things he

- put the evidence in, and he started processing the scene.
- 3 **Q** What's a glassine bag?
- A plastic bag, like a Ziploc baggie to secure it.
- Just a baggie; right? Glassine makes it sound good, but it's just a baggie; right?
- 8 **A** A clear, plastic bag.
- 9 **Q** So you start back here and work your way 10 forward; right?
  - **A** Yes.

- 12 **Q** And he is there from 11:00 until 7:30, 8:00 in the morning?
- By the way, let's talk about that. You worked with Mr. Albert all night; correct?
- 19 **A** Yes.
- 20 Q Okay. Did Mr. Albert work that day?
- 21 **A** Before he came?
- 22 **Q** Yeah.
- 23 **A** My recollection is he came from his home.

- 1 **Q** Where did he live?
- 2 **A** Northeast Ohio somewhere.
- 3 **Q** Somewhere in northeast Ohio?
- 4 **A** Yes.
- 5 **Q** Okay. Well, had he worked previously to
- 6 coming from his home? Because he was coming at night.
- 7 I mean, did he work that day?
- 8 A I don't know.
- 9 **Q** Do you know if he took a nap that day?
- 10 **A** Did not.
- 11 **Q** So, I mean, he could've been working 24 hours
- 12 before he got to that crime scene? You have no idea;
- 13 right?
- 14 A No, I don't.
- 15 **Q** You guys working so closely you obviously got
- 16 to know each other. You didn't talk the six hours?
- 17 **A** Sure we did.
- 18 Q But you don't know any of those questions I
- 19 just asked you?
- 20 **A** Not that I recall.
- 21 **Q** Okay. So how many cases was Mr. Albert
- 22 working on at the time he came to that crime scene?
- 23 **A** I would have no idea.

- Did he have case files with him in addition to the equipment and stuff?
- 3 **A** Not that I saw.
- 4 **Q** Not that you saw, or you don't know?
- 5 **A** I wouldn't know.
- 6 Q Did you look?
- 7 A I would not -- I had no reason to look in his
- 8 car.
- 9 Q Did you ask him?
- 10 **A** No.
- 11 **Q** You didn't ask him about any other cases he's
- 12 working on?
- 13 **A** No.
- 14 **Q** So he could have -- he might be a guy who
- 15 keeps all his files in the car; you don't even know
- 16 | that?
- 17 **A** No, I do not know that.
- 18 **Q** Do you take him through the crime scene
- 19 first, or does he get all his equipment?
- 20 **A** No. We had walked through and showed him
- 21 where everything -- where we thought there was
- 22 evidence.
- 23 **Q** Once again, you showed him?

- 1 **A** Collectively we showed him.
- 2 **Q** Collectively you showed him. I got you.
- 3 Collectively. Really, I'm going to ask you this right
- 4 now, is it fair to say you're basically just tagging
- 5 along there at the investigation at that point?
- 6 **A** No.
- 7 **Q** You're an integral part of this
- 8 investigation?
- 9 **A** I was playing the role I was asked to play,
- 10 and that was to assist Agent Albert as much as I can.
- 11 **Q** Carry his bag, light the way, and move the
- 12 | furniture?
- 13 **A** Assist him in any way that he needed, yes.
- 14 **Q** All right. So you take him through the crime
- 15 scene collectively, and then did you go out and carry
- 16 his equipment in for him?
- 17 **A** No.
- 18 **Q** You didn't?
- 19 **A** I don't recall being in his vehicle at all.
- 20 **Q** Excuse me?
- 21 **A** No, I don't recall being in his vehicle at
- 22 all. I had no reason to go in his vehicle.
- Okay. So he goes and gets his equipment?

- 1 **A** Yes.
- 2 **Q** How many trips did it take him to the car to
- 3 get his equipment?
- 4 **A** Throughout the night he went in and out
- 5 | several times.
- 6 Q So you weren't with him the whole time?
- 7 **A** 100 percent of the time, no.
- 8 **Q** Excuse me?
- 9 **A** No, not 100 percent of the time.
- 10 Q Okay. So what percent of the time were you
- 11 | with him?
- 12 **A** I'd say probably 85 percent.
- 13 **Q** Eighty-five percent? Sure about that?
- 14 **A** That would be the best I could estimate.
- Okay. And once again, I haven't been
- 16 provided -- where are your notes from that night?
- 17 | A I have no notes.
- 18 **Q** You didn't take any notes?
- 19 **A** No, sir.
- 20 **Q** They teach you that at OPATA, to take notes
- 21 at a crime scene?
- 22 **A** That wasn't my role at that particular night.
- 23 **Q** Wasn't your role?

- **Q** Well, I thought your role was to assist in the processing of the crime scene?
- A That's correct.
- And you don't think it was proper to take notes or to document anything that you did that night?
  - A Detective Nemeth was documenting everything, and Agent Albert documents what he needed to do as his role as the crime scene technician.
  - Q So wait a minute now. You're telling me

    Detective Nemeth documents the entire processing of
    this crime scene?
    - A Detective Nemeth was the lead detective on that case.
      - Q I got it. And you just said that he documented everything at the crime scene. Isn't that what you just said?
    - A From a note perspective, Detective Nemeth took the notes for that crime scene, for that case.
- **Q** Well, now, okay, I want to clear this up.
- 21 This is a serious crime scene. You said it; right?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Serious. Not like these other -- someone

- just gets their house robbed or anything, not a big deal. But this is a big deal; correct?
  - A Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- So you just said Detective Nemeth took notes at the scene when I asked you that specifically, and now you're saying there are case notes. So explain to me the difference, because I want to know.
- A Detective Nemeth when he was called in as the detective assigned to that case, from the point the officers take the initial complaint and turned it over to Detective Nemeth, he then documented the investigative action.
- Q Okay. So you don't mean he documented specifically what was going on at that scene?
- A He documented what was being done by the Sheriff's Department.
- Okay. So I don't have any crime scene notes.

  So basically what you're saying is the Sheriff's
- 19 Department then did nothing at that crime scene?
- 20 **A** As far as processing it, no.
- 21 **Q** No. Okay. So the Sheriff's Department had 22 nothing to do with processing that crime scene?
  - **A** Other than photos. The only thing was

1 photos.

Q Photos. Let's talk about the photos. Take a look at what the state gave you as No. 1 and No. 2.

MS. DOHERTY: He doesn't still have
them, Tony.

MR. MERANTO: I'm sorry. I apologize.

I thought you kept those. Your Honor, may I approach the witness, please?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you.

THE COURT: We need to take a recess when it's a good time.

MR. MERANTO: Now would be fine, Your Honor, if it's okay with you.

THE COURT: All right. That's fine.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a morning recess at this time. I would remind you please during your absence from the courtroom not to discuss the case at all among yourselves or with anyone else.

Please do not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence. You must not form or express any opinion about the

case until it is finally submitted to you. We will be in recess. We'll be back in the courtroom at 10:30.

(WHEREUPON, a brief recess was had, after which the proceedings continued as follows, outside the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: Defense counsel wishes to make a motion?

MR. MERANTO: Yes, Judge. At this point in time, this witness, Mr. Finamore, just testified --

THE COURT: You folks can be seated. There's no reason for you to stand.

MR. MERANTO: This witness has just testified and answered in the affirmative that nobody at the Sheriff's Department was qualified to process that scene. As such, I believe the state is unable to proceed with regard to laying the proper foundation to testify further and to admit the evidence with regard to the fingerprints into evidence.

THE COURT: Overruled.

right?

1	MR. MERANTO: Thank you.
2	THE COURT: All right. Bring the jury
3	in.
4	(WHEREUPON, the jury returned to the
5	courtroom, and the proceedings continued as
6	follows:)
7	THE COURT: Mr. Meranto, you may
8	continue.
9	MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
LO	BY MR. MERANTO:
L1	<b>Q</b> Okay, Mr. Finamore. I have handed you what
L2	have been marked as the State's Exhibits No. 1 and 2.
L3	Once again, could you just tell the jury what those
L4	are?
L5	<b>A</b> One is the photo of the door from the
L6	backyard into the garage taken from the backyard.
L7	Photo 2 is a picture of that same door taken from the
L8	inside of the garage.
L9	<b>Q</b> Okay. And I believe I asked you what the
20	Sheriff's Department did in regard to processing that
21	scene, and that's why the reason these photos came up.
22	I think you said that, well, we took some photographs;

- 1 A Correct.
- 2 **Q** Did you, in fact, take these photographs?
- 3 **A** I did not.
- 4 **Q** Do you know who took them?
- Detective Nemeth took some photographs, and I also observed Sergeant Hunt taking some photographs.
  - Q Okay. So you don't even know who took the photographs?
  - **A** No, I do not.
- 10 Q Okay. Look at that first photo, State's No.
- 11 1, because I just have a question. I mean, you testify
- 12 there's, like, one set of footprints going back to that
- door. Is that what you testified to on direct?
- 14 **A** Yes.
- 15 Q All right. Well, what's at the bottom, right
- 16 corner of that picture? That don't look like there's
- 17 | footprints there in the snow?
- 18 **A** There's impressions. I can't tell what those
- 19 are.

7

8

- 20 Q They look like footprints, though, don't
- 21 they?
- 22 **A** I can't say that.
- 23 **Q** You can't tell. Okay. What about to the

- left of that -- I don't know. There's a trench there
  on your left. It looks like there's footprints over
  there, too; correct?
- The snow's disturbed. I can't tell what those are.
- The snow's disturbed. You don't recall then actually, do you?
  - A No.
- 9 **Q** Yes? No?
- 10 **A** No.

- Okay. Now, you got another picture, State's
  Exhibit No. 2, and that's, like, from inside the garage
  looking at that door, and it's open; correct?
- 14 **A** Yes, sir.
- Okay. Now, let's get into your observations
  for a little bit before we get into this fingerprint
  issue. You say there's prints kicking the door in.

  Where are those? Footprints, rather, not fingerprints.
- 19 **A** It was on the door going from the garage into
- 20 the family room.
- Okay. So there's nothing out here, just to be clear?
- 23 **A** That is not the door, no.

	Q Okay. Now, were you with strike that.
2	Can you take me through the crime scene and tell me
3	once again, we were talking about what equipment
1	Mr. Albert had. Tell me about it.

- A He had his fingerprint brushes, powder.

  Again, bags, lifting tape, lifting cards, camera.
- Q Okay. And once again, in those couple hours of training, they teach you about different powders, different brushes, what the contents are, or is it fair to say you have no idea what the powder was or what kind of powder?
- A No. There's several different kinds of powder. There's a standard dry powder. There's a magnetic powder. There are fluorescent powders. There are coarser brushes. There are feather brushes. That's the standard fingerprint lifting equipment.
- Q Well, is it horse hair? Was it feather?

  I've got four or five dozen I can show you. Do you know what kind of brush it was?
- A It was a hair brush rather than the feather type brush.
- **Q** A hair brush?
  - **A** Yes.

- 1 **Q** What kind of hair? Do you know?
- 2 **A** They were generally horse hair. I don't know
- 3 specifically for that brush he had in his hand at that
- 4 moment.
- 5 **Q** You didn't discuss that with Mr. Albert?
- 6 A I had no reason to.
- 7 **Q** You had no reason to discuss what he was
- 8 using in the collection of the evidence?
- 9 **A** I did not.
- 10 Q Because you already know all about that stuff
- 11 | from that couple hours in OPATA; right?
- 12 **A** It's his equipment.
- 13 **Q** All right. So you go through the house
- 14 and --
- 15 MR. MERANTO: How do I turn this back
- on? I'm not technical. Thank you.
- 17 | BY MR. MERANTO:
- 18 Q You go through the house collectively, right,
- 19 with Mr. Albert?
- 20 **A** Yes.
- 21 **Q** And then you're going to help him out; right?
- 22 **A** Yes.
- 23 **Q** And you're specifically ordered to assist

1	1 1	' 1 ' 0
	hım;	right?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A I wasn't ordered. I was just asked to go ahead and work with him.

**Q** Okay.

MR. MERANTO: May I approach the

witness, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit O was

marked for identification.)

### BY MR. MERANTO:

I'm going to hand you what's been marked as Defense Exhibit O. You don't have to look at that for the moment. Did you ever have a chance to review any of the notes or anything in this case?

A Yes.

Q And your name appears regarding the extraction of a bullet from the roof -- or from the ceiling; correct?

A Yes.

And you stated that you guys saw a hole, so you went up into the attic, and you rooted around there for quite a while?

A Yes.

**Q** And found a slug?

we just talked about?

- **A** Correct.
- Anywhere in the stuff you reviewed, anywhere,
  does it say that you were assigned to assist in the
  collection of evidence with Mr. Albert, other than what
  - A No.

- Q Does it say anywhere in any of the notes that you assisted, not even that you were assigned to, but that you assisted in the collection of evidence anywhere other than where we just said?
  - A There was another notation of where several months later we went and recovered bullets that were found in a car out on Route 18. I went out with Sergeant Reichman.
- **Q** Several months later?
- **A** Yes. I think it was in March.
- Nothing with regard to that night at that crime scene; correct?
- **A** No, sir.
- **Q** Okay. So it's your testimony, though, that
- 22 | that was your duty?
- **A** Correct.

- **A** No.

- **Q** Or Detective Nemeth?
- 5 A No, he's not.
  - **Q** Or Sergeant Hunt?
    - A No, he's not.
- So we are here presented with you saying that you assisted in the collection of evidence; correct?
- **A** That's correct.
- **Q** All right. So now let's go through it. In the bedroom, what did the collection of evidence consist of with regard to fingerprints?
  - A He dusted the doorways, the areas that there was potential to have latent prints. He also collected the projectile that was found on the floor near the north wall.
  - And I don't want to interrupt you, and I asked for too much information. I'm going to make this easier and try and speed things up a little bit.

    Evidence of fingerprints, fingerprint dusting and everything, whatever he used, standard powder or
- 23 whatever in the bedroom?

- **A** Yes.
- **Q** How about here in this bedroom?
- **A** No.
- **Q** Throughout this hallway?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** In this bedroom?
- **A** No.
- **Q** Throughout the foyer area in this hallway?
- **A** Right at the end in that area above Heather
- 10 there's some bookshelves. That area was dusted. The
- 11 front door also was in that foyer area that was dusted.
- **Q** So nothing in the living room?
- **A** No.
- **Q** Well, there was a cigarette found; correct?
- **A** It was not found that night that I was aware
- 16 of.
- **Q** So you don't know where it was found either?
- 18 A No, I do not.
- **Q** So you didn't assist with that part of
- 20 collection of the evidence; right?
- **A** No, I did not.
- 22 | Q How about this family room area; is this all
- 23 dusted?

A
---

2.1

- **Q** How about in the garage area?
- **A** Yes.
  - **Q** Just the door or the whole garage area?
- **A** The points of entry where it was obvious that 6 the person had come in the home.
  - And once again, this is serious crime; right?

    This isn't some nickel crime, some burglary or

    something. So they're looking everywhere they can;

    correct? He's dusting everywhere?
  - A The refrigerator. The areas where the victims were, where the struggles were, where the points of entry were, yeah.
  - Q Well, the entire areas, now, those areas, or, I mean, is he picking and choosing something? What's he doing?
  - A No. Just the areas that would and some areas aren't conducive to even getting prints off, so if it's rough surfaces, those kind of things. Like the inside of that one door is, like, barn siding, you wouldn't even dust for that because the prints are not going to be available.
  - Q You're telling me you can't take a print off

1 a rough surface?

6

11

12

- 2 Α Depending on the rough surface. A lot of 3 rough surfaces no, you can't.
- 4 Q Well, did he not have the correct equipment 5 to try and do that, or what was the problem?
- Α It's just not conducive enough to take a 7 print that is clear enough for identification.
- 8 You said it's not conducive. Tell me why Q 9 it's not conducive since you know about that from your 10 training.
  - Because the rough surfaces interfere too much Α with the lands and grooves that are needed for identification.
- 14 The lands and grooves? Q
- 15 Uh-huh. Α
- 16 Don't lands and grooves refer to bullets? Q
- 17 A That as well, but you have ridges and lands 18 and grooves.
- 19 Q You don't have lands and grooves on your 20 fingerprints, do you?
- 2.1 Α The ridges and --
- 22 You got ridges. You got swirls. Q
- 23 Α Ridges.

- So you misspoke; right? You didn't know what you were talking about?
- 3 MS. DOHERTY: Objection.
- 4 **THE COURT:** Overruled.

### 5 | BY MR. MERANTO:

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q You didn't know what you were talking about when you said that, did you?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q You did. Okay. All right. So tell me what surfaces and areas were not tested in those grand areas that you told me about.
- A lot of painted walls, a lot of the furniture. Things that, again, either were not disturbed, there was no indication that any of the struggles took place there. You know, you had a low probability of having evidence of this particular offense.
  - **Q** So we picked and chose which areas to test based on some kind of probability now?
- 20 **A** Correct.
- Q Wow. So, I mean, because you just mentioned painted surfaces. Are you telling me you can't get a print off a painted surface?

- 1 A Some you can. Some you can't.
- 2 **Q** What was that door made of? Gold? It was a
- 3 painted surface, wasn't it?
- 4 A Sure.
- 5 Q Okay. So you can get them off painted
- 6 surfaces?
- 7 **| A** Sure.
- And correct me if I'm wrong, you don't see

  prints a lot of times. You said that. You gotta dust
- and put the stuff down, whatever it is, the standard
- 11 powder?
- 12 **A** Correct.
- 13 **Q** And they pop up; right?
- 14 A They're revealed when the powder sticks to the print, yes.
- And if the powder doesn't work, there's other
- agents that you could use to try and raise prints if
- 18 you think? For example, on non-smooth surfaces; right?
- 19 **A** Correct.
- 20 Q Okay. And you know all that because of the
- 21 | training; right?
- 22 **A** Yes.
- 23  $\mathbf{Q}$  So once again, in the bedroom, what areas

were skipped? What areas did you guys decide not to test? And by the way -- strike that. Did Mr. Albert ask you, hey, Mike, what do you think, should we test this area? Did he ask you specific questions like -- did he ask you what you thought?

A It was, again, just discussion.

Q Okay. Once again, did Mr. Albert ever ask you, hey, Mike, do you think we should test this specific area? I don't know, what did he call you, Detective -- or Deputy Finamore?

A I can't recall if he asked me a question that specific.

Q You can't recall. Okay. So what areas in the bedroom did you just decide we're not going to waste our time?

A lot of the area over to the left side, the upholstered chair, that whole area in the photo, that whole left side of the room, there was no indication that any part of the interaction with Mr. Marsh took place over there, other than the bullet that was in line in plain view on the floor just kind of off the center of that room.

Q What do you mean no part of the interaction

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 1 took place there? What's that have to do with
  2 anything?
  - A It appeared that Mr. Marsh and the intruder went from the door to the bed area, and no -- there was no sign of struggle taking place on that left -- the whole left side of the room.
  - Q Okay. So let me get this straight. Nobody knows what happened there, correct, other than the deaths; yes?
  - A Exactly, no, other than the intruder.
  - Q Okay. And even though nobody knows what happened, somebody, what, had a vision in their mind and said, well, based on this vision, that's where and how and what we're going to test for evidence; is that what you're saying?
  - **l A** Yes.
- 17 **Q** Wow. So whose vision was it, by the way, 18 that we used, or was it a collective vision again?
- 19 **A** Collective.
- 20 Q Collective vision. So at any given time 21 then, what, Sergeant Hunt would say jump in and say, 22 don't test that because I don't think they were over 23 there, and then another time it would be Detective

2.1

- 1 Crater? I mean, how did that work exactly, if you recall?
  - A Again, there was discussion of how and the path that the intruder took, that the Marsh family people took. So it was the areas that had high probability that would've contained evidence related to the three confrontations.
  - So I don't want to put words in your mouth, but you correct me if I'm wrong. So what you're saying is you guessed at where you thought evidence might be and you made a probability determination and tested it in those places?
  - **A** Based on probability; correct.
- So there could be evidence there, we have no idea of knowing, that you guys didn't even look for or test for?
  - A Could there be something overlooked?

    Absolutely.
- **Q** All right. Hallway, same thing? Areas that 20 you tested, areas that you didn't test?
  - A Sure. The doorways -- the areas that appeared that he possibly would've encountered going down the hall were dusted, and the area there -- that

- 1 bookshelf area above Heather there was dusted.
- 2 So I'm asking you here, and you tell me if
  3 I'm wrong; so in the hallway here, we don't know what's
  4 going on, but if I bounce off both walls, but there's
  5 no visible sign, you guys might have just ignored that,
  6 not tested, not looked for prints, not looked for any
  - A If there was nothing obvious there, we would have proceeded to the next area where we felt there would be evidence.
  - Nothing obvious there. Okay. I'm going to have you pick up those pictures again, Exhibits No. 1 and No. 2. You still got those there?
- 14 **A** Yes.

evidence?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

- Q Based on those pictures, show me where the obvious evidence is. I mean, certainly the broken glass is a big indicator, huh? Go ahead. Tell me about where the obvious evidence is in those pictures.
- 19 **A** The broken glass.
- - A These photos were taken before the

- 1 | fingerprints were lifted.
- 2 **Q** So where are the pictures of the fingerprints
- 3 that were lifted supposedly from that door?
- 4 **A** I can't answer that.
- 5 **Q** You can't answer it. There are none? You
- 6 don't know of any?
- 7 **A** They were taken by Mr. Albert and processed
- 8 by him. I don't have them.
- 9 **Q** You have no idea. So there's a place where
- 10 there's clear indication that you want to test; right?
- 11 **A** Yes.
- 12 **Q** And you have no glossy photos of any supposed
- 13 print that might have been there?
- 14 **A** I don't have them, no.
- 15 Q Okay. Where specifically on that door were
- 16 the prints taken?
- 17 **A** If I recall, the prints were taken --
- 18 Q Wait a minute. If you don't recall, then I
- don't want you to say anything; okay? So it's only if
- 20 you recall. Do you know where they were taken from?
- 21 **A** The area above the door knob.
- 22 **Q** The area above the door knob?
- 23 **A** On the side rail above the door knob.

1		Traide	011+0100	+ +h - + 0
$\perp$	Q	Instae,	outside,	Wildt:

- **A** It would be on the outside of the door.
  - On the outside of the door?
  - A Correct.
- 5 **Q** Okay. And by the way, when were those prints
- 6 made?

2

3

- 7 **A** Excuse me?
- When were those prints made? When were they
  put on the outside of that door?
- 10 **A** It would have been at the time of the intrusion.
- 12 **Q** Really? And tell me how you know that.
- 13 **A** Some of the prints that were on there may
- 14 have been irrelevant. They could've been from the
- 15 | owner. Could've been who knows.
- 16 **Q** Well, whoever they were, you have no idea
- when they were put there, do you?
- 18 **A** No, I would not.
- 19 **Q** And once again, your training tells you -- I
- 20 mean, prints could last indefinitely; correct?
- 21 **A** Yeah. There's nothing that interfered with
- 22 them.
- 23 **Q** I mean, they might come here 10 years from

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- now when I'm famous and say there's Meranto's prints on the bar; right?
  - A If they were not disturbed, they could still be there.
    - Q Okay. So you selectively check this crime scene for prints, and I can say that now; right?

      Because you said it, there are specific spots you guys didn't check; right?
  - **A** That's correct.
- You have no idea, you said certainly evidence could've been missed in there; right? Yeah?
  - **A** There's always that probability, sure.
- 13 **Q** Yeah. Yeah. Especially when you don't test it; right? You're not going to find a fingerprint if you don't test an area for it, are you?
- 16 **A** No.
- Okay. And you test the outside of the door near the door knob, and that's where you say you got some prints from, correct, in this case?
- 20 **A** The area above the door knob.
- 21 **Q** Above the door knob. And I know when you opened the door, where do you normally touch a door?

  23 Around the door knob; right?

- **A** Depends on the door.
- 2 **Q** Well, I mean, that's common sense, isn't it?
- 3 You don't need to be -- have all that OPATA training to
- 4 | know that; right? Okay. So we had all kind of prints
- 5 in the house, and we got some prints on the garage
- 6 door, on the outside. And we have no idea when any of
- 7 | those prints were made; correct?
- 8 **A** Exactly. No.
- 9 Q Now, we already established that you don't
- 10 know anything about Mr. Albert, even where he lives;
- 11 right?

- 12 **A** Other than just the general geographic area
- 13 was northeast Ohio.
- 14 **Q** Okay. You don't know if he worked, what he
- 15 did that day; correct?
- 16 A No, I do not.
- 17 **Q** You don't know if he was -- did he tell you
- 18 he was tired? Do you have any conversation about that
- 19 with him? Didn't sound like it, but tell me if you
- 20 did.
- 21 **A** Not that I recall.
- 22 **Q** You don't know if he worked all day and
- 23 night, didn't have a break?

1	Α	Did	not.

- Q You worked that crime scene from 11:00 with him, 11:00 until 7:30, 8:00 in the morning; correct?
- 4 Yes?

2

3

9

- 5 **A** 7:00, 7:30. I had left around 7:30, 8:00. 6 He had left around 7:00 to go do the car.
- Once again, you didn't handle, mark, or collect any evidence other than that bullet evidence?
  - A Even the bullet up in the attic was taken custody of by Agent Albert.
- So you didn't even handle the bullet that they give you credit for in the detective notes.
- 13 Mr. Albert had it; right?
- 14 **A** He took custody of every piece of evidence.
- 15 **Q** And you have no idea where that evidence went from there, do you?
- 17 A Agent Albert -- I mean, other than evidence 18 tracking where it did, in fact, get received at the 19 labs, which would be their process.
- 20 **Q** So once again, I'm going to ask you, do you have any personal knowledge of where that evidence went?
- 23 **A** No.

# REDIRECT/FINAMORE

23

Α

Yes.

1	BY MS. DOHERTY:
2	Q Mr. Finamore, you described the fact that
3	there was one set of footprints leading to the back
4	door. I think that's pictured in State's Exhibit 1;
5	correct? Not the not the footprints, the door?
6	A Okay. What's the question now?
7	Q You had described that you observed, along
8	with other law enforcement personnel, one set of
9	footprints leading to that back door; is that correct?
10	A Correct.
11	Q When you, as a deputy processing a scene, or
12	Agent Albert processing a scene, determine where to
13	look for physical evidence, do you use logic to do
14	that?
15	A Sure.
16	<b>Q</b> Would points of entry into a home where
17	there's been a home invasion be logical to look for
18	prints?
19	MR. MERANTO: Objection.
20	THE COURT: Overruled.
21	BY MS. DOHERTY:
22	Q Would that be logical?

# REDIRECT/FINAMORE

THE COURT: I don't know that he's an
expert on logic or if the question -- it's
redirect, and it's argumentative, but it's
all right. Just move on with this, please.

BY MS. DOHERTY:

O Every location where -- first of all, let me

- Q Every location where -- first of all, let me ask you this, are prints visible to the naked eye generally?
- **A** Latent prints generally, no.
- 10 **Q** And once that powder is placed upon it, it makes them visible; correct?
- 12 **A** Yes.

7

8

- 13 **Q** Were there areas that were processed in that 14 house that were dusted, but no prints were visible?
- 15 **A** Sure.
- Did you watch Bernie Albert lift the prints, the fingerprints that we showed you originally in
- 18 State's Exhibit 43A?
- 19 **A** Yes, I did.
- 20 MS. DOHERTY: Can I approach again,
- Judge?
- 22 **THE COURT:** Yes.
- 23 BY MS. DOHERTY:

# REDIRECT/FINAMORE

23

1	Q	I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit 43A.
2	Other tha	n the three prints, three fingerprints
3	indicated	on that State's Exhibit 43A that indicate
4	they came	from that back door entering into the garage,
5	are there	any other prints on that sheet from that
6	door?	
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	How is that door, that back door, labeled?
9	That's do	or of garage; correct?
LO	A	Yes.
L1	Q	All right. And did you watch Bernie Albert
L2	lift all	of those prints and place them on that card?
L3	A	Yes.
L4	Q	Did the Sheriff's Department employ a
L5	fingerpri	nt examiner, a fingerprint expert at that
L6	time?	
L7	A	No.
L8	Q	Where would all prints that were lifted,
L9	latent pr	ints lifted from a scene, where would they go
20	to be exa	mined?
21		MR. MERANTO: Objection.
22		THE COURT: Overruled. If he knows, he

can answer.

# REDIRECT/FINAMORE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- A They would be sent to the Bureau of Criminal Identification, and possibly sometimes to the FBI laboratory as well.
  - **Q** Because that's where the experts were?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MS. DOHERTY: Can I have one second,

Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the Court, jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

- Q Prior to December 14th, 1974, Attorney
  Meranto was asking you about other scenes that you had
  gone to; correct?
- **A** Yes.
- And as a deputy, going to a scene, responding by dispatch or whatever, did you have occasion to process a scene, any scenes, and lift prints?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Can you put a number on how many times?

#### RECROSS/FINAMORE

1	A	The	twenty	to	thirty	that	we've	discussed
2	before.							

All right. When decisions were made at the Marsh crime scene as to what role various law enforcement personnel were playing, was that your decision?

A No.

**Q** Whose decision was it?

A Detective Nemeth and Lieutenant Crater.

Q I mean, there's a rank there; correct?

A Yes.

MS. DOHERTY: I don't have anything

further, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MERANTO: Just a couple, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

\* \* \* \*

## RECROSS EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

Q Ms. Doherty asked you about you dusted places and didn't get prints. That's true; right?

A Correct.

# RECROSS/FINAMORE

- And there's places that you didn't dust; right?
- 3 **A** Correct.
- 4 Q And if you didn't dust them, you certainly weren't going to get any prints from them, were you?
  - **A** Not latent prints, no.
- 7 And you just made a choice not to do that?
- 8 Yes? No?

- 9 | A It was a decision. It wasn't a choice.
- 10 **Q** It was a decision, not a choice. All right.
- Now, she asked you this -- I'm sorry. Twenty or thirty
- 12 | times you took prints; right?
- 13 **A** Yes.
- 14 **Q** Do you remember testifying at a hearing
- 15 before?
- 16 **A** Correct.
- 17 **Q** And you said you can't remember any case
- where any one of the prints you ever took was used in a
- 19 case; is that true?
- 20 **A** Yeah. I have no way of -- no way of knowing
- 21 that.
- 22 **Q** Well, wait a minute. Name me a specific case
- where they used your prints in evidence.

1		MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, I object.
2		THE COURT: Overruled.
3	A	I can't remember a case.
4	Q	And that's what you said before, right, that
5	you can't'	?
6	A	No.
7	Q	So there's no case you could say where a
8	print you	ever took was used and introduced in
9	evidence,	was there?
10	A	No, I can't name one. No.
11		MR. MERANTO: Nothing else. Thank you.
12		THE COURT: Anything else?
13		MS. DOHERTY: No.
14		THE COURT: I do have a question. You
15		testified today that the prints that have
16		been discussed here today were latent prints
17		that were dusted and then lifted with this
18		tape. Isn't proper process to dust and then
19		photograph, and then lift?
20		THE WITNESS: You would yes, it would
21		be photographed and then lifted; correct.
22		THE COURT: You didn't you didn't
23		testify that that's what was done here. That

1 it was dusted and then lifted with the tape. 2 There was no talk about photographing the 3 print before it was lifted. 4 **THE WITNESS:** I may not have mentioned 5 that in this particular hearing, but that 6 was, in fact, the process that was done. 7 Okay. Anything else? THE COURT: 8 MS. DOHERTY: No, Judge. MR. MERANTO: Well, just based on that 9 10 then, Judge, so --THE COURT: You have a right to ask a 11 question if I've asked a question. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

# FURTHER RECROSS/FINAMORE

1	FURTHER RECROSS EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. MERANTO:
3	<b>Q</b> The process was not followed then
4	appropriately?
5	A Yes, it was.
6	Q Well, where are the photographs? Don't know?
7	A BCI would have to answer that.
8	Q And he's dead; right?
9	A Yes, he is.
10	MR. MERANTO: Thanks.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. Call
12	your next witness, please.
13	MS. DOHERTY: The state calls Gerry
14	Mroczkowski. I can't pronounce his last
15	name. I'm sorry.
16	THE COURT: All right.
17	MS. DOHERTY: Judge, can I approach up
18	there? Is there an exhibit laying there?
19	THE COURT: Sure.
20	THE BAILIFF: Judge, this witness does
21	not object to being photographed.
22	THE COURT: Thank you.
23	* * * *

1	MS. DOHERTY: I'm sorry, Judge.
2	THE COURT: Hey, go sit down.
3	MR. MERANTO: Judge, may we approach?
4	THE COURT: Just sit down. I'm swearing
5	a witness in. This is a big deal.
6	Everybody's going to respect what's going on
7	in the courtroom, particularly when the court
8	is doing something. I don't want to tell you
9	that again. I'm very sorry, sir.
10	THE WITNESS: That's okay.
11	WHEREUPON, the State called
12	
13	GERRY MROCZKOWSKI,
14	
15	who, being first duly sworn, testified
16	as follows:
17	THE COURT: All right, sir. Please be
18	seated in the witness seat. All right. You
19	wish to approach side bar?
20	MR. MERANTO: Yes, Judge.
21	(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among
22	court and counsel off the record and out of
23	the hearing of the jury and court reporter,

1 after which the proceedings continued as 2 follows:) 3 (WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among 4 Court and counsel out of the hearing of the 5 jury as follows:) 6 THE COURT: Okay. We're at side bar out 7 of the hearing of the jury on defense counsel's motion to prohibit this witness 8 9 because he's not named on the state's witness 10 list; is that correct? 11 Yes, Your Honor. MR. MERANTO: 12 THE COURT: Is there anything else you 13 need to say about that at this point? 14 MR. MERANTO: No. Okay. Then I'll ask the 15 THE COURT: 16 state for its response. 17 MS. DOHERTY: Okay. Thank you, Judge. 18 We filed the witness list, and then 19 subsequent to that the state asked for a 20 hearing on defendant's motion in limine to 2.1 exclude the fingerprints. At that time when 22 the state filed the motion asking for a 23 hearing on that issue, I indicated that not

2.1

only would I have available to testify and have testify Mike Finamore, but also BCI agent — a BCI agent who could also authenticate that writing from Bernie Albert, and Robin Ladd who was the print examiner who had custody of — or who represents BCI and had custody of those prints since 1974. So I had indicated at the time that I would put all of those people on for that purpose.

Now, obviously through the course of that hearing the only person I ended up putting on was Mike Finamore because the judge was — the court was satisfied I guess at that point.

THE COURT: Right. I didn't need anything else.

MS. DOHERTY: Correct. But the only purpose of this witness is to because he worked with Bernie Albert, he knew Bernie Albert, he worked with him on many scenes, he can recognize his writing, his initials. He can just verify that on State's Exhibit 43A, that that is Bernie Albert's writing.

THE COURT:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MR. MERANTO: I believe they're doing it to try and bolster what is basically a horrible foundation already, and an attempt to authenticate the evidence that was taken at that crime scene.

Yes?

THE COURT: I don't care what the purpose is. I care whether or not it's appropriate to disallow this because he hasn't been placed on the witness list.

MR. MERANTO: And I was not on notice, Judge, and if I was on notice of his qualifications or who he was or could have had the investigator talk to him there might be a lot of questions that I want to ask him for my own purposes. I mean, I have no idea -- we discussed who the witnesses were going to be, and Ms. Weibling and I split them up among each other. I have no idea who this guy was when they said his name. I mean, because once again, I -all.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MERANTO: I saw what he was for the

limine, but I thought it was for the limine.

I had no idea.

THE COURT: Okay. Does the state want to say anything else?

MS. DOHERTY: Only that he is not a witness who was at the scene, so there isn't any issue with the scene necessarily that —
I mean, he wasn't there. Bernie Albert was.
But his purpose is only to authenticate the signature and the writing of Bernie Albert.

THE COURT: The defendant's motion is sustained. Had to be included on the witness list. One of the key pieces of evidence in this case appears to be the fingerprint — if this guy has anything to do with fingerprint evidence, he has to be properly disclosed on the witness list. For the defense to figure out whether or not somebody's going to be called without him being included on the witness list is beyond that which can be imposed upon the defense. So I'm not going to allow him. Motion's sustained.

(WHEREUPON, the following proceedings

1	were had back in the presence of the jury:)
2	THE COURT: Sir, the court's going to
3	excuse you.
4	THE WITNESS: Okay.
5	THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Will
6	you call your next witness, please?
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Dr. Joseph Ohr,
8	please.
9	THE COURT: What about photographing?
10	THE WITNESS: No, that's fine.
11	THE BAILIFF: He does not object to
12	being photographed, Judge.
13	THE COURT: All right. Will you raise
14	your right hand, please?
15	
16	
17	* * * *
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

	DIRECT/OHR
1	WHEREUPON, the State called
2	
3	DR. JOSEPH OHR,
4	
5	who, being first duly sworn, testified
6	as follows:
7	THE COURT: All right, sir. Please be
8	seated in the witness chair.
9	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
10	THE COURT: As you're doing that, I'll
11	instruct you, these ladies and gentlemen to
12	your right are the ladies and gentlemen of
13	the jury. They need to hear and understand
14	all that you have to say, so please speak
15	loudly and clearly enough for them to
16	understand your answer.
17	THE WITNESS: I understand.
18	THE COURT: And please answer every
19	question out loud.
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
21	THE COURT: Yes, sir. Thank you.
22	

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

- Q Good morning.
- Α Good morning.
- 5 Would you please introduce yourself to the Q

6 jury?

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

- I'm Dr. Joseph Ohr. I'm the medical examiner Α and deputy coroner for Mahoning County.
- And what is your background for your position there, Dr. Ohr?
- I'm a physician and surgeon licensed in the Α State of Ohio, and I am -- well, I graduated from Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois in clinical and anatomical pathology, and after that -- that was a five-year residency. And then after that was a one-year fellowship in forensic pathology at the Miami Dade Medical Examiner's office in Miami, Florida. first assignment was the Franklin County Coroner's 19 office in Columbus, Ohio where I practiced from 2005 to 2009 before coming here to Youngstown.
- 2.1 And you came to Youngstown in 2009? Q
- 22 Α That's right.
  - How many -- over your career, how many Q

1 | autopsies have you performed?

A Well, counselor, I should have that number for you, and I don't. I'm sorry. Easily over 1,000, nearly 2,000 autopsies.

Q And what -- are you a forensic pathologist?

A Yes, I am.

Q Can you tell the jury what that is?

A Yeah. I think just to back up a little bit, a pathologist is a diagnostic physician. I think everybody knows what a radiologist is. And that's a physician who uses CAT scans and x-rays and so forth and so on to make a diagnosis. You have a broken arm or, you know, an infection in your lung; right? A pathologist is also a diagnostic physician, only the pathologist uses all the laboratory techniques available to him or her to make a diagnosis.

Most pathologists work in hospitals. They
run all the laboratories, the surgical pathology
laboratory, the microbiology, the molecular lab, and so
forth and so on. And one laboratory that they run is
the autopsy laboratory; right? And they make a
diagnosis. A person has a lump in their chest, and
that lump is taken out by a surgeon, and goes off to a

pathologist. The pathologist says, aha, you have cancer or you don't, like that.

There's a subspecialty of pathology called forensic pathology, and the diagnosis that I make as a forensic pathologist is the cause and manner of death. How and why a person died. Particularly if they died suddenly and unexpectedly. You see? And what I do is I use all of my experience as a physician and a pathologist and all the laboratory techniques in order to make that diagnosis of how and why someone died. A pathologist generally studies disease. The disease that I study is sudden and unexpected death; okay?

- **Q** Did you have to have specialized training in order to become a forensic pathologist?
- A Yeah. After my residency in general pathology, the -- I spent one year at Miami Dade Medical Examiner in Florida for strictly forensic pathology.
- **Q** And primarily as a forensic pathologist, what do you do?
- As a forensic pathologist I study how and why people are injured and how they die from those injuries. That's what I do. I work like every other

physician. I get a history, a background of the person's illnesses or injuries, and then I do an examination. That examination is typically known as the autopsy, and after my examination and all of the background information, I correlate all that information, and I make a diagnosis the person died this way or that way, and so forth.

Q And at the Mahoning County Coroner's office, what's your duties there?

A Well, as a deputy coroner I have some administrative duties, obviously. As a medical examiner I do the -- I'm in charge of the investigations of how and why people die here in Mahoning County. I have four investigators who help me out with gathering reports and photography and scene work and so forth and so on, but ultimately I'm responsible for the diagnosis that is -- that comes out of that office.

**Q** And what is an autopsy?

An autopsy is really a big, involved —
surgically involved laboratory test; okay? Let me
explain. When you go to the doctor, the doctor doesn't
simply put a stethoscope on you and say, okay, breathe

deeply. The doctor gets your history. Well, you've been coughing, and you've had fever, and have you been coughing and so forth; right? Then and only then does the doctor use a stethoscope or any of the other tests, get an x-ray and so forth.

Well, the autopsy's the same way. You get the background. You get the history. And then you use the autopsy to confirm or refute kind of what you already found out about the person's history. You see what I mean? And that's how an autopsy goes. And given the story, either by the police or by my investigators, and then the body tells me, yes, that story is consistent, or no, that story is not consistent. And that's how an autopsy is used in my line of work.

- **Q** As a forensic pathologist, is it helpful for you to go to the scene?
- **A** Oh, yes, absolutely.
- **Q** And why is that?
  - A Well not to sound funny, but my patients can't talk to me, and so it's important that I get information anywhere and anyhow that I can. And, you know, frankly any other doctor, they do the same.

2.1

They're not just talking to you, the patient, but they're looking at you. They want to know how your home life is. They want to know about your background. Well, I work the same way.

And one of the ways that I can do that is to go to the scene where the death happened to get an appreciation of how a person lived. Oftentimes how a person lives is how they die, or is related to how they die. I can get an understanding of how the other investigators or the investigative reports, the police reports, this was over here, that was over here, this happened that way. The scene also helps me answer questions that I might anticipate from lawyers, from police officers, from arson investigators.

For example, did -- Doctor, could this person have run from here to there after being, I don't know, hit over the head? You see what I mean? And having an appreciation of the scene helps me understand what their questions are for me. See?

Q Did you work for the Mahoning County Prosecutor's -- or the coroner's office in 1974?

A I did not.

Q Did you perform the autopsies on Ben Marsh,

- 1 Marilyn Marsh, or Heather Marsh?
- **A** No, I did not.
- **Q** Are you here testifying as a substitute
- 4 witness?

- **A** Yes, I am.
- **Q** And what is that?
  - A Well, a substitute witness is, in my case, I am stepping into the shoes of the deputy coroner who initially investigated the case because that person can no longer be with us.
- **Q** And who was it that actually performed those autopsies?
- **A** This would've been a Dr. Paul Weiss, and I 14 believe that he died in 2009.
- **Q** What did you review in preparing for your 16 testimony in this case?
  - A Well, it makes sense that I would review all of the autopsy reports and pre-history, the history of the case surrounding those reports. I also reviewed the available autopsy photographs and scene photographs, and I also went to the house which still stands on Turner Road and went through the house and went to the scene, if you will.

Q	How	were y	you ab	le to cor	rela	ate whi	ich	
photograp	hs go	with	which	patient,	or	which	body	that
was liste	d in	the re	eport?					

A Well, it's a matter of correlating — correlating is exactly the word — some of the photographs of the decedent's face. I see a small child, well, that's this person. I see a male, that's that person. Some of the photographs demonstrate injuries. I can tell by the autopsy reports that one decedent had died of a gunshot wound to the head. Another had died of gunshot wounds to the body. So I can see on the body that here are gunshot wounds, but not on the head, and so forth. It allows me to understand the case in that way.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, may I approach?

**THE COURT:** Pardon?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I approach?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 37-39

were marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

Q I'm going to hand you State's Exhibits 37,

- 1 38, and 39. Starting with State's Exhibit 37, could 2 you tell us what that is?
- 3 A Yes. I have State's 37, 38, and 39. 37 is 4 the autopsy report of Benjamin Marsh.
- Is that the same one you reviewed in preparation for your testimony today?
  - A Yes, it is.
  - Q And is that autopsy report kept in the ordinary course of business of the Mahoning County Coroner's office?
- 11 **A** It is.

7

8

9

- 12 **Q** Is that autopsy report made at or near the 13 time of the actual autopsy?
- 14 **A** It is.
- 15 **Q** And I believe that one's a copy of the certified?
- 17 **A** That's correct.
- 18 **Q** Can you tell us what State's Exhibit 38 is?
- 19 **A** Exhibit 38 is a copy of the report from the
- 20 death of Marilyn Marsh.
- 21 **Q** And is that also what you reviewed in 22 preparation for your testimony today?
- 23  $\mathbf{A}$  Yes, it is.

- 1 And that's also kept in the ordinary course Q 2 of the Mahoning County Coroner's office?
- 3 Α It is.
- 4 Q And State's Exhibit 39, can you tell us what 5 that is?
- 6 State's 39 is a report on the death of Α 7 Heather Marsh.
  - And is that the report you reviewed in Q preparation for your testimony today?
- 10 Α Yes, it is.

8

9

15

16

17

- 11 And is that report also kept in the ordinary Q 12 course of business in the Mahoning County Coroner's 13 office?
- 14 Α Yes, it is.
  - And actually, now, are they kept -- since the Q age of those reports, are they kept at the clerk's office?
- They are kept under the clerk's office, but Α 19 they're under our administrative custodianship. In other words, we have access to them, and they're 20 21 available to others through us.
- 22 Let's start with Ben Marsh. In your review Q 23 of his autopsy, what was his age at death?

- **A** Ben was 33 years old.
- **Q** And how big of a guy was he?
- He was 6' 5". And I'd have to refer to the report. Maybe 230 pounds. Let me see. Yeah, 6' 5", 230.
  - **Q** What injuries were noted on Ben when his autopsy was performed in 1974?
  - A Well, he had a number of gunshot wounds on his body. Those wounds included wounds to his chest, his right arm, and his right hip. He also had multiple lacerations, which are cuts in the skin on the left side of his face. When I say a laceration, I'd like to be specific here. A laceration is a cut in the skin made by a blunt object. If I hit you in the mouth and slit your lip, the bluntness of my hand still causes a cut in the skin. You see? That's different than an incised wound. An incised wound is caused by a sharp instrument. A piece of glass, so forth. Okay.
  - Q Can you tell us about each of those gunshot wounds that you -- you described three. There were three?
  - A There -- yes, there were two on the chest.

    One was near the left nipple, and one was near the left

collarbone; okay? The one in the left -- near the left collarbone entered the left collarbone, and a bullet was removed from there. Another -- the bullet here near the nipple went into the chest, through the lung, through the heart, and was captured in the right thoracic cavity.

Another gunshot wound was through the right forearm here, not exactly near the wrist, but not exactly at the elbow either. It had gone through the forearm, and it started here on the outside and went through to the inside.

Finally there was — there was a gunshot wound here on the back of the hand near the ring finger that left near the index finger, went underneath the skin. You see?

And finally there was a gunshot wound here near the right hip. The bullet went in and hit the spine of the — the spine, not — I don't believe it was the spinal column in the back, but there's a hip pointer each of us has. It's called the iliac spine. And a bullet was removed from the spine. Okay?

Q So we actually have evidence of five gunshot

wounds, but only three projectiles were recovered; is

1 | that right?

2.1

A He had two. He had — he had an entrance and an exit wound, three and four. Five and six; you see?

**Q** Right.

A Okay. And seven.

Q We want to count the holes then; right?

A If you want to count the holes, yes. Each hole is a wound; okay? He had an entrance wound, and entrance wound, an entrance wound, and an entrance wound and an entrance wound. He had five entrance wounds.

Q Can you tell whether any of those in the arm was something that went through in the arm and then into his body?

A Yeah, that's certainly possible.

Q How can you tell what's an entrance wound versus an exit wound?

A Well, entrance wounds demonstrate an abrasion around their edge. And let me explain that. When you put your thumb into a plastic bag, right, you're going to go through the plastic, through the wall of the plastic, your thumb kind of stretches that plastic before it punctures through; you know what I mean? You

2.1

take your thumb out and you look at the hole, there's kind of a weird edge, a little stretched out edge. You could almost see where the sides of your thumb was against the plastic; right?

The same thing happens when a bullet enters the body. The skin stretches, and as the bullet pulls or pushes the skin into the body, the side of the bullet rubs up against that skin, and it leaves a little mark. It's called an abrasion collar, and it's one of the details that lets me know that an entrance wound is — or that that wound is an entrance wound. Furthermore, entrance wounds, as a rule of thumb, not always, but just generally, have a very punched out, round look to them; okay? And so when I see those two combinations, the abrasion collar it's called, as well as the round, punched out look, I know I'm looking at an entrance wound.

- Q You already testified that you were able to review the photographs made during this autopsy; is that right?
- A Yes, that's right.
- Is that how you determined those entrance and exit wounds?

	DIRECT/OHR
1	A Yes.
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I approach the
3	witness again, Your Honor?
4	THE COURT: You may.
5	(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 22-29
6	were marked for identification.)
7	BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:
8	Q Dr. Ohr, I'm going to hand you State's
9	Exhibits 22 through 28 or actually 29, but there is
10	a No. 42 that kind of got mixed up in there.
11	MS. WEIBLING: Objection, Your Honor.
12	May we approach at this time?
13	THE COURT: Yes.
14	(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among
15	court and counsel off the record and out of
16	the hearing of the jury and court reporter,
17	after which the proceedings continued as
18	follows:)
19	THE COURT: The objection's overruled.
20	BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:
21	Q I already gave them to you. Could you

Q I already gave them to you. Could you describe, stating the State's Exhibit number first, what's contained in each one of those photographs?

22

2.1

Yes. State's Exhibit 22 is a right face-on view of the decedent Benjamin Marsh. On the right side of the head, starting above the right eyebrow, there are multiple angular and curved lacerations above the forehead, above the eyebrow, lateral to the eyebrow, here in the hairline and so forth. And there's also a laceration here on the ear.

Exhibit 23 is a -- the same view, the right on -- right half of the head with the head turned slightly away from the camera showing the better detail of the injury to the right ear.

Exhibit 24 is a face-on view of Mr. Marsh, and there are, again, lacerations here on the right forehead above the right eyebrow and --

THE COURT: Doctor, hold on a minute please.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among Court and counsel out of the hearing of the jury as follows:)

THE COURT: At side bar, and previously the defense objected to this witness testifying concerning the -- what is essentially the business record, the

Ι

### DIRECT/OHR

23

1 coroner's report regarding the deaths of 2 these three victims and coordinating the 3 admissibility of that report with the 4 photographs that others have testified to. 5 As I understood the objection, the objection 6 was not to the testimony concerning the 7 findings in the reports, but the use of the 8 photographs that connect that in that the 9 photographs, this guy has no idea whose 10 photographs those are. No personal knowledge 11 of that. No basis for doing -- for referring 12 to those photographs as being of a particular 13 Am I stating that right? person. 14 MS. WEIBLING: That's correct, Your 15 Honor. 16 **THE COURT:** That's what your objection 17 is? 18 Absolutely correct, Judge. MR. MERANTO: 19 THE COURT: Okay. And I overruled the 20 objection, but as I'm listening to that and 21 considering that objection still, I don't know how he does that? How does he say 22

that's the photograph of Benjamin Marsh?

1	don't understand that.
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: I actually think he
3	can say it's a photograph depicting the
4	injuries that are noted in this report.
5	THE COURT: He can do that, but the
6	guy's testifying
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right.
8	<b>THE COURT:</b> that it's Benjamin
9	Marsh's picture.
LO	MS. DOHERTY: Because they identified
L1	it.
L2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And the only reason
L3	he knows that is because that's the name on
L4	the report.
L5	THE COURT: I know, but he can't he
L6	can't say this is a picture of Benjamin
L7	Marsh. You know what I mean?
L8	MS. DOHERTY: Except we had other
L9	witnesses testify to that.
20	THE COURT: But he doesn't know that.
21	He doesn't know that.
22	MS. DOHERTY: They already identified
23	them.

	DIRE
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: But he can't say that's Benjamin Marsh's picture.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: He can say it's a male victim. A male patient or a male decedent.

THE COURT: I think I agree with that, but, I mean, you could get a picture of any dead guy with three bullet holes in him and say, well, yeah, this is sort of, like, what's described in the coroner's report.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right.

THE COURT: But I think the objection's well taken in the respect that he can't refer to these photographs as these are photographs of those particular victims.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right.

MS. DOHERTY: Do you want us to caution him to not say the names?

THE COURT: Yeah. Just clean that up, that's all.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: All right.

THE COURT: In that regard I think the objection's well taken.

1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay.
2	MS. WEIBLING: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: He can't identify the
4	particular photographs and coordinate them,
5	but you can do that without the naming the
6	person in those. That's the only thing I see
7	wrong with it.
8	(WHEREUPON, the following proceedings
9	were had back in the presence of the jury:)
10	BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:
11	Q Doctor, before we move on, you don't know
12	those photographs are of Ben Marsh specifically? You
13	didn't know Ben Marsh; is that correct?
14	A That's correct.
15	Q So you what you're seeing in your
16	photographs is a male decedent, we can call him, that
17	correlates those photographs correlate to the
18	injuries you saw in the report; is that correct?
19	A Yes, that's correct.
20	Q And if you would just when you're describing

- each photograph, to name them as the male you had in your report?
- 23 **A** I understand.

21

Q	Okay?

2.1

**A** Uh-huh.

Q Thank you. I don't know what number you're on, but if you want to finish.

A Sure. This is State's Exhibit 42. This is a left face, left shoulder and left chest view of the male decedent. It demonstrates a gunshot wound here, high up on the left chest, near the left collarbone, and also demonstrates a gunshot wound just lateral to the left nipple here on the chest; okay?

**Q** And those wounds specifically correlate to the report that you reviewed in this case of the male decedent?

A Yes. Exhibit 25 is a view of the right forearm of the decedent, the right flank and right hip of the decedent, the male decedent, as well as the dorsum or back side of the left hand. In this particular view there was an entrance gunshot wound here on the right forearm. There is an entrance gunshot wound here on the right hip. And there is also a laceration, a cut on the dorsum of the middle finger of the right hand; okay?

Exhibit 26 is a view of the male decedent,

the inner part of the right forearm, and it shows an exit qunshot wound; okay?

Twenty-seven is the view of the male decedent showing the right hand, specifically the back of the right hand, and there is a cut. Forgive me. Earlier I said that there was a cut near the middle finger. No. It's out here near the pinky. On the back of the hand there is an entrance gunshot wound here near the base of the pinky and an exit gunshot wound near the base of the index finger. Goes across the hand like so. Okay?

Exhibit 28 is the decedent's -- male decedent, the -- this picture demonstrates the -- essentially this view, meaning the fingers, the thumb, the heel of the hand, and the wrist of the male decedent; okay? Around the wrist is a plastic band, and in handwriting, it says Benjamin Marsh, Coroner's. On the middle finger of the left hand is a laceration.

State's Exhibit 29 is a view of the male decedent as we look down into the skull vault, or the brain vault. This is removing the top of the skull like so, and the brain has been removed for examination, and I can see the walls of the skull here and the floor upon which the brain rests. There are

4

5

6

7

8

9

- multiple fractures in the bone here on the right side that extend onto the floor of the brain vault. Okay? And that's what I have.
  - Q The photographs that you've reviewed, are those the same photographs you reviewed for your testimony today?
  - A Yes, that's correct.
  - Are those the same photographs you reviewed in connection with that report from 1974, coroner's report?
- 11 **A** It is.

- 17 **Q** This injury to his forearm --
- 18 **A** Yes.
- 19 **Q** -- was that a fatal injury?
- 20 **A** No.
- 21 **Q** The one to his side that went into his flank, 22 you said --
- 23 **A** Right.

**Q** -- was that a fatal injury?

**A** No.

**Q** What one would've been fatal or most concerning?

A The concerning gunshot wound was that lateral to the left nipple. It went in through the lung, through the heart, and — excuse me. Perhaps both lungs. Let me check. Oh, I beg your pardon. Yes, through the left lung, through the heart, through the right lung, and was removed from the right chest cavity.

Q What would that projectile have been doing to those body parts as it's going in?

Well, a bullet damages in two ways. Number one, it delivers energy to the body, just the same as a punch does. And if you punch a lung or punch a heart, you do damage to those tissues. Those tissues are not used to being punched. In fact, you have an entire ribcage set of muscles, skin and fat around those organs to protect them; okay? So energy is delivered to those organs, bruising them, tearing them, and also causing them to bleed. And so you do damage in two ways. You cause those organs to bleed, and you inflict

- 1 a punch type of energy to those organs.
- **Q** Would that shot have killed him instantly?
- **A** Not necessarily.
- 4 Q What was -- what would happen -- you said the
- 5 | bleeding would start. Where would that blood go?
  - A Well, the blood would go into the chest cavity.
  - Q From your review of the report, did they find that blood in the chest cavity?
- **A** Yes.

2.1

- **Q** You said there was also some other -- some 12 lacerations and skull damage?
- **A** Yes.
- Can you tell us what that would've been doing?
  - A Well, the essentially when the head is hit, energy is delivered not only to the skin, cutting the skin, but it penetrates to the skull, and in this case breaking the skull. And that energy would continue through the wall of the skull to the brain itself. So there would be injuries to the brain caused by the energy delivered, number one, and also the brain would be injured by the shards or fragments of bone

- 1 that would physically cut the surface of the brain.
- 2 Does reviewing those photographs of the side 3 of his face and his head help you in determining what
- 4 was used in order to make --
- 5 Well, I can't know specifically what was --6 what was used. It is not consistent with a fist. Ιt 7 is consistent with a tool. Something with an edge to it.
- 9 Would it have to be considerably pretty heavy Q 10 in order to break the skull of an adult male?
- 11 Α Your question is fair, counselor. It could 12 be a heavy object that is wielded lightly, or it could 13 be a light object that is wielded with a lot of force.
- 14 And I can't tell the difference.
- 15 Is it consistent with a gun being used? Q
- 16 Α Yes.

- 17 The hand wound on his left hand, does that Q
- 18 tell you anything as a forensic pathologist?
- 19 Α I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?
- 20 Q The hand wound on his left hand?
- 2.1 A On the left hand?
- 22 Yes. Does that tell you anything as a Q
- 23 forensic pathologist?

- 1 Α Well, in the context of this case, it 2 would -- it might be related to the wounds of the face.
- 3 0 As a defensive wound?
- 4 Α That's fair.
- 5 Did you have a chance to review the scene Q 6 photographs as well?
  - Α Yes.

- 8 MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I approach again,
- 9 Your Honor?
- 10 THE COURT: You may.
- BY MS. CANTALAMESSA: 11
- 12 I'm going to hand you State's Exhibits 14 and Q 13 15.
- 14 Thank you. Α
- 15 Are those the same photographs you reviewed Q of the scene --16
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 -- in relation to this case? What do those Q 19 photographs tell you when you're investigating your 20 case for forensic pathology purposes?
- 21 Α Well, each of the photographs show the male 22 decedent laying on the bed with his left side down, his 23
  - head on a pillow, his legs off the side of the bed to

the floor; okay? The right arm is over his torso, and his left arm, specifically his left hand, is — is here near his chin. The injury that counselor just asked about was on his left hand. The injuries, the angular injuries to the face, were on the right side of the face, face up.

- **Q** Does the location of that blood spatter tell you anything as you're looking at the case?
- A Well, I'm not a blood spatter expert, but yes, the blood would've come from both the gunshot wounds, as well as the injuries to the face and head.
- Q Can you tell by looking at the photographs, the reports, which injury happened first?
- A No, I can't.
  - Q Can you tell by looking at the photographs whether the gunshot wounds happened before the beating happened?
  - A The injuries to the face are -- the injuries to the face are grouped here. The person would not have been moving while these injuries were being inflicted.
  - **Q** Do those injuries depict that person receiving all of that in that location on the bed?

7

8

16

18

- 1 A Yes, that's possible.
- 2 **Q** What is the cause and manner of the death in this male decedent's case?
- Well, the decedent died of a gunshot wound.

  Specifically the one that went into the chest through
  the left lung, the heart, and the right lung.
  - Q And what's the -- is that the cause or the --
  - **A** The cause, yes.

called a homicide. Okay?

decedent, his left eye is swollen?

- 9 **Q** Okay. What is the manner of death?
- 10 A The manner of death is a homicide. Let me

  11 explain. A manner is one of five categories in which

  12 deaths are categorized. You can have a natural death,

  13 obviously, an accidental, a suicidal, a homicidal, or

  14 an undetermined type death. And specifically the

  15 medical term, death at the hands of another person, is
- On the picture of the male victim, the male
- 19 **A** Yes.
- Is that an additional injury, or is that what you call an artifact?
- 22 **A** Well, it's possible that it is an additional injury. However, it could be related to those injuries

- that started here on the right side of the head.

  Remember, energy is delivered not only to the surface, but travels through the head, through the brain, and may cause hemorrhages in the blood vessels underneath the left eye. You see?
  - Q I say artifact. Can you tell the jury what that means?
  - A Yeah. Artifact means that it could be that it's not injury, but simply the decedent is laying on his left side, and so by gravity, over time, blood starts to travel through the tissues and stain the skin and tissues on the other side of the face, on the opposite side of the head. The side where the head was down as opposed to the side where the head was up. It happens by gravity. It's called lividity, and it's an artifact that happens after death. Okay?
  - Q How long with just the gunshot wound to the lung, the heart, and the other lung, how long could this male decedent have lived?
- **A** I don't have those details from the report that I was given, so I can't know that.
- **Q** But you said it didn't have to be instantaneously; is that correct?

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

- **A** No. That's correct.
- 2 **Q** What about those injuries to his skull; is
- 3 that an instantaneous?
  - A Not necessarily. I would've expected the decedent to have been incapacitated, knocked out, and certainly with the injuries I've seen injuries like that where they're nearly instantaneously fatal, and I've seen people survive those kind of injuries, so I'm
- In your review of the reports, the

  photographs, and going to the crime scene, do you agree

  with Dr. Weiss's conclusion in cause and manner of

  death?

sorry to waffle, but that's the honest truth.

- **A** Yes, I do.
- 15 **Q** Back then they called it shock and hemorrhage.
- 17 **A** Yeah.
- 18 **Q** What does that mean?
- This is an old term that basically is giving voice to shock, the energy that's delivered to the body, and hemorrhage, which means bleeding. Okay?

  It's just the formal terms for those two -- two things
- 23 that happen when a bullet goes into a body.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- And so it doesn't change anything, the fact that he died from gunshot wounds? They just call it shock and hemorrhage from gunshot wounds; is that right?
- **A** That's correct.
  - Q Moving on to Marilyn, or the adult female decedent's report that you reviewed, did you also receive autopsy photographs for review in that report?
- A That's right.
  - Q Did those injuries for that adult female decedent, would they correlate to the report for the adult female decedent that you reviewed?
- **A** Yes.
- MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I approach, Your
- 15 Honor?
- THE COURT: You may.
- (WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 30-32
- were marked for identification.)
- 19 BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:
- 20 Q I'm going to hand you State's Exhibits 30, 21 31, and 32.
- 22 **A** Yes.
  - Q Could you tell us what's in each of those

1 photographs, stating the State's Exhibit number first?

A In State's Exhibit 30, I have the face-on view, including the neck and upper part of the chest of the female decedent. There are -- well, she had slightly swollen and discolored eyelids.

In 31 I have a right face view of the female decedent, and there is an abrasion here on the right cheek, as well as the discoloration of the right eyelid.

Exhibit 32 is the posterior view of the female decedent, and there is an entrance gunshot wound in the back of the head near the midline, here.

- **Q** And what was the age of the female decedent at her time of death?
- **A** She was .
- **Q** And how big was she?
- **A** She was 5 foot 9 and 270 pounds.
- **Q** And what were her injuries as noted in
- 19 Dr. Weiss's coroner's report?
- **A** Well, she had lacerations of the brain due to a gunshot wound to the back of the head.
- **Q** And that was consistent with what you saw 23 both in the photographs and the report?

1	Α	Yes.

- 2 **Q** You mentioned she had an injury on her face?
- 3 **A** Yeah. It's not uncommon in people who have
- 4 gunshot wounds to their head, there will -- small
- 5 | fractures will occur on the floor of the brain vault,
- and those fractures will cause small injuries to the
- 7 eyelids. It will cause the eyelids to discolor.
- 8 **Q** And what was her cause and manner of death?
- 9 **A** Well, she died as a result of a gunshot wound to the back of the head.
- Can you determine how many -- whether it was
- seconds to minutes, any time that it took for her?
- 13 **A** Yeah. She could've died within seconds to a couple of minutes.
- Do you agree with Dr. Weiss's conclusion in that cause and manner of death?
- 17 **A** Yes.
- 18 **Q** And what was -- did you say what manner of death that was?
- 20 **A** Yes. This is also a homicide.
- 21 **Q** Moving on to the third report that you
- 22 reviewed, it was a female juvenile?
- 23 **A** Correct.

21

22

23

1 MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I approach one 2 last time, Your Honor? 3 THE COURT: You may. 4 (WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 33-36 5 were marked for identification.) BY MS. CANTALAMESSA: 6 7 Dr. Ohr, I'm going to hand you State's Q Exhibits 33 through 36. Would you do the same thing 8 9 for me with those photographs? 10 Yes. A I have State's 33 through 36. State's 11 33 is a left face view of the juvenile decedent. 12 on the face and within the hairline, there are multiple 13 lacerations. One here at the -- excuse me, the left 14 side of the nose. One here at the outer edge of the 15 left orbit, around the eye. One on the left cheek. There are one here, the left hairline, one near the 16 17 midline, and then there are multiple within the hair 18 itself. 19 Can you say exactly how many wounds she has? Q 20

A Well, from this picture I can see eight in this particular exhibit. The next photograph is a more face-on view of the female juvenile, and it's really

showing that there are no injuries to the right side of

1 | the face.

2.1

**Q** What number is that? I'm sorry.

A This is State's 34. State's 35 is the juvenile decedent, and we're looking at the top of the head. The hair has been combed left and right, and there are multiple lacerations here near the midline in the front and along the left side to the midline of the back. Perhaps one, two, three, four, five — five, possibly six injuries to the top of the head.

**Q** And how old was that female juvenile at the time of autopsy?

A She was four.

Q And how much did she weigh?

A She weighed 35 pounds.

Q What can you tell us about those injuries to her head? Was it more force than would've been on the adult male? Was it less force? Anything you could say about that?

A Well, no. The -- the injuries did break the skull. A child's skull tends to be thinner and more flexible than that of an adult. Would it take more or less force to break the child's skull? It's -- I really can't tell. The flexibility makes it less

- likely that the skull would break. The thinness of the skull makes it more likely that the skull would break.
- 3 You see? The point is is that the skull was broken.
  - Q Can you tell what kind of object made those lacerations?
  - A Well, no, not specifically. The laceration, the wounds themselves, do have an angular appearance to them. Some of them have kind of a 90-degree edge to them. This is not consistent with a fist unless maybe the fist was wearing, you know, a large, angular ring or something like that. It's consistent with a tool. I don't know what tool.
  - **Q** Is it consistent with the injuries that were on the adult male?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** And those you've already testified those 17 are consistent with a qun?
- **A** Well, yes, a gun is possible here.
- **Q** The report talks about the injury to the skull, the crushing or the fracture of the skull. Is there anything to note about that?
  - A Not really. The term I believe you're looking for is comminuted. Comminuted simply means

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- that it's not broken across like a stick or like if you
  break your arm, you get a linear break. Comminuted
  means more spiderweb like or like an eggshell. You
  know, many pieces, like that.
- Would the heavier the type of tool that was used cause that effect?
  - A Well, no. I really can't -- I can't really tell.
    - And what, according to the report and your review of all the evidence in the case, what was the female juvenile decedent's cause and manner of death?
    - A Well, she died as a result of these injuries to the face and head. The fracturing the skull, again, leads to laceration or cuts in the brain itself, as well as the force or energy that comes from the blow, through the skin, through the skull, to the brain itself.
  - And what is her manner of death?
- 19 **A** The manner of death here is that of a homicide.
- Do you agree with all the conclusions that were made back in 1974 in these coroner's reports?
  - A Well, yes. I agree to the findings of the

2.1

autopsy reports in correlation with the photographs
that I've been shown.

Q Okay. And do you come to that conclusion based on a reasonable degree of medical certainty?

A Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Are you going to be a while? It's time for -- over time for the jury to go to lunch.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: I have one more thing to ask.

THE COURT: Are you going to have something, too?

MS. WEIBLING: Yes, Your Honor, I do have a cross.

THE COURT: Okay. Then we're going to recess. Ladies and gentlemen, during your absence from the courtroom, I would remind you, please, not to discuss this case at all among yourselves or with anyone else. Please do not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence. You should not form or express any opinion about the case.

Again, you're free to go wherever you like

2.1

for lunch. Return to the jury room shortly before 1:30 so we can begin at that time. Please avoid any publicity about the case or anyone discussing the case. Thank you.

(WHEREUPON, the Court recessed at 12:17 p.m., November 19, 2013 and reopened at 1:33 p.m., November 19, 2013 and the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: Thank you. Please continue.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your

Honor.

# BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

**Q** Dr. Ohr, do you know where they used to do the autopsies in Mahoning County?

A Yes. It's now called the Oak Hill
Renaissance Center. It's -- it's government offices,
including our office. It was the old South Side
Hospital. South Side Hospital, of course, had a
hospital morgue, and that's where autopsies were done.

And did those coroner's reports reflect that those autopsies in this case were all done at the South Side Hospital?

A Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 MS. CANTALAMESSA: May I approach the witness, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 40, 41C, 41D, 41E, 41F were marked for

identification.)

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit 40 and then 41C, D, E, and F. When you do an autopsy, Dr. Ohr, every projectile that is collected, do you keep that and give it over to the police in any way?

A Yes.

• And how is that done?

A Well, the bullets -- in my practice the projectiles are removed, they are cleaned, and they are photographed, they are packaged. And a -- and an evidence sheet or evidence trail sheet is attached to the projectiles. This lets the person who receives the projectiles know what's on the list, what bullets are there, to double check those and sign off on them.

Q And do you normally, if there's multiple projectiles found, mark where you found each one?

A Yes. Yes, I do.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

22

- Did you have a chance to review the actual evidence taken from the coroner's office back in 1974?
  - **A** Yes, I did.
  - Q Did they mark those projectiles in the same manner in that you mark them today?
    - A The slight difference is this; back then projectiles were actually marked on. The butt of the bullet was marked on it. I don't do that personally. We photograph them today. But yes, essentially, correct, they are labeled, and they're correlated with the autopsy report.
    - **Q** And were those labeled, and were you able to correlate those with the autopsy reports?
  - A Yes.
- 15 **Q** And how were you able to do that?
- 16 A Well, the -- as part of the autopsy findings,
  17 the autopsy report will list, for example, projectile
  18 removed from the right chest cavity like that, and then
  19 they'll put a number next to it, No. 3, and then No. 3
  20 will go on the box of the package in which the bullet
  21 is stored and would go on an evidence log as well.
  - Q Is the doctor who removed that projectile, is their name indicated on the label?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 1 A Yes, it is.
- 2 And can you tell us what State's Exhibit 40 is, please? You could open it if that assists you.
- 4  $\blacksquare$  And those are open as well.
  - With a cardboard box in them. The package is labeled Shelf No. 66. The box has no labeling, but within the box is a round tin, and the tin has labeling that identifies the date of the autopsy, the decedent's name, and Dr. Weiss who was the coroner involved with this case.
  - Q Is that for the female decedent or the male decedent?
    - **A** This is for the male decedent.
    - And since there were three projectiles from him, does that indicate which one that that correlates to?
- 18 A Yes. This one says anterior clavicle.
- Anterior means front. Clavicle means collarbone. And it has the No. 1 associated with it. I go to the autopsy report, and on the autopsy report it says No. 1
- 22 from the clavicle.
  - **Q** Could you open the other box from Exhibit

- 1 No. 40?
- 2 **A** Sure. Also a box, no labeling on it, and
- 3 inside a small metal tin. The tin also that of the
- 4 male decedent, the date. The tin also says South Side
- 5 Hospital on it, and it says bullet marked No. 2. And
- 6 forgive me, I can't read this little smudged part here.
- 7 Bullet No. 2.
- 8 **Q** And there was a No. 2 in the coroner's
- 9 report?
- 10 **A** Yes.
- 11 **Q** And could you look at 41C for us?
- 12 **A** Uh-huh.
- 13 **Q** They have a sticker on the bottom, if that
- 14 helps.
- 15 **A** Yeah. Thank you. This again is the male
- 16 decedent. The date of the autopsy, South Side
- 17 Hospital. Then this one says spine, and it says Bullet
- 18 No. 3 on it.
- 19 **Q** And that's the one you describe before as the
- 20 | iliac --
- 21 **A** Iliac spine. Correct.
- 22 **Q** And could you do 41D for us?
- 23 **A** Uh-huh. Another tin. 41D is another metal

- tin, and this one says this is of the female decedent, the adult. It has the date of the autopsy, and the South Side Hospital. It has Dr. Weiss's name on it, and it's marked head.
- $\mathbf{Q}$  And what are the other two, 41E and F?
  - A 41E is a clear, plastic capsule taped closed, and it says there's a small piece of gauze or paper inside that wraps what is apparently it's labeled fragment removed from the head of the female decedent, and it says by Dr. Weiss.
- **Q** Okay.
- A 41F, it says hair sample of -- and this is the male decedent, and it has the date of the autopsy on it.
  - Q Do all that, 40 and 41C, D, E, and F, all reflect the same date that's on the coroner's report?
- $\blacksquare$  **A** They do.
- As a deputy coroner for Mahoning County, do
  you, or is it commonplace for coroners to take
  fingerprints as well of decedents?
- **A** In my practice, yes, I take the fingerprints of all homicide victims.
  - Q And for one minute before I sit down, we

- 1 talked before about three projectiles in the male adult
  2 decedent?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** But seven wounds?
- **A** I understand.
- 6 Q Could all seven of those wounds be from those 7 three projectiles, or --
- **A** Yes.

2.1

- 9 Q Okay. Could there be even a fourth
  10 projectile that caused one of the other wounds on the
  11 arm or the hand?
  - A Oh, sure, yeah. There's a wound here on the hand and one through the forearm that has both an entrance and an exit. So it could've gone through the body and be lost to the room or in the wall or something like this.
  - And you said before that it was possible that the forearm wound could've went in the forearm, out the forearm, then in the side; is that correct? That's possible?
  - A Well, yes, it's possible that it happened either at the forearm or, you know, the hand also has an entrance and an exit. Could've gone entrance, exit,

1	and	then	back	into	the	hip.	That's	certainly	possible.
---	-----	------	------	------	-----	------	--------	-----------	-----------

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can I have one

second, Your Honor?

THE COURT: All right.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the Court, jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

MS. CANTALAMESSA: I have nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you.

**THE COURT:** Any cross examination?

MS. WEIBLING: Yes, Your Honor.

#### CROSS/OHR

# CROSS EXAMINATION

#### BY MS. WEIBLING:

- Q Dr. Ohr, I'm Attorney Kristie Weibling. I'm going to ask you some questions. If you need me to repeat anything, just let me know.
- A Thank you.
- Q Just for clarification purposes, the exhibits that you were referencing that are in front of you, those are projectiles; correct?
  - A Projectiles, and then one is a hair sample, and one is a fragment of a projectile.
  - **Q** Did you remove any of those projectiles from the decedent, the male decedent?
- **A** No, I did not.
- **Q** And did you take the hair sample that is contained there?
- **A** I did not.
  - Q Dr. Ohr, it's evident that you are a highly skilled physician and are very knowledgeable on this subject matter. You previously testified that you reviewed autopsy photographs, the autopsy report, reviewed the scene where these incidents allegedly had taken place. Based upon your review of all of that

# CROSS/OHR

information,	as you	sit	here	today,	can	you	tell	us	who
caused the i	njuries	that	are	refere	nced	in ·	those		
autopsy repo	rts?								

A No, I can't.

MS. WEIBLING: Thank you, Your Honor. No further questions.

**THE COURT:** Anything else from the state?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Your next witness, please.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, the state calls Andrew Chappell.

THE BAILIFF: Judge, this witness does not object to being photographed.

DIRECT/	CHAPPELL
	THE COURT: Okay. Raise your right
	hand, please.
	WHEREUPON, the State called
	ANDREW CHAPPELL,
	who, being first duly sworn, testified
	as follows:
	THE COURT: Please be seated in the
	witness chair. You testified before,
	Mr. Chappell?
	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
	THE COURT: All right. Please keep your
	voice up and answer all the questions out
	loud. Thank you.
	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your
	Honor.
DIRECT	EXAMINATION
BY MS.	CANTALAMESSA:
Q	Good afternoon.
A	Good afternoon.
Q	Would you please introduce yourself to the
jury?	

- 1 Andrew Chappell, C-H-A-P-P-E-L-L.
- 2 Q And Mr. Chappell, what do you do for a
- 3 living?
- 4 **A** I am a forensic scientist assigned to the
- 5 | firearm section at the Ohio Bureau of Criminal
- 6 Investigation, commonly referred to as BCI.
- 7 **Q** And what kind of education do you have in
- 8 order to work at BCI?
- 9 **A** I have a bachelor's degree in chemistry from
- 10 | Hampden-Sydney College. A master's degree in forensic
- 11 science from the University of Alabama at Birmingham.
- 12 I completed an internship with the firearms section of
- 13 the Virginia Division of Forensic Sciences. I
- 14 completed a year of on-the-job training at BCI and have
- 15 continued to attend classes and seminars that's
- 16 available since then.
- 17 **Q** How long have you worked at BCI?
- 18 **A** Twelve years.
- 19 **Q** Did you work anywhere prior to that?
- 20 **A** No, I did not.
- 21  $\mathbf{Q}$  You said what division you work at at BCI.
- 22 What do you do in that division?
- 23 **A** I examine submitted firearms to determine if

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

they function as designed. I examine fired ammunition components comparing them to each other to determine if they were fired from the same firearm or multiple. compare those also to test fires I take from submitted firearms to determine if they were fired from that particular qun. I examine victim clothing for patterns of gunshot residue in order to estimate the distance a shooter was from the victim at the time the gun was fired. I restore serial numbers that have been ground off of firearms or pretty much any metal surface that once had a unique identifier stamped into it that has since been removed. And I do something that's called NIBIN database entry. And NIBIN is a national database that we enter both evidence and test fired cartridge cases into in order to determine if there is a link between previously unassociated crimes.

- **Q** Do you have any specialized training through BCI for your position there?
- 19 **A** Yes, I do.
- 20 **Q** Do you have to keep up with so many hours?
- 21 **A** No, we do not.
- 22 **Q** What kind of specialized training for BCI
- 23 have you had?

- A Training in the examination of firearms in the comparison of ammunition components with reference to being able to identify them as having come from a specific firearm. Examination of gunshot residue patterns and restoration of serial numbers.
- **Q** Okay. And are you a member of any professional organizations?
- A No, I'm not.
- **Q** Is BCI an accredited laboratory?
- **A** Yes, it is.
- **Q** Okay. And how is it accredited?
- **A** It is accredited through the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors.
  - Q Do you have -- while you work at BCI, do you have to undergo proficiency testing in order to maintain your employment?
- **A** Yes, I do.
- **Q** And what is that?
- Proficiency testing is we take a test
  designed to make sure that our skill level is
  maintained and that we are competent in the area that
  we work. We take at least two external proficiencies
- 23 each year and currently do additional three internal

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 reworkings of someone else's case work.

**Q** And then firearms comparison cases, do you get proficiency testing in that as well?

A Yes, we do.

Q Tell us, when you're comparing firearms as you compared projectiles or lead bullets from this case, what are you looking for?

First I'm looking at the class Α characteristics, which for a bullet is going to be the caliber, which refers to the diameter of the bullet. I'm looking at the number of lands and grooves that are carved into the bullet, as well as the direction that they twist, and their widths. Lands and grooves are kind of like the rumble strip down the side of the highway, cut into a barrel with a twist by the manufacturer. And they are put there in order to put a spin on the bullet, which gives you greater accuracy at longer distances. Much like throwing a football. you don't get a nice tight spiral, it tips end over end and doesn't go as far and hit the intended receiver. Same applies with the lands and grooves in the barrel of a qun.

**Q** And is there a database kept that you know

- 1 | which guns have which type of lands and grooves?
- 2 **A** Yes. The FBI maintains a database of general
- 3 rifling characteristics.
- 4 **Q** What do you do when you get these
- 5 projectiles? Do you look at them with your naked eye,
- 6 or how do you do this?
- 7 **A** We examine them using a comparison
- 8 microscope. And a comparison microscope is essentially
- 9 two microscopes connected by an optical bridge that
- 10 allows you to look at two objects side by side at the
- 11 same time.
- 12 You received some evidence from this case; is
- 13 | that correct?
- 14 **A** Yes, it is.
- 15 **Q** All right. When did you receive evidence to
- 16 compare in this case?
- 17 **A** May I refer to my notes?
- MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, may he
- refer to his notes?
- THE COURT: Fine by me.
- 21 **A** Evidence was submitted for my examination in
- 22 July of this year.
- 23 **Q** What did you receive that you were going to

l compare	?
-----------	---

A I examined four fired bullets and three lead fragments that were recovered from the bodies of Benjamin and Marilyn Marsh.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 45 was marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

- Q Before I do that, though, so I can bring you two things at once, did you write a report in reference to your comparison in this case?
- A Yes, I did.
- I'm going to hand you State's Exhibit 41,
  State's Exhibit 40, and then there's 41C, D, E, and F,
  and State's Exhibit 45. And I'll ask you some
  questions. Let's start with State's Exhibit 45. Could
  you tell us what that is?
- A This is a copy of the report that I issued stating my findings.
- **Q** And is that a fair and accurate copy of your original report?

- 1 A Yes, it is.
- **Q** What date did you sign that report or finish your analysis?
  - **A** August 28th of this year.
- **Q** You said you received four projectiles and three bullet fragments?
  - A Yes.

- **Q** Okay. Are those contained in any of those exhibits you have up there?
- **A** Yes, they are.
- **Q** Okay. How do you know?
  - A When evidence is submitted to the laboratory, it receives a case number unique to that particular incident, and each package of evidence receives an item number unique to that. And those are printed along with a bar code label and affixed to the packaging, and we use that label for tracking purposes of the evidence within the laboratory. And the evidence also bears my initials and the date that I sealed the packaging.
- **Q** And is that also true for State's Exhibit 40? 21 I think there's two bags inside.
- **A** Yes, it is.
  - Q Okay. And what were BCI numbers on State's

- 1 | Exhibit 40 and 41?
- 2 **A** 11 and 12.
- Did you -- was this the first time that this evidence was submitted to BCI?
- 5 **A** No, it was not.
- 6 **Q** How do you know that?
- The evidence was originally submitted in 1974, and that is indicated by the case number, as well as submission sheets from the initial submission.
- Do you have an old case file going back that long ago?
- 12 **A** Yes, I do.
- Do you have all the old submission sheets throughout the years?
- 15 **A** I have several of them, yes.
- 16 **Q** Is this case also given a 1974 case number
- 17 because of the original date of it?
- 18 **A** Yes, it is.
- 19 **Q** When you made your comparison, you looked at
- 20 them through a comparison microscope?
- 21 **A** Yes, I did.
- 22 **Q** And how were you able to do that? I mean,
- which ones did you take out? Did you take out all four

2.1

of them and do them all four at one time, or was it a one-to-one basis?

A It is a one-to-one comparison.

**Q** Did you find -- did you make any conclusions in regards to those four projectiles that you had?

A Yes, I did.

**Q** And what was that?

A All four of the bullets have the same general rifling characteristics, and two of those bullets have matching individual barrel engraved striations, meaning that those two were fired from the same firearm. The remaining two bullets did not exhibit sufficient individual detail in order to identify or eliminate them as having been fired from the same firearm as the other two.

Q Okay. Let's go back to how is a bullet -how are you able to just take the projectile and not
the full bullet and tell where that bullet comes from?

People commonly refer to a cartridge as a

bullet. In order to explain the terminology, it helps if you think of it like a champagne bottle. The overall cartridge is similar to an unopened bottle.

The cartridge case corresponds to the bottle itself.

2.1

The bullet which sits in the top, corresponds to the cork. And then the powder, which is inside, corresponds to the actual champagne. Both the bullet and the cartridge case are identifiable to a particular firearm, and so you don't need both in order to make an identification. Either one is identifiable on its own.

Q What is the problem with only doing the lead or the projectile from the bullet? Is there anything about that lead piece that isn't desirable over time?

A Lead is very soft, and over time from rolling around in the container, being handled during additional comparisons, the lead wears down and gets smooth, and it becomes much more difficult to make an identification.

You said you were, though, able to match two of the bullets you had -- or two of the projectiles you had; is that right?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. The four projectiles that you have, where did they come from?

A They were recovered from the bodies.

Q Okay. You didn't have any of the projectiles from the scene in Canfield?

2.1

A	No,	Ι	did	not.
---	-----	---	-----	------

- **Q** Were all the projectiles you tested marked accordingly as from those bodies?
- A Yes, they were.
- **Q** Do you note that in your report as well as how each projectile was marked so that you can keep the same identification?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q What are you able to say about those besides being from the .38 caliber classification, about those two bullets you were able to identify?
- A Based on the general rifling characteristics, the class characteristics that I mentioned earlier, I entered those into the database that's maintained by the FBI, and was able to provide a list of firearms that have those same general characteristics, and therefore could have fired those bullets.
- Q What kind of characteristics did you find?
  Did you find the lands and grooves that we've talked about?
- A The characteristics that I'm using for this search are the caliber family, the number of lands and grooves, their direction of twist, and the widths of

- 1 the lands and grooves.
- 2 **Q** Do you know how many lands and grooves were
- 3 on these?
- 4 **A** There were six.
- 5 **Q** Do you know the direction of twist?
- 6 **A** Left.
- 7 **Q** And that information you put into your
- 8 database?
- 9 A Yes, I did.
- 10 **Q** And what did you come up with?
- 11 **A** I came up with a list of possible firearms.
- 12 **Q** And you've also included that in your report;
- 13 is that right?
- 14 A Yes, I did.
- Does your conclusion include weapons that are
- 16 considered or called .38 specials?
- 17 **A** Yes, it does.
- Out of the 12 guns you've listed, how many of
- 19 those guns are .38 specials?
- 20 **A** Eight.
- 21 **Q** Can you talk about the difference between a
- 22 revolver and a semiautomatic for us?
- 23 **A** revolver is the old fashioned kind of gun

2.1

you used to see in the old westerns. Cartridges are loaded into a round cylinder that revolves or turns when the hammer is cocked to move each cartridge in line with the firing pin. When a revolver is fired, the cartridge cases stay in the cylinder until they are manually removed by someone.

With a semiautomatic, cartridges are loaded into a magazine, which is a box-like structure with a spring loaded follower, functions like a PEZ dispenser. It constantly pushes everything to the top. That gets inserted into the pistol, and the slide is pulled rearward, and when that -- and as it moves forward again under spring tension it takes the top cartridge in the magazine and loads it into the chamber, ready to be fired.

Once the gun is fired, the pressure from detonating the cartridge forces the bullet down the barrel, but it also causes the slide to move rearward again. And as it moves rearward, there's a small metal hook that catches under the rim of the now fired cartridge case and pulls it out of the chamber until it hits another little metal piece called an ejector that kicks it out of the gun. Then the slide will move

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

forward again under spring tension and load the next cartridge from the magazine.

MR. MERANTO: Judge, excuse me. May we approach?

THE COURT: All right.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among court and counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can I keep going?

MR. MERANTO: Yeah.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you.

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you.

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

Mr. Chappell, you talked about matching two bullets to that list of guns, and eight out of the twelve are .38 specials. Which two bullets have you identified that matched the .38 special?

A One -- I didn't identify any to a particular firearm.

**Q** Right.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- The two that I matched to each other, one was recovered from Mr. Marsh's clavicle, and the other was recovered from his spine.
  - You also mentioned having three bullet fragments from Mrs. Marsh. Were you able to do anything with those bullet fragments?
  - A Unfortunately, no. The bullet fragments did not exhibit any class or individual characteristics, and that prevented any further analysis.
  - Q When you knew that it was resubmitted because it had been submitted in 1974, were more projectiles submitted back in 1974?
- 13 **A** Yes, there were.
- 14 **Q** How many were submitted back then?
- 15 **A** A total of six were initially submitted in 1974.
- Were they able to match those six bullets back in 1974?
- A According to the original case notes, all six bullets were matched to each other.
- 21 **Q** Did they ever do the same thing you do today 22 in making this list of potential weapons?
- 23 **A** I honestly don't know if they had that

- 1 capability in 1974.
- **Q** That's fine. Do you come to all these
  3 conclusions based on a reasonable degree of scientific
  4 certainty?
- **A** Yes, I do.

- Q And do you base that, your opinion, on all your training and experience and your work at BCI?
  - A Yes, I do.
    - MS. CANTALAMESSA: Can I have one second, Your Honor?

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the Court, jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

- Q When we talk about fragments, how is a bullet caused to be fragmented? What causes that, if you know?
  - **A** Impact with a harder object.

A	Yes.	The	ey ha	ave t	the sa	ame	e class		
character	istics	as	the	two	that	Ι	matched	to	each
other.									

- And when you're saying class characteristics is that because you're taking a measurement of how big they are?
- A Yes. That's referring to their diameter, the number of lands and grooves, the direction of twist, and the land and groove measurements.
- Q Okay. The manner in which these bullets are kept in these -- in these tins, did that affect your ability to match those two the other two bullets?
- As I said, over time because the lead is so soft, it will break down as it moves within the containers or when it's handled for further examination.
- **Q** Have you ever done a case of this age?
  - A No, I have not.
- MS. CANTALAMESSA: Nothing further, Your
  Honor. Thank you.
  - THE COURT: Do you folks wish to cross examine this witness?
    - MR. MERANTO: Yes, Your Honor.

#### CROSS/CHAPPELL

2 MR. MERANTO: Thank you.

# CROSS EXAMINATION

# BY MR. MERANTO:

3

4

5

7

8

- Q Good afternoon, Mr. Chappell.
- 6 **A** Good afternoon.
  - **Q** You've been there 12 years?
  - **A** Yes, I have.
- 11 **A** When they were submitted.
  - **Q** In July of this year?
- 13 **A** In July of this year.
- 14 **Q** So that's the first time in the last 12
- 15 | years; right?
- 16 **A** That's correct.
- 17 Q And you may have been able to -- I mean, from
- what I'm hearing from your direct, you may have been
- able to provide more information if they were submitted
- 20 at an earlier time; correct?
- 21 **A** It is possible that the bullets may not have
- 22 been as degraded at that time.
- 23 **Q** Okay. But as we stand here today, you have

#### CROSS/CHAPPELL

- 1 | four bullets that you were able to analyze; right?
- **A** That's correct.
- **Q** Two that you believe were from the same weapon?
- **A** Yes. Two were fired from the same weapon.
  - Q Okay. The other two, what kind of weapon fired those?
    - A They have the same general characteristics, which means they could've been fired from the same weapon. Then again, because they do not have the individual characteristics, they may not have been.
  - **Q** Do they match each other?
- **A** I cannot match them to each other.
- Okay. So potentially there's three weapons that may have been involved here, correct, based on your analysis?
  - A I can only determine that the two were fired from one firearm. With the other two, I can't say whether or not they were fired from the same firearm or multiple.
- **Q** Okay. So would that be a yes then? 22 Potentially, at most, three weapons here; right?
- **A** At most, three.

# CROSS/CHAPPELL

Q	And by t	the way	y, I	see	you	kee	ep	usir	ng tha	at
lands and	grooves	term;	righ	nt?	That	ː's	a	gun	term	to
analyze bu	allets;	right?								

- A Yes, it is.
- Q You ever use that lands and grooves term to analyze fingerprints, or ever heard it used like that?

A No, I have not.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you.

10 \* \* \* \*

# REDIRECT EXAMINATION

# BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

Q Mr. Chappell, you can't include or exclude those other two bullets because they were too worn; is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q But back in 1974 or '75 era, someone at BCI matched all six; is that correct?

A That is correct.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: No further questions,

Your Honor.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### RECROSS/CHAPPELL

# RECROSS EXAMINATION

# BY MR. MERANTO:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

- Q Well, you're here today, though. Whoever analyzed them is not around; right?
- **A** No, they are not.
- Q Okay. So you don't know what they did, how they analyzed them, what techniques they used, do you?
  - A All I can do is refer to their notes.
- 9 Q Okay. You don't have -- you've got a lot of education there, a lot of seminars, and you keep up on your hours?
- 12 **A** Yes, I do.
- Did you ever do any weapons study with regard to weaponry prior to the semiautomatic era?
- I have not conducted any research on that, no.
- Well, have you been to any seminars where
  they talked about common uses of weapons or what
  weapons were commonly used in that period of time? For
  example, in the early '70s?
- 21 **A** No, I have not.
- Okay. Anything, by the way, in all that stuff that you analyzed and all that testimony you gave

#### RECROSS/CHAPPELL

tells you about who fired those weapons, those three
different weapons?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A There's nothing in my analysis that indicates who fired a firearm.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you.

**THE COURT:** Anything else?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Nothing, Your Honor.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You're

excused. Next?

MS. DOHERTY: The state calls Robin

Ladd, Judge.

THE BAILIFF: Judge, this witness

objects to being photographed.

THE COURT: This witness is not to be

photographed. Hi. Raise your right hand,

please.

21

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

\* \* \* \* \*

	DIRECT/LAI	סס
1		WHEREUPON, the State called
2		
3		ROBIN LADD,
4		
5		who, being first duly sworn, testified
6		as follows:
7		THE COURT: All right. Please be seated
8		in the witness chair. These are the ladies
9		and gentlemen of our jury, and they're here
10		to hear and understand everything you have to
11		say, so please speak loudly and clearly
12		enough for them to understand your testimony.
13		Thank you. All right.
14		MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, Your Honor.
15	DIRECT EXA	AMINATION
16	BY MS. DO	HERTY:
17	Q	Good afternoon.
18	A	Good afternoon.
19	Q	Can you tell us your name and spell your
20	first and	last name for the record?
21	A	Robin Ladd, R-O-B-I-N, L-A-D-D.
22	Q	And where are you employed?
23	Δ	I work for the Bureau of Criminal

- 1 Investigation in London, Ohio.
- 2 **Q** And what is the Bureau of Criminal
- 3 Investigation?

- 4 **A** It is a division of the Attorney General's
- office. We are the crime lab for the State of Ohio.
  - Q How many individual divisions are there of
- 7 BCI across the state?
- 9 and we have two regional labs.
- 10 **Q** And we refer to it as BCI; right?
- 11 **A** Yes.
- 12 **Q** And if you know, how long has BCI been in
- 13 existence?
- 14 A I honestly don't know. It's been at least
- 15 since the 1930s.
- 16 **Q** All right. What is the function of BCI kind
- of in general?
- 18 **A** We are an assisting agency. We assist other
- 19 law enforcement agencies with the processing and
- 20 analysis of evidence. We also help to process some
- 21 crime scenes, and we also have our fingerprint
- 22 dentification unit. So we have different areas of
- 23 investigation, and the crime lab, and also

- 1 identification area of fingerprints that are submitted 2 into our database.
  - Q And is there a division of BCI or at least a department in BCI that does DNA analysis?
  - A Yes.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- 0 And trace evidence analysis, that kind of 7 thing?
  - Yes. Α
  - All right. You talked about a division of BCI that actually goes out to crime scenes. Tell us about that.
  - Our crime scene agents will assist other agencies that do not have the manpower to take on a particular crime, or they might need assistance just because they don't have the capability or equipment to process some of the scenes. So they will contact BCI and request one of our agents to help them with the scene.
  - Q And are those agents trained then in evidence collection?
- 21 A Yes.
- Tell the jury, please, about your educational 22 Q 23 background and training that allows you to work at BCI.

- have taken several classes in the different processing techniques for latent fingerprints, friction ridge detail. Also in the distortion of prints and the different comparison methods that we use for latent prints.
- Q How long have you been employed with BCI in total?
- 9 A Approximately 14 years. I'm about a month 10 and a half short of 14 years.
- **Q** And what is your position and your job at 12 BCI?
- **A** I am a forensic scientist in the latent print division.
- **Q** What about prior to working at BCI, did you work in the same field?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Where?
- **A** I worked for the Orange County Sheriff's 20 office in Orlando, Florida.
- **Q** And how long were you there?
- **A** Approximately 12 years.
- **Q** And were your job responsibilities the same

or similar to those you have at BCI as what you did in Florida?

A Yes.

2.1

Q Can you tell the jury, when you say latent prints or fingerprints, tell them what they are.

A latent print — first of all, the ridges that are found on the underside of the hands and the underside of the feet, the skin is different from other parts of the human body. These ridges are raised. They're corrugated and they're very porous. They're friction ridges, meaning that different items or different things can stick to, or we can grab things, and we can rip them. So different substances can adhere to this ridge detail, and then when an item is touched a recreation of that ridge detail may be left. It might be visible such as on glass or a mirror, or it could be invisible such as on a piece of paper in which further chemical processing would be needed. And that's an example of what a latent print is.

**Q** Go ahead.

A known print would be -- or an inked fingerprint is where you're basically taking this friction ridge skin and applying, like, black printer's

ink and then applying that to a contrasting item such as a white fingerprint card. That's an example of what an inked print would be or a known print.

**Q** And latent prints, how do those come into play as far as a crime scene?

A When somebody touches a surface, they may leave a friction ridge detail. So basically when you're touching an item, you're leaving a recreation of this friction ridge detail on a surface. It is left there by whatever the substance is on this friction ridge skin. So if I have oil or perspiration on the skin, and I touch an item, I'm going to leave a recreation of that ridge detail on that surface. It may be something that can be retrieved, sometimes not. And it may be sufficient, meaning there's enough ridge detail to make a possible identification and sometimes again not enough information.

Q How are those latent prints collected, retrieved?

A When a person has a piece of evidence that they are going to process, they will use whatever method is best. So if you're -- if we're looking at a non-porous item, like this area, we could use a powder.

And when you apply the powder, it will adhere to this area that any contaminants are on, and you'll be able to visualize what is on that surface. So if there is a fingerprint, and you use the powder on that area, you will be able to see that there is possible ridge detail for possible identification. So then you would apply — you would take clear tape or you could photograph, and you would lift this area. You could put the lift on a card, some kind of card stock or acetate sheet. And if you need to photograph it, meaning that this surface is not conducive to lifting the print off, if it's got grooves in it, then photography is used.

And how does the surface of an object, an item, affect the collector's ability to lift a print that can be used?

A There are some surfaces that are not really conducive to leaving good latent prints, meaning that a person may have touched the surface, but we might not be able to retrieve any friction ridge detail that is useable. So if we have — some of the items would be, like, leathers. Leathers are not very good conducive surfaces. They seem like they're nice and smooth, but

the prints do not lay clearly across or evenly across that surface. Bricks, concrete, very porous. If you look at it, it actually looks like the print would be sitting on a bunch of needle tops, the tips of needles. So again, you're not getting flow of ridges, so you're not able to get a clear print, and it would not be useable information for any identifications.

As a fingerprint examiner, a forensic analyst, what do you look for when you're comparing a latent print lifted from a crime scene and a known print? What are you looking for?

Basically when we're comparing a latent print to the known inked impressions, we are comparing the — we're examining the characteristics that are found on these two separate impressions to see if the — if they're in the same position and area. An identification can be affected by viewing these characteristics, keeping in mind that they are the same type of characteristic, the same number of characteristics in the same position and area of that hand, foot, or finger.

Q When items, collected evidence comes to BCI for analysis, how do -- how do items, evidence come to

2.1

you, come to BCI in general?

A Evidence is submitted by any law enforcement agency. It has to be a law enforcement agency that has to bring the evidence in. So it can be either an external agency, agencies from other areas in the United States, or even foreign countries, or by our own agents. They will bring evidence in to us for analysis, because they are law enforcement.

Q Once a piece of evidence is submitted to BCI, what happens to it?

A When the evidence is submitted, it is assigned a lab case number, and anything that is associated with that case will be assigned that number, but then it is also assigned an item number. So every piece of evidence that comes in or bag of evidence will be assigned an item number, along with the BCI lab number. And then the evidence is placed into a sealed and secured property room, and then the submission sheets are submitted to the associating departments or disciplines that will need it. So if latent prints need to analyze some evidence, we will get a submission sheet showing that we need — that we have evidence now on a certain case and showing which items we would need

1 to analyze.

2.1

Q So in other words, every piece of evidence, whether it's a latent print, something to be examined for trace evidence, DNA, that is all going to have, at least, go back to that same BCI submission number?

A Yes.

And are the agents -- you said that agents from BCI are also those who submit evidence for analysis to BCI; correct?

A Yes.

**Q** Are those agents trained in collection of evidence in terms of collecting fingerprints?

**A** Yes.

**Q** Why is fingerprint analysis a forensic tool used by law enforcement?

A Fingerprints are permanent. They're unchanging, barring accident or injury from before you're born, like the 12th week of gestation, until after death and total decomposition. They are also unique, meaning that the configuration of all these different characteristics are unique to each individual. Not only that individual, but also each area of your friction ridge skin. So every fingerprint

- 1 that you have is going to be unique to you alone.
- 2 Q And I think you said that those fingerprints,
- 3 they don't even change after death until there's
- 4 decomposition; correct?
- 5 **A** Correct.
- 6 Q This particular case, is there a BC number --
- 7 BCI number assigned to any analysis done in this case?
- 8 **A** Yes.
- 9 **Q** And what is that BCI number?
- 10 **A** 7435791.
- 11 **Q** And what does the 74 indicate?
- 12 **A** That is the year of the case or the year that
- 13 it was originally submitted to BCI.
- 14 Q And you work out of the London office;
- 15 correct?
- 16 **A** Yes.
- 17 **Q** The items that you analyzed in connection
- with this case, where were they housed from 1974 until
- 19 you actually looked at them?
- 20 **A** These were kept in our old file room, which
- 21 is the secured, locked room that's in the back area of
- 22 our lab area. So only lab personnel and lab management
- 23 have access to this area.

- **Q** I think you indicated that at least back to 2 the 1930s, BCI existed; correct?
  - A Yes.

- Was there a certain area where major case evidence was kept in London?
  - **A** From the 1930s?
    - Q Up until --
  - A Yes. All old case evidence that we had, if it was large evidence, would most likely be returned to the agency that submitted it. Other than that, like latent prints, smaller evidence from very old cases were kept with the files in that locked room in the back.
    - Q And the evidence that the fingerprints that we're talking about in this case, were they kept in that same area with all the major case evidence?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** All right. The collection process for latent prints, you talked about a powder being used, correct, a black powder?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Can you tell the jury about what that consists of? Why do you use powder to do it?

A	The powders that we use, a lot of them are
basically	they use volcanic ash in some of them.
There's d	ifferent types of powders that are used, but
basically	all it is is a small particulate matter that
will adhe	re to any residue that is left on a surface.
We could	use baby powder if we wanted to use powder.
It is jus	t brushed on. It does not matter what kind of
brush we'	re using. There's squirrel hair, camel hair.
There's f	iberglass brushes. These different brushes we
will use	with the powder. The powder adheres to the
brush, an	d then it is transferred as we brush it across
to that s	urface type. That's pretty much it.

- Q Okay. Has that process, that actually lifting that evidence, those latent prints, has that changed over the years?
- A No. We actually have kits still in our office that are just for display, but the powders, even from the 1940s, can still be used that we have on display. We could still use them this day, and they would be fine.
- Q This case in particular, approximately when were you asked to look at the evidence that still existed at BCI?

All right. And can you tell the jury what AFIS is and why it wasn't available in the 1970s?

A AFIS stands for Automated Fingerprint

Identification System, and what it is is a database of known finger and palm print cards. This technology didn't come into play until the 1980s. More towards the late '80s. And it has been refined and still being refined through the years. So it is a major database that is being used by the FBI to prove that no two

fingerprints can be the same. It is also being used for us as a tool so that we can identify prints that maybe could not have been identified many years ago.

Q What items -- well, let me back up for a minute.

MS. DOHERTY: May I approach, Judge?

THE COURT: You may.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 61 & 62 were marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

- All right. I'm going to hand you a bunch of stuff probably. First of all, let me hand you State's Exhibit 61 and 62. I actually took them out of this envelope, if you can just keep those with it. Tell us what those are.
- A These are the known palm and fingers of an individual by the name of James Ferrara, and they were taken by Sergeant Cappabianca.
- Q All right. And that's State's Exhibit 61 and 62; correct?
- A Yes.
- **Q** Now I'm going to hand you -- this envelope is actually marked State's Exhibit 43, and then there are

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

a number of 43A through I, if you could look at those and tell us what those are?

A Okay. First Exhibit 43B, C, D, A, these are latent lifts. These are lift cards and then the latent lifts that they used a powder, lifted the lift, put it on this card as backing, and then wrote on the — wrote the information as to where the prints were originally taken from.

MR. MERANTO: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you.

A And then State's Exhibit 43E through I, these are known palm prints of Benjamin Marsh and Marilyn Marsh, the victim -- adult victims on this case.

Q Okay. And I have each one of those marked with a separate exhibit sticker; right?

A Yes.

Q So when you begin looking, the prints located in State's Exhibit 43A through I, those were located in BCI London; correct?

A Yes.

**Q** And what is the first thing that you do or did with those prints as part of this case study?

A When I received this case file and I reviewed
them, I found these latent lifts. I will analyze these
latent lifts to see if I agree with how many prints
were sufficient. If I find any other prints that may
be sufficient, I then will compare what prints were in
the file, meaning the known prints of the victims that
were in this case file. I made comparisons to these
prints to the unknown questioned prints of the latent
prints to see if any of them matched.

- Q And you did that in this case; correct?
- A I did.
- **Q** And initially when you compared the known prints of Marilyn Marsh and Ben Marsh to the latent lifts from the scene, what did you determine?
- A I determined that there were approximately hold on a minute. Five identifications that were made to Benjamin Marsh, the male victim on this case.
- **Q** And tell the jury, please, about the known prints of Ben and Marilyn -- I can't talk -- Ben and Marilyn Marsh that you were able to use to compare?
- A The quality of these prints, they were not the best quality. Obviously you can see that they're very faint. There's areas that are missing. So for

the palmar areas of the prints, the latent prints that were sufficient, could not be identified. So that leaves some of the prints unidentified that may indeed be from the victims. There are some fingerprints also that were not clear enough on the victims' prints in order to make a complete comparison. So there again could be unidentified prints on this case that do match the victims.

Q What is the next step you took after confirming that at least some of those prints originally submitted belonged to Ben Marsh? What did you do next?

A The unidentified latent fingerprints that were on this case, if they were of sufficient quality to enter into our AFIS database to complete a search, were entered. Three fingerprints that were sufficient quality were entered into our AFIS database, and a search was completed. And three AFIS hits were made.

**Q** All right. And if you can refer to the specific prints on the card and the exhibit number that you're referring to?

A This is State's Exhibit 43A, and it would be what I have marked as Lift No. 2, which says it came

1 | from door of garage dated 12/14/74, and initials BLA.

- **Q** And how do you know that those are the latent lifts that you examined and submitted to AFIS?
- A These are marked. We'll mark them A, B, C, and the lift number, and when I enter the information into our AFIS to do a search, I will put the BCI lab number, the lift number, and then which ones it would be, A, B, or C. That way I can identify exactly what print individually is going to was hit, made a hit.
- Q And your initials are on there as well confirming that; correct?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** There is a -- I'm going to call it a bar 14 code, with an item number and a BCI number. What is 15 that?
  - We did not have bar codes back in 1974, but when we open these cases and we find evidence that is sufficient that can be more work can be done, more analysis or entry into AFIS, we will then enter the case. We backlog the case into our LIM system, which is basically an electronic system so that we can track our evidence now, and everything is given a bar code. So bar codes were created for all the items that we had

still at BCI.

Q Would you, on that exhibit you have in your hand, State's Exhibit 43A, of the prints lifted on that card, could you describe for the jury where they were lifted from according to that card and what comparison and confirmations you were able to make?

A Yes. Lift No. 1 at the top has two sufficient partial latent fingerprints. The lift says it came from storm door off garage dated 12/14/74, the initials BLA. Comparison was made. One identification was made to the left middle finger of the male victim, Benjamin Marsh. The finger next to this left middle could possibly be that of Benjamin Marsh, but there was not enough of his fingerprints on that particular card to make — to complete this comparison. So this additional print is left unidentified at this time.

Item 2, which I went over, it was the door of garage dated 12/14/74. Three sufficient partial latent fingerprints. These three were searched through AFIS, and AFIS hit was made on each one identified to the left middle, left ring, and left little finger of the card bearing a name of James Ferrara.

Item 3 -- or Lift 3, excuse me, was a lift

from door off garage, and this was identified to the right index finger of the male victim, Benjamin Marsh.

Lift 4 was the door off garage, and this was insufficient. There was nothing of comparable quality on that lift.

Lift 5 came from door to guns, and this was identified to the left index finger of the card bearing the name of Benjamin Marsh, the male victim on this case.

And No. 6, top bedroom door inside, dated 12/14/74. There's one sufficient print on this. Even though it looks like there are others, these are not sufficient quality. This was identified to the left little finger of Benjamin Marsh.

And the last one, Lift No. 7, is from the inside bedroom door frame, and it, too, was insufficient.

Q The remaining print latent lift cards that you have there, 43B through D, I think, can you go through the same description of those?

A Yes. State's Exhibit 43B is one card with one latent lift. This was lift -- I labeled it Lift 8. It came from door with guns. This has one sufficient

print. This is not of sufficient quality to make a comparison on this one. The sufficient print was identified to the left middle finger of the card bearing the name of Benjamin Marsh, the male victim on this case.

43C, there are three lifts on this case, or on this card. No. 9 is a partial palm print that is of sufficient quality. It came from the bathroom door framing.

And No. 10 which is in the center is basically two palms. Came from left side off framing of hall shelves.

And then No. 11, which is a partial palm print, came from off front, right side door frame.

43D is a single lift. It is a partial palm print with some sufficient fingers. There are three sufficient fingers at the top, and the palm itself is of sufficient quality. This was from the -- off the side of the refrigerator. This is not identified.

All right. The three fingers identified on State's Exhibit 43A, the three latent prints identified as those of James Ferrara, can you tell the jury about the quality of those lifts and your ability to use them

1 to compare?

These are very good quality, actually. The ridge detail itself is very clear. You can tell that there is some background noise, which would come from the surface itself. There is — this middle, which is actually the left ring finger is more of the tip of the finger, but on the left middle and left little, you have areas of the core, which is the center of your print, and then going up to the tip of the print. So these are very good quality prints.

Q If a latent print is lifted poorly, smudged, would you be able to make that comparison?

A It would depend on how much distortion was present in that print. If it was completely smudged — like several of these prints, you can see that it looks like there's an area that was touched. It looks like a fingerprint should be there, but there's so much distortion and smudging in that area, that it is not of sufficient quality. No identification could be made on these prints.

**Q** And would that be due to the print that is left being smudged, or the lift taken, or both?

A It could be both. If you have too much

pressure on a surface, you're not going to leave good ridge detail because you're pressing the ridges into the furrows making it more of a flat surface, so you're not leaving good ridge detail for any kind of a comparison. If the lift was moved while they were trying to take the lift, they could smear the print, smear the powders through and destroy the actual latent lift. So it could be both.

**Q** But those three prints you were able, because they were good quality, to make the comparison?

A Yes.

Q Once the AFIS match was determined, what do you do then?

A Once we get a hit through AFIS, we pull the original card. We make the comparison to verify that this is, indeed, a hit, and then it is the policy of the Bureau to have another qualified examiner do an independent verification and comparison of all the prints, unidentified and identified.

And I think we've always kind of referred to that as peer review, but it's an internal quality control or something like that?

A Yes.

- Okay. Would a poor lift make a fingerprint change into somebody else's?
  - A No.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

- Q The determination was made, you said, by another employee as well, another analyst that confirmed the AFIS hit to James Ferrara; correct?
- A Yes.
- Q What did you do then?
- A Then I would report my findings to the submitting local law enforcement agency.
- 11 **| O** Were --
- 12 **MS. DOHERTY:** Can I approach again?
- 13 **THE COURT:** Yeah. Maybe I better talk
  14 to counsel over here.
- MS. DOHERTY: Okay.
  - (WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among court and counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)
- 21 BY MS. DOHERTY:
- 22 **Q** You talked about an AFIS hit that leads you to known prints to compare; correct?

l <b>   A</b> Yes
-------------------

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Q All right. And was that done in this case?
Were known prints of James Ferrara obtained then to
compare to Exhibit 43A that you had?

A Yes.

**Q** And what was your determination with that comparison?

A The identifications were made and confirmed on the Lift No. 2.

MR. MERANTO: Objection to confirmation,

Judge.

THE COURT: That's overruled. Go ahead.

A They were identified to the left middle, left

ring, and left little of James Ferrara.

THE COURT: By you?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

And the verification process that you described where another analyst confirms your identification, that was done in this case as well; correct?

A Yes.

Q All right. The opinion that you have given

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

that the prints, three of the prints located on 43A, State's Exhibit, belonged to James Ferrara, is that within a reasonable degree of scientific certainty?

A Yes.

Q Were those prints also compared to -- and I don't know what exhibit it is -- the full hand print including the palm and the fingers of James Ferrara?

And I don't know what exhibit that is. 61 maybe, 62?

A Sixty-one and sixty-two, yes.

Q Okay. And you prepared a report indicating those findings; correct?

A Yes.

**Q** And is that report kept in the ordinary course of business at BCI?

A Yes.

MS. DOHERTY: Judge, can I approach?

THE COURT: Yes.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 44 was

marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

Q I'm going to hand you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 44. Can you look at that and tell us if you recognize what it is?

A Yes. This is a copy of the report that I issued on this case, 7435791, involving a homicide with the victims Benjamin Marsh, Marilyn Marsh, and Heather Marsh. This shows the items that were within the case file that I examined and my findings, and my initials, and my information for contact.

**Q** When -- you are a fingerprint examiner. The usefulness forensically of fingerprints, how would you describe that?

A Fingerprints, like I said, are unique to every individual and every finger and area of your friction ridge detail, to each individual. Even identical twins who have the same DNA do not have the same fingerprints, so they are unique. It is the —basically how nature works, that no two pieces of anything in this world will be created exactly the same by nature, and that is exactly the same as fingerprints. We have external conditions and internal conditions that are what create your fingerprints in the characteristics and the blueprint pattern types that you have.

Q Throughout your career, both in Florida, as well as at BCI, how many prints have you compared and

4	
	examined?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.1

22

23

- A Millions. Millions.
- And although BCI has been in existence since at least the 1930s, DNA evidence has not come into play until much after 1974; fair to say?

A Yes.

MS. DOHERTY: Can I have just one minute, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the Court, jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

## BY MS. DOHERTY:

- You indicated that the location, that those prints that you've been discussing, all those exhibits, that they were kept at BCI in London since 1974?
- A As far as I know, yes.
- Okay. And that location, that London office, that has not changed; correct?
  - **A** Correct.
  - Q That's been the same location --
    - A London office was at the prison, but

everything has been kept secured and moved securely, yes.

**Q** Okay.

MS. DOHERTY: I don't have anything further, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take the afternoon recess at this time. During your absence from the courtroom, please don't discuss the case at all among yourselves or with anyone else. Please do not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence. Please do not form or express any opinion about the case. We'll be in recess until 3:15.

(WHEREUPON, a brief recess was had, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: All right. You may cross examine, Mr. Meranto.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.

\* \* \* \* \*

2.1

1

2

3

5

# CROSS EXAMINATION

# BY MR. MERANTO:

Q Good afternoon, Ms. Ladd. I'm Tony Meranto.

I'm going to ask you some questions. We met briefly.

If you want me to repeat something, just let me know;

- 4 I'm going to ask you some questions. We met briefly.
- 6 okay? Let's start off, first of all, you stated to the
- 7 jury, I believe, that no two people's fingerprints are
- 8 | exactly alike; correct?
- 9 Based on the science of fingerprints and the
- 10 science of nature itself, no two fingerprints have ever
- 11 been found to be from two -- being the same
- 12 fingerprint, from two separate individuals.
- 13 Q So they've never been found to be the same;
- 14 right?
- 15 **A** That's correct.
- 16 **Q** You're not saying that you checked every
- 17 single individual on the planet and done that?
- 18 **A** That would be impossible.
- 19 Q In fact, you stated that the FBI is
- 20 currently -- that's why they're putting these databases
- 21 together, to try and maybe get closer to proving that?
- 22 **A** Yes, and they have --
- 23 Q But it's not been proven?

A They basically have proven that. They can't					
do comparisons to every person that was past or in the					
future or even currently right now. There's billions					
of people on the planet. But from everything they've					
looked at, from the different configurations of the					
characteristics, the shapes of the ridges, the pores,					
based on the science of nature itself, no two					
fingerprints or no two areas of friction ridge skin					
could possibly be made from two separate impressions or					
two separate people.					

- Q So once again I'm telling you, you said they haven't done that, they haven't tested everybody or checked everybody?
- **A** Correct.
- Q So your belief is you're satisfied with making that statement; correct?
- **| A** I am.
- But you also said the FBI is still putting
  data together to try and make that more exact; correct?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Now, tell me about -- first of all, you work 22 for the Orange County Sheriff's Department for 12

23 years?

A Yes.

- 2 **Q** And you were a fingerprint examiner? Were
- 4 **A** I was a latent print examiner.
- 5 **Q** Okay. So you didn't actually go out to the
- 6 crime scenes? You examined them afterwards, or what?
- 7 **A** Correct.
- 8 **Q** Okay. Let's talk first about where you got
- 9 these. You say they were in an old file room and
- 10 locked in the London facility. But you also said, I
- 11 believe, the London facility was moved?
- 12 **A** Yes.
- 13 **O** When was that?
- 14 **A** Back in I believe October of 1999, they moved
- 15 from the jail building that they were in, which is just
- 16 behind them, to the facility that we are currently
- 17 | located in.
- 18 **Q** Were you there in 1999 when they made that
- 19 move?
- 20 **A** No.
- 21 **Q** Okay. So you saw these in that file room
- 22 | back there. What was that date?
- 23 **A** In 2009 is when I started going through these

- 1 | old files.
- 2 Q Okay. So fair to say prior to 2009, you have
- 3 no idea where those were?
- 4 A I could make an assumption, but no, I do not
- know exactly where they were.

  Well, unless I ask you to based on your
  - Q Well, unless I ask you to based on your scientific knowledge, I'd appreciate if you don't make an assumption. Just tell me just the facts, ma'am, as they say; okay?
- 10 **A** Yes.

7

8

- So you don't know where they were prior to the day you looked at them; correct?
- 13 A Correct.
- 14 **Q** You have no idea how they got there in that room, who placed them there?
- 16 **A** Correct.
- You have no idea back in '74 where and how they were placed there; correct?
- 19 **A** Correct.
- 20 Q Did you know Bernie Albert?
- 21 **A** No.
- Okay. So the guy that supposedly took these prints, not around, and you never spoke to him about

1 this either now obviously?

A Correct.

Q Now, were you trained then in what they call the Henry system?

A Yes.

**Q** Would you explain that to the jury?

A It's been many years since I've used the Henry classification system. What the Henry system is is a classification system of an inked fingerprint card classifying each finger by the ridge count, the pattern type, and that is how they used to do the filing system for fingerprint cards.

Q Okay. And what do you use -- what three types of -- well, there's a bunch of types of characteristics of a fingerprint, but give us some just as an example if you would?

The different characteristic types, basically there is an ending ridge which is a ridge that flows and abruptly stops. There's short ridges which is basically just a short ridge, an enclosure or an island where two ridges come together forming — they bifurcate, and then they come back together, forming basically a little island between the ridge, or a

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

20

21

22

- bifurcation where a ridge flows and then separates or
  bifurcates into two separate ridges.
  - Q Okay. And how many sets of prints did you analyze over the course of your career using the Henry system?
    - A Probably thousands. I worked for a very large agency.
  - **Q** Thousands?
  - A Yes.
- 10 **Q** Were these analyzed in that fashion?
- 11 **A** Using the Henry classification?
- 12 **Q** Right.
- 13 A Yes, that's -- that's what I thought you

  14 asked was -- yes, we did the Henry classification. We

  15 classified the fingerprint card. We then would search

  16 the files and then file them.
- Just so we're clear, that's you get that

  little magnifying glass, right, and you analyze the

  prints and do them that way?
  - A The Henry classification is not the same as a latent print. What we're looking at is basically a count of ridges from one point to another and the different pattern types. The pattern types being the

whorls, arches, or loops. We're determining what kind of pattern it is, and then you're counting from an area which is called a delta formation where it's a triradius to the core. And that will give us a ridge count. Again, it will give us a number, and that fingerprint is assigned a number, and that gives us just a classifying of those prints. Now, this is only on known fingerprint cards, not latent prints. We do not use a classification system for latents.

Q Okay. Now, why don't you classify latents?
A Latent prints are just partial prints. We
normally don't get a fully rolled or controlled print

normally don't get a fully rolled or controlled print when you're looking at a known print that is in a controlled environment where somebody's actually controlling the flow of the ridge. So basically they're rolling your finger or they're placing the palm down nice and neatly so that they know that they're getting all the information that they possibly can on those prints. A latent print is just a touch print, so normally we don't roll all our fingers when we touch a surface. We can leave beautiful prints on surfaces, but we don't necessarily have every piece of information on that print.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

22

- Q Okay. So once again, that's why you prefer, like, an intact print in order to -- I mean, obviously it's easier to examine than with regard to a latent, with a partial print? It's harder to match in other words?
- **A** A latent print?
- Q Yes.
- **A** It can be.
- 9 Q Okay. So in this case these latent prints,
  10 were they matches the old fashioned way, for lack of a
  11 better way to put it?
- 12 **A** Yes.
- Okay. And who did that?
- 14 I did that comparison when we got the AFIS Α 15 hit, I have to do a visual comparison, manual 16 comparison the same way that they've been doing it for 17 over 100 years. We use a little magnifier. We compare 18 the prints side by side, making sure that they are --19 all the characteristics are the same, same number, same 20 position, same area, and no dissimilarities that could 21 not be explained.
  - **Q** Okay. Tell me about AFIS and what exactly it does.

22

23

1	<b>A</b> AFIS is the Automated Fingerprint
2	Identification System. It is basically a database of
3	known finger and palm print cards of individuals. We
4	then we can new people that are entered into the
5	system are searched against that database to see if
6	they have presently been entered into that database, or
7	latent prints for our side, the latent prints that are
8	unknown questioned prints are searched against that
9	database to see if maybe it's made by an individual who
10	has a fingerprint or palm print in our system. And
11	then we can if we get a hit, we have to pull the
12	original cards, and we have to do a manual comparison.
13	Q Okay. When you talk about hits, you get a
14	range of hits, do you not, normally?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Okay. And basically AFIS prints you out or
17	gives you issues a score?
18	A Yes.
19	Q And tell me about that score and how it's
20	derived and what the range of the score is.
21	A The score's done on algorithms. I am not an

IT person. I do not set up the system. All I know is

that based on the score that we have, the higher the

score, they say the higher the probability is that this is an actual match through the AFIS system. We look at every print that is brought up as a candidate side by side on the screen to see if there is a possible match. If there is a possible match like there was in this case, we will then pull the original cards to confirm that yes, that is a hit or an actual match.

- **Q** So you then physically match it using points of comparison?
- the entirety of the print that we have. All the visible detail that we have, the ridge formation, the flow of the ridges, the number of characteristics.

  We're looking at all this information to make sure that these are, indeed, made by the same individual as that of the fingerprint card that we're looking at.
  - Q So that's a no, you don't use points of comparison?
- **A** That's part of it.
- 20 Q Okay, but let's talk about that for a minute.
  21 The points of comparison thing -- like, on a finger,
  22 there's how many points of comparison on average?
  - A It depends on how big the finger is. There

2.1

1 could be a hundred. There could be a couple hundred.

**Q** Okay. So it depends?

A It depends.

Q They're different. At least most of them are different, as far as we know; right?

A Yes.

And used to be the old fashioned way, you'd check for points of comparison on a fingerprint. And when would you declare it a match when you were working back the old fashioned way in Orange County, how many points?

A There has not been a point system in the United States since the 1970s when the FBI decided that points were not a necessary way of looking at an identification. Points meaning the different characteristics that we're looking at. So, like, the ending ridge, when we find an ending ridge, that would be considered a point. So we're actually -- we could have our own set standards, what we feel comfortable with, but we're looking at everything. We're looking at three levels of detail, basically, to say that this is a sufficient print, has enough information to make an identification or individualization.

- 1 **Q** So you didn't count any points in this case?

- 4 Q And how many points of comparison did you
- find on all three of those prints, if you know?
- For the left little finger there are 15
  points plus. I stopped counting. 18 points plus on
  the left ring finger, and 14 plus points on the left
  middle finger.
- 10 **Q** And once again, that's out of a possible 11 hundred, 200, whatever; right?
- 12 A Sure.
- MR. MERANTO: Your Honor, may I
- 14 approach?
- 15 **THE COURT:** Yes.
- (WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit S was
- marked for identification.)
- 18 BY MR. MERANTO:
- 19 **Q** Ms. Ladd, take a look at that if you would.
- 20 Do you recognize that?
- 21 **A** Yes. Give me a moment, please. I'm sorry.
- 22 **Q** Take your time.
- 23 **A** Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

22

23

- Okay. That's what's been marked as Defense Exhibit S. What is that?
  - A This is a copy of the information from my report. These are copies of the fingerprints that were compared, copies of my notes, and copies of the AFIS printouts.

THE COURT: I don't want you showing that to the jury. You're just testifying to his question. I don't want you showing anything to the jury.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.

## BY MR. MERANTO:

- And I'm looking through your notes, if you can flip back through your notes. I think there's three pages; right? Two pages?
- **A** I find at least three.
- Okay. And basically those are on -basically your report that you issued just kind of
  regurgitates your notes; right? There's no additional
  information?
  - A Correct.
  - Q So you don't detail the process which you go

- through in any fashion when you say you found 15 points of comparison and you stopped? That's not documented anywhere, is it?
  - **A** It's on the actual lift.
  - **Q** Okay. You wrote it?
  - **A** Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q Okay. Tell me about these scores.
  - A The scores on the AFIS?
- 9 Yes, because they seem to be different scores
  10 up and down the range. And tell me what those scores
  11 represent.
  - A The scores just mean that that is the score that the computer system is giving this showing the strength of the possible match.
  - Q Okay. And I get that. What's the range of scores? Do you know? No, I don't mean the range of scores that it spit out. I mean what's the range of scores that you could possibly get?
  - A They could go -- depending on how much information you had, they could be currently 4,000 down to probably 600.
- 22 **Q** So as in anything that's run by a computer, 23 it kind of depends on what you put in it, doesn't it?

- Q So if there's any errors or any missteps with regard to the entering of the information, that could drastically affect the scores; correct?
- **A** Meaning?
- Q I mean if you enter bad information, you get bad information out? Garbage in, garbage out?
- A You're talking about just the scanned image, the fingerprint image itself? That's where the score comes from.
- I got you. But once again, you said the scores could vary based on different information that could be entered into the system; right?
- A Yes.
  - **Q** And you have no idea what makes that system run or what that algorithm is, do you?
- **A** I don't understand it, no.
  - Q Okay. So basically now you've been trained to basically slip a piece of paper into the computer, and the computer spits out some data, and based on that data you decide how to proceed; correct?
- **A** Yes.
  - **Q** Kind of like going on a dating match; right?

1	I mean, you put characteristics down, and you plug them
2	into a computer, and the computer pops out people;
3	right?

A It pops out people -- I think it's a little bit more involved than dating.

And I get it. I am simplifying it. I agree with you. But my point is, depending on what you put in, that can vary greatly what gets popped out?

A Yes.

Q All right. So just to --

MR. MERANTO: One moment, Your Honor, please.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the Court, jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

Q Okay. Just to sum up, did you get a call, or were you -- did you go check this information on your own?

A As far as I remember, I checked this information since we were going through those case files at that time.

- Okay. Because they're so old you were taking them out, moving some of that stuff?
  - **A** We are.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

- Q All right. You have no idea how they got there or how they were collected at the scene, any of that stuff at all?
  - A Correct.
  - And you were never able to discuss or talk to anybody about how or when they were collected? You just found them in a box, and they correspond at this point with that number; right?
- A Correct.
- Q I'm going to show you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit B.
- MR. MERANTO: May I approach, Your

16 Honor?

17 THE COURT: Yes.

18 (WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibits A & B

were marked for identification.)

## 20 BY MR. MERANTO:

- 21 **Q** I'm going to hand you what's been marked as
  22 Defendant's A and Defendant's B. What is -- I'm sorry.
- I handed you both of them. I've got to come back

1 again. I'm sorry.

2 **THE COURT:** These are your exhibits?

3 MR. MERANTO: Yes, Your Honor.

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

**Q** Okay. What is A?

A is a copy of -- it's the first page of a report that I issued on June 10th of 2009.

Q Okay. And that's the one you referred to it's the same as the state submitted; correct?

A Correct.

**Q** The results of your examination?

A Yes.

**Q** All right. And where your findings are -those first two paragraphs seem to indicate there's a
discrepancy there.

A Yes.

**Q** Explain to me what that was.

A The original examiner on this case, David
Nibert, did his original evaluation of the latent
prints and found that there were 10 partial latent
fingerprints in his opinion and 4 partial latent palm
prints of sufficient quality. My opinion differs from
his that I found not only the ones that he found to be

sufficient, but also two additional partial latent fingerprints and one additional partial palm print. I also found that he said that in his opinion that the inked impressions of the victims were not of clear enough quality to make an accurate comparison with the latent prints, and I differed that I could find five prints of identifiable quality that matched Benjamin Marsh.

Q Okay. So I just want to be straight. You never collected the prints, you don't know how they got there, when they were put there? You found them in '09; correct?

A Correct.

**Q** And you say there's two additional prints there than the guy in 1974 that analyzed them found?

A The lifts are the same amount. What I found on those lifts that he originally looked at, I found what I believe to be more prints of sufficient quality.

Q So I guess this isn't as exact as you make it sound maybe; is that hard to characterize? I mean, you got two different opinions here; right?

A That's the subjective part on what is considered to be sufficient.

1	Q	Subjectivity.	So	this	is	still	a	subjective
		correct?						

- A This part of it. The identification process is objective. It is not a subjective part.
- Q Well, it's objective, but once again, only to the extent that you plug into a computer and you get out a bunch of numbers and you move based on those numbers.
- A Not all our cases are run through AFIS. This particular case we entered unidentifieds through AFIS. The original identifications to the victims were not put into AFIS. No computers were used in any part of that identification. That was only done by the old manual system of looking side by side, known print to latent print.
- Q I guess we'll just agree to disagree. Thank you.

**THE COURT:** Any redirect?

MS. DOHERTY: Yes, Your Honor.

\* \* \* \* \*

# REDIRECT EXAMINATION

# BY MS. DOHERTY:

**Q** You have had the opportunity to review reports of comparisons back to 1974, correct, relating to this case?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A Yes.

And until the time that you made the identification to James Ferrara, no identification had been made to those three prints from the door of the garage located on State's Exhibit 43A; correct?

A Correct.

I'm trying to remember how Attorney Meranto compared AFIS to dating, but when you are specifically -- we talked about AFIS, you're not putting data in, you're putting the print in; correct?

A Correct.

Q This isn't like you punch in a bunch of numbers, points of comparison. You actually put the latent print into the program?

A We put the latent print in, but we are marking information on that print itself to do the

- 1 search.
- 2 **Q** All right. AFIS would then lead you to
- 3 potentially individuals for you to manually compare; is
- 4 that fair to say?
- 5 **A** Yes.
- 6 **Q** And is that what you did here?
- 7 **| A** Yes.
- 8 **Q** AFIS led you to a possible hit, or a hit for
- 9 James Ferrara?
- 10 **A** Correct.
- 11 **Q** Among other people?
- 12 **A** Yes.
- 13 **Q** You then manually compared the latent prints
- 14 lifted from the scene to those of James Ferrara?
- 15 **A** Yes.
- 16 **Q** And you made that identification that those
- 17 prints belonged to James Ferrara?
- 18 **A** Yes.
- 19 **Q** All right. And that was confirmed by someone
- 20 else, some other expert in fingerprint examination in
- 21 your office?
- 22 **A** Yes.
- 23  $\mathbf{Q}$  And I don't know what exhibit it is either.

- 1 It's late. Attorney Meranto showed you an old report 2 from Nibert?
- **A** Yes.
- And there is not a difference in the number of latent prints that he examined versus what you examined; correct?
- **A** Correct.
- **A** Correct.
- **Q** There are other experts besides yourself who compare fingerprints; correct?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Have you ever had someone hired by the defense examine your results?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Your opinions?
- **A** Yes.
- 20 Q And that can be done; correct?
- **A** Absolutely.
- **Q** You talked about the process in which
- 23 evidence is kept at BCI at London; correct?

- **A** Yes.
- **Q** At anytime is evidence accessible to other than anyone other than lab personnel?
- **A** No.

- And these prints as well, were they ever accessible to anyone other than lab personnel?
  - $\mathbf{A}$  Not that I'm aware of.
  - Q Okay. And in that you have reviewed reports of other examiners back to the 1970s, 1974, did all those reports indicate the same BCI number that exists now, '74 whatever?
    - Everything in this case file that had that case number on it that was exactly what went with that case file. Other cases had their own original case numbers along with any evidence that was found with those case files.
- **Q** And the reports themselves would also carry that 74-35791 as well; correct?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** So everything can be taken back to those original submissions?
- **A** Yes.
  - Q Do you still have State's Exhibit 43A up

1 | there, the latent lifts?

A I do.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Q Okay. And I may have already asked you this. I apologize. The prints, latent prints that you have identified having belonged to James Ferrara on that card, other lifts exist on that card belonging to Ben Marsh; correct?

A Yes.

Q And they're all on the same card?

A Yes.

Q If a fingerprint is unsuitable for comparison, can you even put it into AFIS for a potential hit?

A No.

**Q** Why not?

A There's not enough information. It would come back with nothing basically. There's not enough information for the system to even compare against anything. It would come with numbers because it would just start plotting its own minutia everywhere.

And in your examination of those three fingerprints from James Ferrara, they were sufficient to put into AFIS to lead you to him; correct?

#### RECROSS/LADD

#### RECROSS EXAMINATION

- BY MR. MERANTO:
- 3 **Q** Is that card 43A that you're looking at right
- 4 there?

1

- 5 **A** It is.
- 6 **Q** Does that look exactly the same as it did
- 7 December 14th, 1974?
- 8 A I could only assume, but it would have --
- 9 **Q** Yeah, because you weren't there; right?
- 10 **A** Right. And I've added information, my
- 11 markings, the bar code, my initials.
- 12 **Q** And you added that stuff in 2009 or '10?
- 13 **A** 2009, yes.
- 14 **Q** Okay. So you have no idea how that was
- 15 created, when it was created, what was on it the day it
- 16 was created; right?
- 17 **A** Correct.
- 18 **Q** Okay. And once again, Defense Exhibit A and
- 19 B, got the same 74-35791; right?
- 20 **A** Yes.
- 21 **Q** Both of them?
- 22 **A** Yes.
- 23 **Q** And the findings are different on both of

1 them; is that not true? 2 A Yes. 3 MR. MERANTO: Thank you. 4 THE COURT: Anything else from the 5 state? 6 MS. DOHERTY: I don't have anything 7 else, Judge. 8 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 9 You're excused. What else does the state 10 have to present? The state has two more 11 MS. DOHERTY: 12 witnesses, Judge, and then that's it. 13 THE COURT: Well, let me see counsel 14 over here. (WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among 15 16 court and counsel off the record and out of 17 the hearing of the jury and court reporter, 18 after which the proceedings continued as 19 follows:) 20 THE COURT: So it's been a long day for 21 everybody, and we could trudge onward, but 22 you reach a point where you probably lose 23 some of your focus, and I don't want you to

do that. So we're going to recess as far as the jury is concerned. I should say -- see, when we're done for the day, it's adjourn. When we take a break, it's a recess. So I want you to follow the admonitions that I've given to you previously about your conduct outside of the courtroom. You should not investigate the case or view any publicity about the case in addition to the other admonitions I've given you. You don't want me to start repeating stuff like the lawyers are doing, do you? All right then. Just remember the admonitions and follow them, please. We'll see you at 8:30 in the morning. Have a great night, folks.

# (WHEREUPON, the jury left the courtroom, and the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. So I asked at side bar what we had left, and the state has a couple of other witnesses, and the defense may have some witnesses. And the state then objected, so I said I'd hear that.

MS. DOHERTY: Judge, Attorney Meranto

1 indicated at side bar that he may put on 2 Brenda Gerardi from BCI. What she did in 3 regards to this case was examine a cigarette 4 that is unclear where it came from. Ιt 5 wasn't -- are you going to laugh? Really? 6 MR. MERANTO: Yep. 7 MS. DOHERTY: It wasn't clear where it came from. It wasn't submitted by either 8 9 Bernie Albert or Deputy Finamore. 10 event --11 **THE COURT:** Who's Deputy Finamore? Ι 12 don't know that name. 13 MS. DOHERTY: Mr. Finamore. I'm sorry. 14 He was a deputy then. 15 THE COURT: Well, he didn't submit any 16 evidence. 17 MS. DOHERTY: No, he did not, but he 18 also didn't observe Bernie Albert collect a 19 cigarette butt, or a -- not butt, a 20 cigarette. In any event, that is, I assume, 2.1 the purpose of putting on Brenda Gerardi, 22 that James Ferrara was excluded as being the 23 DNA donor on that cigarette. He also

1	indicated that he is going to put on the
2	defendant's brother. Again, Judge, we
3	received witnesses from him yesterday. When
4	I indicated to him that we just received the
5	witness yesterday, he said, they're out in
6	the hall. Go talk to 'em. So quite frankly,
7	I have no idea what the brother would be
8	saying. I'm assuming I don't know. So
9	we're objecting. We have two more witnesses
10	left.
11	THE COURT: Are these people disclosed
12	to you on a witness list?
13	MR. MERANTO: It was filed, Judge.
14	THE COURT: Huh?
15	MR. MERANTO: Yes, it was filed and
16	disclosed.
17	MS. DOHERTY: The two remaining, you
18	mean? Yeah.
19	MR. MERANTO: Yes, the two witnesses.
20	THE COURT: Yesterday?
21	MR. MERANTO: Yes.
22	MS. DOHERTY: No, I didn't tell you
23	yesterday.

1	MR. MERANTO: Excuse me. I'm sorry,
2	Judge, with this hearing I apologize. I
3	didn't hear exactly what you said.
4	THE COURT: They were on the witness
5	list. When did you file the witness list?
6	MR. MERANTO: It was yesterday morning,
7	yes.
8	THE COURT: Why so late?
9	MR. MERANTO: Well, Judge
10	THE COURT: I don't get that.
11	MR. MERANTO: With regard to
12	Ms. Gerardi, I'm sure the state can't say
13	they weren't on notice. They submitted the
14	evidence, and that's how we got the report
15	with regard to Mr. Ferrara.
16	THE COURT: Gerardi made the report from
17	the state?
18	MR. MERANTO: Yes. I was provided
19	THE COURT: Where is he from?
20	MR. MERANTO: Brenda Gerardi from BCI.
21	THE COURT: She?
22	MR. MERANTO: Yes.
23	THE COURT: I have a report from BCI?

MR. MERANTO: Yeah.

2

THE COURT: Okay. The objection's

3

overruled as regards Gerardi. What is this

4

other objection? To the defendant's brother?

Yes, Judge. I foresee

5

Is that what you said?

MR. MERANTO:

6

some evidence maybe coming in with regards to

7

Mr. Mondora that there were basically two

8

ways that these people were excluded, all

10

these suspects. They were excluded by

11

fingerprint or by photo I.D. based on a

12

composite that was done and was then even

13

printed in the paper, in fact. And there's

14

hoards of information about how they were excluded in that fashion. And I have some

1516

suspects that I want to talk to Mr. Mondora

17

about that seem to resemble that person that

18

would then ignore by way of fingerprints, for

19

example.

20

2.1

22

\_ \_

23

But then I have a picture of Mr. Ferrara in 1975. That's the only way I can identify that is by having his brother identify it just to basically show what he looked like

Ι

1 close to the time of the alleged crime. 2 THE COURT: When you filed the witness 3 list? Yesterday morning? 4 MR. MERANTO: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: And now I'm hearing an 6 objection for the first time? 7 MR. MERANTO: Well, Judge, I actually 8 mentioned to them this morning --9 THE COURT: That's not your problem on 10 the objection. I'd like to know. 11 MR. MERANTO: I did want to add 12 something before you inquired of them. 13 also mentioned the fact that I may be adding 14 a witness that I talked to, and Ms. Doherty 15 told me, well, why don't you wait and see 16 what happens with regard to Mr. Fitzpatrick, 17 and then we can deal with that, and you can 18 then potentially call that witness. 19 just wanted to let the court know that 20 because we were advised, at least the state was, not to put on Mr. Fitzpatrick until that 21 22 was discussed with the court, the court would

23

make the final decision at that time.

1 least that's the way I understood it. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MS. DOHERTY: Judge, regarding 4 Mr. Ferrara, the brother testifying, yes, 5 Attorney Meranto filed a witness list 6 yesterday. I am objecting now because we are 7 getting to that point. I had no idea what 8 Mr. Ferrara would be testifying to. Attorney 9 Meranto is referring to a composite sketch. 10 We have no idea who put it together, who drew 11 it, who gave the information. It was 12 something to do with somebody at the K-mart 13 parking lot I think saw someone near the 14 orange Vega in 1974, and they somehow came up 15 with a composite sketch. 16 THE COURT: Sounds like you do know 17 something about it. MS. DOHERTY: We don't know who did it. 18 19 We have absolutely no idea. That person 20 certainly can't come in and testify. And 2.1 Detective Mondora --22 THE COURT: There's a lot of that going 23 on in this case.

MS. DOHERTY: Detective Mondora certainly can't testify to it. I wasn't anticipating him testifying to any of that investigation because he wasn't there. He was four.

THE COURT: At this point the motion's overruled, so if you want to get out and talk to this guy or Mr. Meranto has him here now or can have him here tomorrow, you can take some time to talk to him tomorrow if you have him here early. Doesn't sound like a big deal.

MR. MERANTO: And Your Honor, by the way, just to -- here's 15 pages of information about a person they referred to as Mrs. Informer because she wanted to remain anonymous who worked on four or five different days to put forth this composite, which, by the way, is attached to the discovery that the state gave me. The actual first initial pictures of this guy, and then how they went back, and she said no, and they modified it, and here's the picture, and it

was then printed in the paper.

THE COURT: Well, I think everybody better stop and think about what this whole case is about. This is a case where the evidence against the defendant is a fingerprint on the door of the outside of the building, an identification of that fingerprint as his, and apparently some more evidence about statements that he made that are not confessions, but are viewed by the state as possibly incriminating. And a lot of this is due to the nature of the case and the age of the case.

The court's concern is that the defendant have the right to defend himself. As difficult as it is to prosecute, it's that difficult to defend also. That's why I feel compelled to let the defense do pretty much what they need to do to defend this case. Of course, within the rules of evidence. Of course, within what is allowable. But I don't know what I'm going to do with a composite or with whatever else the state —

or the defense may have to offer. But at this point the court has ruled on the Gerardi, is that --

MR. MERANTO: Brenda Gerardi, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Brenda Gerardi thing.

That's a state produced police report in the eyes of the court regarding this case. I don't know how that could not be admissible.

MR. MERANTO: Your Honor, then along those lines, with regard to all these other reports, they are, in fact, police reports and statements of the police, and my -- I mean, my understanding at least is that 803.8 allows me to get them into evidence. I know they're hearsay, but if I want to get them in, I believe I'm allowed to.

THE COURT: If indeed that's what they are, I've pretty well made that clear that you're entitled to get them in. The defendant's always been allowed to introduce police reports. The police and the state aren't allowed to introduce police reports.

That's just basic criminal law. So that's the court's ruling at this time regarding these other issues. I'm prepared to take argument on these other issues if you want to do that now, or we can do that in the morning. I'll give you time to prepare.

MS. DOHERTY: The other issues being the composite, et cetera?

THE COURT: I guess. I just learned about that now, too. I'm kind of, like, trying this in the dark; you know?

Everything's just surprising me. Who the next witness is, what they might testify to, how many witnesses are left. I have no witness list from the State of Ohio. I got no idea what's going on. And it's kind of foreign to me. I'm just used to it being done a little bit differently, I guess.

So yes, I just found that out, too, about this composite, although I do -- I did note, and I've noted for a long time, I might as well show you, because it's unusual, to have something like this in the file. But I

have that in the court file. So it's not something that everybody didn't know about. I saw it in the court file before. I don't know how it got there or who put it there, but it's there. There's nothing attached to it.

MR. MERANTO: Judge, I believe it was attached to one of my motions. It may have ripped off. It was the last page.

THE COURT: It may have been. So do you want to talk about that now, or do you want to prepare something for that, or what? I don't care.

MS. DOHERTY: Judge, I prefer to talk about that in the morning. I guess the only thing — if Attorney Meranto agrees, I don't know, since I just found out about it. The only other thing I would like, I don't think we made a record earlier because I think we just did it at side bar. The state called Jerry Mroczkowski to —

THE COURT: Yeah, we did not make a record, and I did indicate that I would give

the parties the opportunity to address that and make it a matter of record, so please do so.

MS. DOHERTY: Okay. Thank you, Judge.

I didn't think we did it. The state
anticipated calling this gentleman. He was a
former BCI employee, crime scene agent who
worked with Bernie Albert for many years. He
could recognize his writing. He had worked
many scenes with him. He was present at the
motion in limine hearing, and defense counsel
was put on notice at that time that we were
going to use him for purposes of that hearing
because of some issues regarding the
authentication, as well as the actual prints
being lifted.

The state wanted to put him on today for that same reason because he can authenticate or could authenticate the writing, handwriting of Bernie Albert. And defense counsel objected, indicating that

Mr. Mroczkowski -- don't ask me how to spell it -- was not on the state's witness list. I

guess I didn't suggest at the time that
Attorney Meranto be given the opportunity to
speak to him so that we could still use him,
but in any event, that was his objection. I
just wanted to put it on the record.

THE COURT: Do you want to address that?
You're the one who objected to him
testifying.

MR. MERANTO: Yeah, Judge. And I think it's unfortunate, but once again, we were put on notice with regard to the hearing on the motion in limine with regard to the potential exclusion of the fingerprints, and I certainly knew they were calling him then. I didn't prepare for him that day, because quite frankly, I didn't think it was relevant to the issue, and evidently the court and the state agreed, because he was never called.

As far as calling him at trial, I had no idea. This isn't a trial. I had no clue the guy was coming. When she called his name I turned to Ms. Weibling and said, who is that, because I did not even know who he was,

2.1

because I didn't review that motion because it was involving the hearing I think on November 12th.

THE COURT: Well, there's two reasons
that I sustained your motion, so the record's
clear. Number one, his name was not included
on the state's witness list, and the state
has to do that. Whatever the reason is,
inadvertence, or mistake, or confusion or
whatever, a misunderstanding. I can't
forgive that. The rules don't forgive that.
Secondly, the other witness that you called,
I'm sorry that I don't really remember his
name.

MR. MERANTO: Judge, I think if I may, you're referring to the witness with regard -- I think it was Dr. Ohr.

THE COURT: No. I'm talking about Mike Finamore.

MR. MERANTO: Excuse me, Judge.

THE COURT: Who testified both at the motion in limine and at this trial that he saw that witness put those marks on that

1 So I'm not sure why anybody else would 2 have to do that. I guess I'm not a big fan 3 of overkill. I think that's already been 4 done. 5 So I didn't see why it was necessary 6 anyhow. He does not satisfy any problems 7 with the chain of custody of the evidence as was explained to me at side bar when I made 8 9 the ruling, so that's why I'm making the 10 ruling. 11 MS. DOHERTY: Okay. 12 **THE COURT:** So the record's clear. So 13 is there anything else? 14 MS. DOHERTY: No, Your Honor. 15 Okay. THE COURT: Then we need to be 16 prepared to discuss this issue of the 17 admissibility of the composite. We can do 18 that before we begin, or we can do that at 19 the time that the state rests its case. 20 Whatever time allows. 21 MS. DOHERTY: Okay. 22 THE COURT: Okay? 23 MS. DOHERTY: Okay.

Thank you, Your Honor. 1 MR. MERANTO: 2 **THE COURT:** Anything else? 3 MS. DOHERTY: No, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Thank you, folks. 5 (WHEREUPON, the Court recessed at 4:09 6 p.m., November 19, 2013 and reopened at 8:37 7 a.m., November 20, 2013 and the proceedings continued as follows:) 8 9 THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and 10 gentlemen. Came in this morning and saw the 11 cup of coffee, and we had coffee, and I 12 poured it into the cup, and it was cold. 13 the lovely Ms. Ference indicated to me that 14 was because she had made coffee for the jury 15 and ran another batch through, and that's why 16 it was cold. So I hope yours was nice and 17 hot. I hope you got to enjoy it. 18 This is near the end of November, and I 19 give my dog a shower. Like, he's a boxer 20 dog. He's a big dog. So I've got to take 21 him into the shower with me. You know, you 22 can't put him in a bathtub or a wash tub or 23

anything like that.

So my wife, of course, keeps a very nice house, and she said it's time for the dog —

I don't like when she calls him the dog.

Charlie, he's precious to me. But she called him the dog today. And she said it's time that the dog gets his shower. So I had to get up early this morning and do that before court. So we're both nice and clean today, and ready for action.

All right. The state is still in the process of presenting its case, and it has additional witnesses to call as I understand; is that correct?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Call your next witness, please. Let me see you at side bar, please.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among Court and counsel out of the hearing of the jury as follows:)

THE COURT: We're at side bar, and the parties have approached the court. This was a subject matter that was brought to the

1 court's attention via a motion in limine that 2 is the testimony of this proposed witness 3 regarding a conversation that he had with the 4 defendant. The state appropriately addressed 5 the court, indicated that was their next 6 witness, and I asked them to do that if they 7 intend to present his testimony. And the 8 defense indicated that it was maintaining its 9 objection due to the relevance of the 10 testimony; is that correct? 11 Yeah, and the fact that MR. MERANTO: 12 even if it's relevant that the probative 13 value is certainly outweighed by the 14 prejudice that it could cause to this defendant. 15 16 MS. CANTALAMESSA: I think you mean the 17 other way around. 18 THE COURT: Huh? 19 MS. CANTALAMESSA: I think you mean that 20 the probative value is outweighed. MR. MERANTO: By the prejudice to the 2.1 22 defendant. 23 MS. CANTALAMESSA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

1 THE COURT: He said it right. 2 MS. CANTALAMESSA: I'm sorry. 3 THE COURT: You've gotta tune in now. 4 There is a -- it's a close call on relevance, 5 for sure, and of course the relevance is 6 something that could be argued, but I believe 7 its admissible, and the motion is overruled 8 over the objection of -- the motion's 9 overruled over the objection of the defense. (WHEREUPON, the following proceedings 10 were had back in the presence of the jury:) 11 12 Judge, this witness does THE BAILIFF: 13 not object to being photographed. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

1	WHEREUPON, the State called
2	
3	DEPUTY DEVIN FITZPATRICK,
4	
5	who, being first duly sworn, testified
6	as follows:
7	THE COURT: These ladies and gentlemen
8	of the jury here need to hear everything that
9	you have to say, so I want you to speak
10	loudly and clearly enough as you're taught in
11	OPATA and make sure that they understand
12	everything that you have to say. Please
13	answer the questions out loud.
14	THE WITNESS: (Nods head.) Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: Okay. So first of all, you
16	nodded. That wasn't out loud. And second,
17	you didn't talk so anybody could hear you.
18	So now we're cool; okay?
19	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
20	THE COURT: Thank you very much. All
21	right.
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
2.3	BY MS. DOHERTY:

- Thank you. Much better. I can even hear you. Tell us your name and spell your first and last name for the record, please.
  - **A** Devin Fitzpatrick, D-E-V-I-N,
- $5 \quad \blacksquare \quad F-I-T-Z-P-A-T-R-I-C-K$ .

4

- **Q** And where are you employed?
- 7 A Mahoning County Sheriff's office.
- 8 **Q** What do you do for the Mahoning County
- 9 Sheriff's office?
- 10 **A** I'm currently assigned to the corrections division.
- 12 **Q** All right. And you have recently had a terrible cold; correct?
- 14 **A** Correct.
- I can -- I am having a little bit of trouble
- 16 hearing you. I know it's hard. Just try to keep your
- 17 voice up a little bit. What is your job at the
- 18 correctional facility?
- 19 **A** I'm a pod deputy, so I'm responsible for
- 20 inmates, their requests, maintaining security.
- 21 **Q** Okay. And how long have you been with the
- 22 | Sheriff's Department?
- 23 **A** It'll be five years in January.

- 1 **Q** And are you familiar with James Ferrara?
- 2 **A** Yes, I am.
- 3 **Q** And have you had conversations with him?
- 4 **A** Yes, I have.
- 5 Q And I'm going to specifically ask you about
- 6 October 7th, 2013. What shift do you work?
- 7 **|| A** I work day shift, 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- 8 **Q** And were you approached by Mr. Ferrara that
- 9 day?
- 10 **A** Yes, I was.
- 11 **Q** And what was the context, I guess, of how
- 12 your conversation with him began?
- 13 **A** I had just returned from our department's
- annual firearms qualifications, and he approached the
- podium and inquired about my performance on the firing
- 16 range.
- 17 **Q** And had you discussed with him his knowledge
- 18 of firearms?
- 19 **A** Yes. We discussed his military experience,
- 20 the various levels of marksmanship assigned to military
- 21 personnel by their skill level. He asked about the
- weapon that we carry at the Sheriff's Department, which
- is a Glock .40 caliber, Model 23. And we had a brief

2.1

- discussion on the pros and cons of semiautomatic pistols and revolvers.
  - **Q** All right. And what is the difference between a semiautomatic pistol and a revolver?
  - A One squeeze of a trigger on the semiautomatic pistol, the round is discharged, and the next round is chambered; whereas, a revolver you squeeze the trigger and the chamber turns.
  - **Q** And what happens to the casings in the case of a revolver versus a semiautomatic?
  - A With a semiautomatic the casings are discharged out of the side of the firearm. With a revolver the casings will remain in the firearm.
  - And during this discussion with Mr. Ferrara regarding the pros and cons of semiautomatics versus revolvers, tell the jury the remainder of that conversation.
  - A He made a statement, he said it was a question he framed it as a question. He says, "Do you know what my weapon of choice is?" And before I had a chance to answer, he responded himself by saying, "A .38 detective special." And then he said, "Do you know why?" And again, before I had a chance to answer,

- 1 he said, "No brass. No brass." And he says, "You're 2 not gonna get any ballistics off of brass."
  - Q And what is brass?
- 4 Α It would be the cartridge that would be 5 discharged from the -- from a semiautomatic, or maintained in the revolver. 6
  - 0 All right. So casings that are discharged in a semiautomatic wouldn't be discharged in a revolver?
- 9 A Correct.
- 10 Q And a detective .38 special is a revolver?
- 11 Α Yes, it is.
  - Q And Deputy Fitzpatrick, the person that you just described having that conversation on October 7th, 2013, do you see that person in the courtroom today?
- 15 Α I do.
- 16 And where is he seated, and describe what 17 he's wearing, please?
- 18 Α He's seated at the defense table in the black 19 shirt, white stripes.
  - MS. DOHERTY: All right. Your Honor, I'd ask the record to reflect that he's identified James Ferrara?
    - The record will so indicate. THE COURT:

20

3

7

8

12

13

14

2.1

22

1	MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, Your Honor.
2	Judge, I have nothing further.
3	THE COURT: All right.
4	MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
5	CROSS EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. MERANTO:
7	Q Good morning, Deputy Fitzpatrick.
8	A Good morning.
9	Q You've been on the department five years?
10	A It'll be five years in January.
11	Q Have you ever worked the road, or are you
12	always in the jail?
13	A I'm in the jail, sir.
14	Q Do you ever write reports?
15	A Yes, sir.
16	Q How often do you write reports?
17	A We write jail reports on a fairly regular
18	basis, but actual police reports, not too often. Not
19	as much as guys on the road.
20	MR. MERANTO: Okay. May I approach the
21	witness, Your Honor?
22	THE COURT: You may.
23	(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit D was

## 1 marked for identification.)

## 2 BY MR. MERANTO:

- 3 Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as
- 4 Defendant's Exhibit D. Do you know what that is?
- 5 **A** Yes.
- 6 **Q** Okay. What is it?
- 7 **A** It's a copy of my report, my supplemental
- 8 report.
- 9 Q You wrote it; right?
- 10 **A** I did.
- 11 **Q** You work 7:00 to 7:00 in the jail. You wrote
- 12 | it?
- 13 **A** October 7th.
- 14 **Q** I mean, you normally work 7:00 to 7:00 in the
- 15 | jail; right?
- 16 **A** Yes, sir.
- 17 **Q** And I want you to go down where you're
- 18 talking about -- you have some things in quotes there;
- 19 right?
- 20 **A** I've got to get my glasses.
- 21 **Q** You and me both.
- 22 **A** This is a recent addition for me, so I'm
- 23 still adjusting.

- 1 Q Get used to it, trust me. It only gets 2 worse.
- **A** Okay.

- Q Okay. I believe you just said on direct that he came up to you and said, do you know what my weapon of choice is? That's what you just said on direct; correct?
- A Yes, sir.
- **Q** Well, there you got a quotation there, and it says, "My weapon of choice has always been a .38 special." So you would agree that those are two
- 12 different statements?
- **A** No, I wouldn't.
- **Q** Well, you put it in quotes. I didn't put it in quotes. What does a quote designate to you when you write something in quotations?
- **A** That it was stated by the person.
- **Q** It's exactly what they stated; right?
- **A** Correct.
- **A** I don't recall.

- 1 **Q** Well, then why did you put it in quotations 2 like you knew exactly what it was?
- Well, I do remember that that is exactly what he said.
- Which was exactly what he said? What you testified to, or what's in the report?
  - A He framed it as a question, a rhetorical question.
  - **Q** So then your report is wrong; correct?
- 10 **A** No, it's not.
- 11 **Q** Well, is that a question? There's no
  12 question mark after that sentence, is it? You put in
  13 quotation, "My weapon of choice has always been a .38
  14 detective special," period; right?
  - A Correct.
- 16 Q No question mark there, is it?
- 17 **| A** No.

7

8

9

- So I'm going to ask you again, did he say it like you testified to, or did he say it like it's in
- 20 the report?
- I believe he said it like it's in the report, and then he asked the question afterwards, "Do you want
- 23 to know why?"

- Okay. By the way, this incident allegedly happened on October 7th, 2013; right?
  - A Yes.

3

8

9

14

15

- 4 **Q** At 1:30 in the afternoon?
- 5 **A** Correct.
- Do you want to tell me why you waited until

  October 15th at 10:00 at night to write this report?
  - A Well, I had written it down, and this -- I dated it when I gave it to Detective Mondora.
- 10 **Q** You wrote it down somewhere else?
- 11 A No. No. I didn't sign -- I don't date my

  12 reports until I sign them, and I did not sign it until

  13 I gave it to Detective Mondora.
  - Q Well, I wouldn't know that by looking at this report, would I? It looks to me like you wrote it on the 15th. You sure about that?
- 17 **A** Yeah.
- Okay. So this guy's charged with triple
  murder, and out of the clear blue he talks to you and
  tells you his weapon of choice is a .38; right?
- 21 **A** Uh-huh.
- 22 **Q** And you wait a week to submit a report about
- 23 it?

1	A It was the first opportunity I had.
2	MR. MERANTO: Thank you. Nothing
3	further.
4	MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, I'd ask he be
5	allowed to finish his answer.
6	MR. MERANTO: My apology, Your Honor.
7	Go ahead and finish your answer.
8	MS. DOHERTY: Object.
9	THE COURT: If you want him to finish,
10	he can finish. If you don't, that's fine.
11	MR. MERANTO: Yeah, I don't. I'm done.
12	Thank you.
13	THE COURT: So do you want to redirect?
14	MS. DOHERTY: I would, Judge.
15	THE COURT: All right. Then redirect.
16	MS. DOHERTY: Thank you.
17	
18	* * * *
19	
20	
21	
22	

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

1

2

3

- **Q** The report that you have in front of you,
- 4 what is it marked?
- 5 **A** October 7th.
- 6 **Q** No. I mean what exhibit?
- 7 **| A** D.
- 8 MR. MERANTO: D.

#### 9 BY MS. DOHERTY:

- 10 Q Okay. So I'm going to refer to Defense
- 11 Exhibit D. Do you indicate anywhere in the body of
- 12 that report, and at the top, when you wrote that
- 13 | information down? What's the date on there?
- 14 October 7th?
- 15 **A** October 7th.
- 16 **Q** Okay. And when you provided that -- this
- 17 | report to Detective Mondora was what date?
- 18 **A** October 15th.
- 19 Q Okay. And you have it signed at the bottom;
- 20 correct?
- 21 **A** Yes, ma'am.
- 22 **Q** And I think you indicated you signed it when
- 23 you gave it to a detective?

## RECROSS EXAMINATION

## BY MR. MERANTO:

- Q I might be a little slow. Do you want to show me anywhere in that report where it says you wrote this down on October 7th?
- A Well, at the top it's indicated 10/7, the incident date and time.
- It says the incident. That's when the incident happened. Ms. Doherty just asked you, does it say in there that you wrote it down on October 7th?

  I'm telling you, because I'm missing it, you show me in there where it says you wrote this down on October 7th.
- A I dated it October 15th when I signed it to give to Detective Mondora, which is our department policy.
- Q Okay. I'm going to ask you this again.

  English is your first language; right? I'm not having a problem with the translation here; correct?
- **A** No.
- 20 Q Okay. I'm going to ask you again,
  21 Ms. Doherty just asked you, didn't you write down when
  22 you wrote the report and it's in there? I'm telling
- you, show me where it's in there.

	RECROSS/FITZPATRICK
1	A It's not in the body of the report.
2	MR. MERANTO: Thank you very much.
3	Nothing else.
4	THE COURT: Anything else?
5	MS. DOHERTY: No, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You're
7	excused. Your next witness, please?
8	MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, the state
9	would call Detective Mondora.
10	THE COURT: All right. Raise your right
11	hand.
12	
13	
14	* * * *
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1	WHEREUPON, the State called
2	
3	DETECTIVE PATRICK MONDORA,
4	
5	who, being first duly sworn, testified
6	as follows:
7	THE COURT: Please be seated in the
8	witness chair. You've heard the instructions
9	given to the other witnesses. Please follow
10	them.
11	THE WITNESS: I will.
12	THE COURT: Thank you.
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MS. DOHERTY:
15	Q Good morning.
16	A Good morning.
17	<b>Q</b> Can you please state your full name for the
18	record and spell your last name for the court reporter?
19	<b>A</b> My name's Patrick Mondora, M-O-N-D-O-R-A.
20	<b>Q</b> And where are you employed?
21	A Mahoning County Sheriff's office.
22	<b>Q</b> How long have you been employed with the
23	Mahoning County Sheriff's Department?

- **A** Thirteen years.
- - A I started in the jail, worked records, and then I worked the patrol. And then in 2005 I was assigned to detectives.
  - **Q** And your training that allows you to work as a detective and a deputy with the Sheriff's Department is what?
  - A Well, I originally had OPATA to start off, and then prior to being assigned to detectives, I submitted a request to go to entry level detective school, which I went to for a week, and after being assigned to the detectives, I've been to numerous schools for homicide, fingerprint, latent prints, interviews, stuff like that.
  - Q Okay. And back when you were a new deputy and you talked about OPATA, what type of training as a deputy did you receive through OPATA?
  - A Once assigned to the detectives, I went to a latent print school where we would learn how to lift prints off of different materials, different items,

stuff like that. It was a week class.

Q Okay. And you -- when you were on the road,
I think you said that you were a deputy on the road,
what was your -- what were your duties at that time?

A Well, nowadays we respond to a crime when I was on patrol, and if it was a crime needing evidence collection as far as fingerprints or stuff like that, a detective would be called.

Q Okay. So now you're a detective and you've been through detective training more appropriate for a detective, in 2009, was there a cold case that existed regarding this homicide?

A Yes.

And -- or these homicides. I'm sorry. And tell us how you became involved in this case.

A In 2009, I became aware of the Marsh case, and I asked my commander, Lenny Sliwinski, you know, what's this about the Marsh case? He says, you guys need to -- you guys, being myself and my partner, Dave Benigas, he says, you guys need to become familiar with this just in case something should ever happen. You guys should have a knowledge of what happened back in '74. So my partner, Benigas, he reviewed it for a

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- week. I reviewed it for a week. And we started looking for evidence.
  - **Q** And when you say you reviewed this case, tell the jury what you reviewed.
    - A All those binders there on the table, the prosecutor's table, photographs.
  - **Q** What do those binders include?
    - A Two of those binders I believe include 150 plus suspects at the time that back in '74 they submitted criminals, known criminals back then that were either committing burglaries or robberies, or were capable of committing that crime. They submitted those fingerprints of those known criminals to prints that were lifted at the Marsh house.
    - And what about any detective notes, reports of the scene, BCI reports? Did you also review all of those?
- 18 **A** Yes.
- 20 And tips that were made through either 20 anonymous sources or psychics, were those included as 21 well in there?
- 22 **A** Yes.
  - **Q** Who were the lead investigators at the time?

- Detective Nemeth, Sergeant Hunt, Crater

  Deputy Finamore was there, Phil Chance, Deputy Phil

  Chance, and Catheline were the responding officers that

  night in '74.
  - **Q** First of all, how old were you in 1974?
  - **A** I was four.
- 7 **Q** So obviously you weren't there?
  - **A** Correct.

5

6

- 9 **Q** You were looking at all of this information almost 40 years later?
- 11 A Yes, ma'am.
- 12 **Q** In your review of all of those reports, 13 including the BCI reports, was there ever an
- identification made through the fingerprints that were submitted to a perpetrator?
- 16 **A** No.
- 17 **Q** Was there ever an arrest made as the perpetrator of these crimes?
- 19 A No, there was not. As a matter of fact,
  20 two -- even two sheriffs later, those sheriffs were
  21 still submitting fingerprints to the case, to no avail.
  22 No one ever got a hit.
- 23 **Q** Were you ever able to speak to Detective

- 1 Nemeth?
- 2 **A** Yes.
- 3 **Q** And this would've been subsequent to 2009?
- 4 A Prior to -- after -- yeah, after 2009, prior
- 5 to his death.
- 6 **Q** And when did he pass away?
- 7 **A** I don't know the date of that.
- 8 Q All right, but he is -- he has passed since
- 9 then?
- 10 **A** Yes.
- 11 **Q** What about Floyd Crater?
- 12 **A** Never had a chance to talk to him either.
- 13 **Q** He's passed away?
- 14 A Yes, ma'am.
- 15 **Q** And Lieutenant Hunt?
- 16 **A** I don't know his status.
- 17 Q And Bernie Albert, I don't know if you
- mentioned Bernie Albert. Is he listed in the paperwork
- in your review of the case?
- 20 **A** Yes, he is. He's a BCI agent.
- 21 **Q** All right. And has he passed away since that
- 22 time?
- 23 **A** Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

1	Q	Did	you	ever	have	the	opportunity	to	even
2	<b>Q</b> talk to	him?							

- A No, ma'am.
- Q You have reviewed all of the information, you and Detective Benigas. So what do you do next?
  - A Well, when we started looking for our evidence, we knew that BCI was called to the crime scene, Bernie Albert, and he's the one that processed the crime scene that night. So we called down to BCI London to see if they had any of our evidence. And I had spoken to Robin Ladd. I think her name was Robinette back then.
- Q She's been married since then; right?
- A Yes. And she advised that they were in the process of going through all the cases, and she would see what she can find for me.
- **Q** And were you alerted by her at some point that she had obtained --

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Don't answer the question.

Let me hear the question.

(WHEREUPON, the record was read as requested.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1		What's the rest of the
2	question?	

MS. DOHERTY: The --

THE COURT: Why don't you just ask it again. The objection's sustained.

### BY MS. DOHERTY:

**Q** Were you contacted in 2009 by Robin Ladd regarding the existence of latent prints lifted from the Marsh homicide scene?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: He can answer that.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

- **Q** You can answer.
- 14 A Yes, I was.
- 15 **Q** And were you given at that time the name of James Ferrara?
- 17 **A** Yes, I was.
- 18 **Q** What did you and Detective Benigas do then?
  19 And let me clarify that. This was still back in 2009;
- 20 correct?
- 21 **A** Correct.
- 22 **Q** Okay.
- 23 **A** And then we just started on a background

- investigation of Mr. Ferrara, you know, his address,
  where he lived, where he worked, how he knew the
  victims, stuff like that.
  - **Q** If he knew the victims?
- **A** Yeah. Even if he knew the victims.
  - Q Okay. And were you making efforts to track down any law enforcement personnel who may have been at the scene, responsible for any of the investigation?
  - A Yes.
- **Q** And were you able to contact Mike Finamore?
- **A** Yes.

- **Q** And how did you know that Mike Finamore had even been part of this case?
- 14 MR. MERANTO: Judge, objection.
- **THE COURT:** Overruled.
- 16 A His name appears in -- he was one of the off
  17 deputies that -- he recovered the slug from the ceiling
  18 at the crime scene that night in '74.
- **Q** All right. So his name was in the paperwork, 20 and that caused you to contact him?
- **A** Yes, ma'am.
- **Q** And he lived out of state?
- **A** Yes.

- 1 **Q** Were you able to contact Frank Boyle?
- 2 **A** Yes, I was.
- And was his information included within the investigative notes?
- 5 **A** Yes. He was one of the individuals that 6 found the bodies that night.
  - Q All right. So in your investigation into James Ferrara, were you able to determine any location that he had lived prior I guess to 2009?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

11 THE COURT: He can answer yes or no. I

12 don't know what the heck that has to do with

13 anything.

A Yes.

- **Q** Did you attempt to recover car titles?
- 16 **A** Yes.
- 17 **Q** And did you find a car title that listed an
- 18 address?

7

8

9

10

14

- 19 **A** Yes.
- 20 **Q** And where was that address?
- MR. MERANTO: Objection.
- 22 **THE COURT:** Sustained.
- 23 BY MS. DOHERTY:

- Q The car title that you obtained, where did you get it from? Let me -- no, stop that -- or strike that. When you're reviewing, back in the '70s and '80s, to try to gather this information, how difficult was it to obtain documents, et cetera, from the Bureau of Motor Vehicles or anywhere else?
  - A Numerous subpoenas were sent out for Mr. Ferrara's information. Post office, IRS, military, GM payroll, GM records, and what we were coming to find is that most documents were purged after so long. They were just throwing them out.
- **Q** Even the BMV and IRS; correct?
- **A** Correct.
- So I guess what I'm asking is even though you had information from BCI regarding Robin Ladd's identification of James Ferrara as the contributor of these prints, you didn't just immediately act upon it; correct?
  - A No, ma'am.
- 20 Q Okay. You took your time to look into everything you could?
- **A** Yes.
  - **Q** Did you contact and speak to James Ferrara?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

**A** Yes, we did.

THE COURT: All right. Let me see counsel at side bar here.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among court and counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

- Q You worked with Detective Benigas during this time as well; correct?
- A Yes.
- So you and Detective Benigas -- where is
- 14 Detective Benigas now?
- 15 A He's retired.
- Okay. On what date did you and Detective
  Benigas speak to James Ferrara?
- 18 A I believe it was February 11th, 2010.
- 19 Q And were you able to determine from your
- 20 conversation with him whether he had ever served in the
- 21 military?
- 22 **A** Yes, he had said that he served in the Marine
- 23 | Corps in '68.

- And were you able to determine the dates that
  he worked -- well, first of all, were you able to
  determine from him whether or not he worked at GM ever?

  A Yes, he advised that he worked at General
  Motors in the van plant, materials plant, from '70 to
- Motors in the van plant, materials plant, from '70 to '83.
  - **Q** From 1970 to 1983?
  - A Correct.

7

- 9 **Q** And you were able to determine through your
  10 investigation and reading of the reports that Ben Marsh
  11 had worked at GM until the time of his death in '74;
  12 correct?
- 13 A Correct.
- 14 **Q** Were you able to determine, or did you talk
  15 to Mr. Ferrara about any addresses or locations that he
  16 had lived in Mahoning County?
- 17 **A** Yes. He had said in '74 he lived in Trumbull
  18 County, and then in '76 he had moved to Westchester
  19 Apartments in Austintown.
- 20 **Q** And where are the Westchester Apartments in Austintown?
- 22 **A** Westchester Drive, located between Raccoon and Mahoning Avenue.

- 1 **Q** And the orange Vega was located at the K-mart plaza in Austintown?
- 3 MR. MERANTO: Objection.
- 4 **THE COURT:** Sustained.

### 5 BY MS. DOHERTY:

6

7

- Q In your review of the reports, and the witnesses, where was Mrs. Marsh's vehicle discovered after the homicide?
- 9 A In the parking lot of the K-mart in
  10 Austintown at the corner of Raccoon Road and Mahoning
  11 Avenue.
- 12 **Q** Approximately how far is that location to Westchester Apartments?
- 14 **A** About a mile.
- Did you make efforts to speak to the owner or landlord or anyone from the Westchester Apartments regarding records from 1974 or '76?
- 18 A Yes, we did.
- 19 **Q** And what did you determine?
- 20 **A** We found out that the records were purged, so they had no record of him living there.
- 22 **Q** No records at all? You just couldn't find out if he did, when he did?

- - **Q** Okay. Did you discuss with James Ferrara whether or not he knew Ben Marsh?
  - **A** Yes, we did.
- And what did you ask him, and what did he say?
  - We had asked him if he -- if he was familiar with Ben Marsh. He advised to us -- it's in two separate interviews. We interviewed him on the 11th, and then we interviewed him again on the 12th. And both times, he said, "I didn't know Ben Marsh. I wasn't friends with Ben Marsh. I didn't talk to Ben Marsh. I didn't know where Ben Marsh lived. I don't even know where that house is." He even asked us at one point, he said, "Where is Canfield?" We told him. He said, "I don't know where that house was." He says --
  - **Q** Go ahead.
  - A Just that he didn't know the family. He didn't know anything. He only knew that he was a supervisor at the plant -- or security at the plant.
    - Q Did he indicate to you that he had never been

1 to Ben Marsh's house?

A Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

**Q** And did he indicate to you that he didn't even know where Canfield was?

A Correct.

Q You said you interviewed him then the next day as well; correct?

A Yes.

**Q** And did he tell you he had never been inside that house?

A No, he did not.

Q On the second time -- during the second time that you interviewed James Ferrara, did you tell him at that time that his fingerprints --

MR. MERANTO: Objection. Can we approach?

THE COURT: Yes.

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among court and counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

BY MS. DOHERTY:

Did you discuss with Mr. Ferrara the fact that you had his fingerprints at the scene?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

### BY MS. DOHERTY:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

**Q** What was your discussion about the fingerprints?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained. What was your discussion with Mr. Ferrara?

THE WITNESS: On the second day of the interview we advised Mr. Ferrara that we had his prints at the crime scene.

**Q** And what was his response?

A "That's impossible." He elaborated that, "I didn't know Ben. I wasn't friends with him. I didn't hang out with him. If people said I was talking to him or hanging out with him, they are lying. He said, I didn't know the family." And then he just said, "That's impossible."

Q Okay. Once you spoke to Mr. Ferrara, were his fingerprints and palm prints collected in your presence?

2.1

A Yes. The first interview after we were done with him, we obtained fresh fingerprints and also took a buccal swab of his mouth.

MS. DOHERTY: All right. Can I approach, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

- I have these marked as State's Exhibit 61 and 62 already. I'm just keeping them with that envelope. Can you look at those and tell us what they are and what date they were collected?
- A On -- these are -- these are whole hand prints of James Ferrara taken by Sergeant William Cappabianca of the Mahoning County Sheriff's office, and signed by James Ferrara on February 11th, 2010. Left and right hand.
- **Q** Okay. And what was done then with those prints lifted from James Ferrara?
- A Those prints after we collected them were sent to BCI to Robin Ladd for comparison to the prints lifted at the crime scene in '74.
- **Q** All right. And did you receive confirmation from Robin Ladd regarding the prints?

1		MR. MERANTO: Objection.
2		THE COURT: Let me hear the question
3		again.
4		(WHEREUPON, the record was read as
5		requested.)
6		THE COURT: Sustained.
7	BY MS. DO	HERTY:
8	Q	Did you receive a report from Robin Ladd?
9	A	Yes, I did.
10	Q	All right. Did you arrest James Ferrara?
11	A	No.
12	Q	When did you arrest James Ferrara?
13	A	He was indicted in June of 2013.
14	Q	Detective Mondora, do you see James Ferrara
15	in the co	urtroom today?
16	A	Yes, ma'am. He's sitting at the defense
17	table wea	ring glasses, a black shirt, white stripes.
18		MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, I'd ask the
19		record reflect he's identified James Ferrara?
20		THE COURT: Yes, the record will so
21		indicate.
22	BY MS. DO	HERTY:
23	Q	Detective Mondora, the prints that have

1

2

3

4

5

- been -- the fingerprint lifts, latent lifts from the crime scene at the Marsh residence that Robin Ladd testified to, since 1974 until the time she ran her tests, did the Mahoning County Sheriff's Department ever have possession of those?
- 6 A No, we did not.
- 7 **Q** And when you began investigating this case, 8 where were those prints?
- 9 A After they had confirmation, they sent them
  10 back to us, and they went into our evidence room.
- 11 Q I mean before that.
- 12 **A** Prior to Robin?
- 13 **Q** Yes.
- 14 **A** She retained them.
- Okay. In your review of all of the reports connected to this case, was James Ferrara's name ever mentioned?
- 18 **A** No, ma'am.
  - **Q** Until 2009?
- 20 **A** Correct.
- 21 **MS. DOHERTY:** I don't have anything
- further, Judge. Thank you.
- 23 **THE COURT:** All right. Mr. Meranto.

1 MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor. 2 CROSS EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. MERANTO: 4 Q Good morning, Mr. Mondora. How are you? 5 Α Good morning, sir. 6 This was a difficult case to even be involved Q 7 with, wasn't it, after 39, 40 years? 8 Α Yes, sir. 9 And what you had, what you're referring to, I 10 think, fair to say this, all this, and what's on my desk, that's the stuff you had to review; correct? 11 12 Α Looks about right. 13 And you talked to Detective Nemeth, but 14 pretty much everybody involved in this case is

16 **A** Yes, sir.

deceased; right?

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In going through this. Did you have any reason to doubt the trustworthiness of the stuff that's contained in all these reports and all of this documentation?

A No, I did not.

Q Okay. So you proceeded in that fashion, assuming that everything was done at least as well as

- 1 | it could be?
- 2 **A** Correct.
- Okay. Now, let's clear a few things up
  before we get into this case. You've been present in
- 5 the courtroom, you've heard all the testimony; correct?
- 6 A Yes, sir.
- You know -- you heard the testimony of detective -- or excuse me, Deputy Fitzpatrick just now; right?
- 10 **A** Yes.
- And you guys sent ballistics down -- or
  ballistics were done in this case; correct? Ballistics
  with regard to the bullets and stuff that were found?
- 14 **A** Yes.
- 15 **Q** And you heard Mr. Chappell testify?
- 16 **A** Correct.
- And he said they were from a .38, and he actually issued a report and gave a list of guns, a
- 19 .38; correct?
- 20 **A** Correct.
- 21 **Q** Do you remember when he issued his report?
- 22 **A** No, sir, I do not.
- 23 **MR. MERANTO:** May I approach, Judge?

THE COURT: You ma
-------------------

# BY MR. MERANTO:

2

3

- Q I think this is State's 45. I'm referring to that date. Tell me what date that was issued.
- 5 **A** August 28th, 2013.
- 6 Q So just a few months ago; right?
- 7 **A** Yes, sir.
- 8 **Q** After this case was indicted; right?
- 9 **A** Yes, sir.
- 10 Q And that's when Detective -- or Deputy
- 11 Fitzpatrick came forward with this supposed statement
- 12 of Mr. Ferrara?
- 13 **A** His was in October.
- 14 **Q** Right. So after that?
- 15 **A** Yes.
- 16 **Q** After you guys assume it's a .38?
- 17 **A** Well, we know it's a .38 from the ballistic
- 18 report.
- 19 **Q** Right. You know. Okay. Now, let's talk
- 20 about this statement, too. You talked to Mr. Ferrara.
- 21 He talked to you willingly; right?
- 22 **A** Yes.
- 23 **Q** In fact, you wanted him to waive his right,

- 1 | he said I know my right, don't worry about it?
- **A** Correct.
- **Q** And he talked to you for how long?
- 4 | A I believe it was about an hour.
- **Q** The first time or both times?

don't even know where Canfield is?"

- An hour the first time, maybe a half hour the second time.
- **Q** Okay. And you asked him a number of questions; right?
- **A** Correct.
- **Q** It's going on and on for, like you said, a couple hours both days, two days?
- **A** Correct.
- **Q** And he says to you, "I don't know the guy, I never been there. I've never been in that house, I
- **A** Correct.

- **Q** How long have you been doing this with regard to being a detective specifically?
- **A** Eight years.
- **Q** And over the course of those eight years, how 22 many suspects have you spoken to, would you say? I'm 23 not going to hold you to this.

- 1 **A** Suspects in a murder case or --
- 2 Q Suspects -- well, you know what, let me stop
- 3 you there for a minute. Let me stop you there for a
- 4 minute, because we had this problem with Mr. Finamore.
- 5 What is the difference whether it's a murder case or a
- 6 burglary case or a robbery case?
- 7 **A** You're correct. There's no difference.
- 8 Q Okay. So you treat them all just as serious,
- 9 don't you?
- 10 **A** Correct.
- 11 **Q** So tell me again how many suspects you think
- 12 you talked to in the course of your eight years?
- 13 **A** A hundred.
- 14 **Q** A hundred. Fair number. Okay. And some of
- 15 those go on to get charged, some of them don't, I would
- 16 presume?
- 17 **A** Correct.
- 18 Q And I'm not going to ask you for that number,
- 19 because who knows. And you've got somebody who you're
- 20 asking about a crime?
- 21 **A** Correct.
- 22 Q And if they didn't do it, what do they say to
- 23 you?

- 1 | A I wasn't there. I didn't do it.
- 2 **Q** And if you got somebody that down the road
- 3 maybe gets charged, gets maybe proven guilty, what do
- 4 they say to you?
- 5 **A** I wasn't there. I didn't do it.
- 6 Q Thank you. You were four in 1974?
- 7 A Correct.
  - **Q** Where did you grow up?
- 9 A New Middletown.
- 10 **Q** New Middletown. Okay. I know where New
- 11 Middletown is; okay? What street did you live on in
- 12 New Middletown?

- 13 A Woodland Drive.
- 14 **Q** Took you a little while to remember that, and
- 15 you lived there; right?
- 16 **A** I knew. I just didn't want to give the
- 17 address out.
- 18 **Q** I apologize. I didn't have any clandestine
- 19 purpose. I didn't want to get that information out. I
- 20 apologize.
- 21 **A** Thank you.
- 22 **Q** Let's try a little different angle. You go
- 23 to high school at Springfield?

- 1 **A** Yes.
- 2 Q All right. Did you know people from other
- 3 sides of town, other parts of town?
- 4 Absolutely.
- 5 **Q** All right. You graduated high school what
- 6 year?
- 7 **|| A** '89.
- Part of a secret, right, '89? Ever have occasion to ride with buddies, go with buddies, friends
- or relatives to other people's houses, other locations?
- 11 **A** Yes.
- 12 **Q** Can you tell me -- let's just use -- you
- 13 graduated in '89. Let's use '88. Tell me every place
- 14 you went to with every friend or every relative in
- 15 1988.
- 16 **A** I couldn't tell you that.
- 17 Q Okay. Couldn't do it, could you?
- 18 **A** No.
- 19 Q Are there places you think you went to that,
- 20 you know, if I told you, remember going to meet
- 21 so-and-so's cousin over in Niles, and you might go, oh,
- 22 | yeah, right; isn't that fair to say?
- 23 **A** Correct.

- 1 **Q** All right. And you talked to Mr. Ferrara in 2009, 2010?
- 3 **A** 2010.
- 4 **Q** Okay. So at the time it was only 36 years?
- 5 **A** Correct.
- And I asked you when you graduated, how long have you been out of school, or high school. How many vears?
- 9 **A** Twenty plus.
- So twenty plus. So 10 or 15 years extra

  added by the time you talked to Mr. Ferrara. And you

  didn't tell Mr. Ferrara up front you had his print, did
- 14 A No, I did not.
- So you talk to him, you interview him, and then the next day you tell him that?
- 17 **A** Correct.

you?

- Now that we cleared that up, let's get on to this case. By the way, you talked about contacting Deputy Finamore?
- 21 **A** Yes.
- MR. MERANTO: May I approach, Your
- 23 Honor?

	CROSS/MON	DORA
1		THE COURT: Yes, you may.
2		(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit N was
3		marked for identification.)
4	BY MR. ME	RANTO:
5	Q	I'm going to show you what's been marked as
6	Defense E	xhibit N. Do you recognize that?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	What are those?
9	A	This is our investigation.
10	Q	Your this is actually your detective
11	notes? Y	ou wrote these?
12	A	Mine and Detective Benigas, yes.
13	Q	Okay. Collaboration?
14	A	Correct.
15	Q	I want you to look at the first page of this,
16	I believe	. Well, I'm not even going to do that.
17	Mr. Finam	nore's name anywhere in there?
18	A	I don't know. I'd have to review it and see.
19	Q	You want to review it, or do you want me to
20	just save	you the time? Would you doubt me if I say
21	his name'	s nowhere in those detective notes?
22	A	I wouldn't doubt you.
23	Q	You said that Bernie Albert processed the

1	scene	?

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- A Correct.
- You didn't say Bernie Albert with assistance from Deputy Finamore, did you?
  - A No.
- 6 **Q** In fact, once again, nowhere in there, is it?
  - A We didn't know Finamore assisted him until we talked to him on the phone.
  - Q Well, his name does appear in the -- early on in the detective notes digging that slug out; right?
  - A Correct.
  - even in all these detective notes and everything else, his name's never mentioned anywhere other than digging that slug out of the ceiling?
- 16 **A** Correct.
- Now, I want to clear something up that
  happened on direct also with regard to this fingerprint
  issue. Ms. Doherty asked you if you -- Ms. Doherty
  asked you if you had OPATA training; right?
- 21 **A** Yes.
- 22 **Q** And then she asked you about fingerprint, and I didn't want to object because I've been being a

- little maybe grumpy or something, but she asked you about whether you had OPATA training with regard to fingerprints, and you answered that when you went to be a detective, that you got some specialized training in fingerprints?
- A Correct.
- **Q** So I'm going to ask you again about OPATA. 8 What training did you have in fingerprints?
  - A The training in OPATA is, you know, back when I went to the academy in '91, it was a night school. So we went from 6:00 to 10:00. So our training for fingerprints probably would've been maybe 8 hours, 2 nights, over 2 nights.
  - **Q** Would you call that cursory? I mean, not -- not intense?
- 16 A Right. Not intense. Just basic how to throw
  17 the -- how to put the fingerprint dust on, apply it,
  18 lift it, preserve it, document it.
  - Q Okay. And I notice that in this case when you wanted to get Mr. Ferrara's prints, is it Deputy Cappabianca, or does he have rank now?
- **A** He's a major now.
  - **Q** Major Cappabianca. I thought so. That's why

- 1 I wanted to clear that up. Why did he take the prints?
- 2 **A** He walked in the room after our interview,
- and we were getting ready to fingerprint, and he asked
- 4 if he could assist.
- 5 **Q** Okay. So you -- but you take those -- you
- 6 guys take those anytime somebody's booked into the
- 7 | jail, too; right?
- 8 **A** Correct.
- 9 **Q** So people are designated to do that; correct?
- 10 **A** Correct.
- 11 **Q** And I believe that you stated that now when
- 12 someone goes out to a crime scene from the Sheriff's
- Department, if there's any evidence to be processed,
- 14 they call the detective unit; right?
- 15 **A** They call me, yes.
- 16 **Q** They call you?
- 17 **| A** Yes.
- 18 Q You are the man. Was that different in '74
- 19 that you know of?
- 20 **A** Not that I know of. They didn't have a
- 21 specialized crime scene unit to go out to those.
- 22 **Q** At all?
- 23 **A** At all.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q	nd let me ask you something, because you	ı're
a detectiv	now eight years; right? Would you	
because yo	said if there's evidence to be processe	ed,
they call	ou?	

A Correct.

Q You ever had cause to call a deputy off the road to say I need you to process this crime scene?

A They didn't call Finamore to. I would never call a deputy off the road to process it. But they didn't call Finamore to process the crime scene either.

Q Yeah. He just volunteered; right?

A Correct.

Q Went out there. Okay. All right.

MR. MERANTO: May I approach the

witness, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit F was

marked for identification.)

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

Q I'm going to show you what has been marked as Defendant's Exhibit F. Take a look at that and go through it if you would. You know what that -- you're familiar with this stuff, you went through it, didn't

	CROSS/MONI	DORA
1	you?	
2	A	Absolutely.
3	Q	Did you read through all this?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Okay. Good. All right. What is that?
6	A	This is a list of 167 individuals that were
7	looked at	for the Marsh homicide.
8	Q	Okay. Let me show you another one.
9		THE COURT: Tell me what's going on
10		here.
11		MR. MERANTO: I handed her a document I
12		wanted to show
13		THE COURT: What?
14		MR. MERANTO: I handed her a document I
15		wanted to show the deputy, and I guess she's
16		trying to verify whether I got it from them.
17		MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, I'm actually
18		just looking at.
19		THE COURT: I can't hear you when you're
20		sitting down.
21		MS. DOHERTY: I said I'm actually trying
22		to look at it to make sure that I can find

it.

	CROSS/MONI	DORA
1		MR. MERANTO: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.
2		MS. DOHERTY: I wasn't trying to verify
3		it.
4		MR. MERANTO: I will wait.
5		MS. DOHERTY: Okay. I found it.
6		MR. MERANTO: Thank you.
7	BY MR. MEI	RANTO:
8	Q	I'm going to also
9		MR. MERANTO: I think I asked if I can
10		approach?
11		THE COURT: You did.
12		MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
13		(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit E was
14		marked for identification.)
15	BY MR. ME	RANTO:
16	Q	I think that is Defense Exhibit E, is it not?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And what is that list of?
19	A	It's another list of 34 individuals.
20	Q	And what's it say up on top there?
21	A	"Suspects and others who have had prints
22	submitted	for elimination."
23	Q	Okay. So they submitted prints for

- 1 | elimination, too; correct?
- 2 **A** Correct.
- 3  $\mathbf{Q}$  And correct me if I'm wrong, that first list,
- 4 which is Exhibit F, the list of the 167 people, it says
- 5 list of suspects, but up at the top they eliminated
- 6 people; correct?
- 7 **| A** Yes.
- 8 **Q** I mean, through their investigation they
- 9 eliminated people?
- 10 **A** Correct.
- 11 **Q** Listen, I can go all day through 167 people
- 12 because they investigated all of them, and you would
- 13 agree with me, there's paperwork on all of them;
- 14 | correct?
- 15 **A** Correct.
- 16 **Q** Some of them, 20, 30 pages?
- 17 **A** These were -- these were known criminals in
- 18 the area at that time, yes.
- 19 **Q** Well, wait a minute now. They're only known
- 20 criminals? You're telling me there were no suspects
- 21 based on tips in there? You didn't review any?
- 22 **A** No, there's tips.
- 23 **Q** Lots of them; right?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	So not just known criminals?
3	A	The majority of these are known criminals in
4	the area.	
5	Q	Okay. We're going to get to that. But
6	rather th	an go through all of these, I'm going to try
7	and narro	w things down a little bit just to give the
8	jury a fl	avor but, I mean, I don't want to spend all
9	day going	through 167. I'm also going to show you
10		MR. MERANTO: Your Honor, may we
11		approach one moment?
12		THE COURT: All right.
13		MR. MERANTO: Thank you.
14		(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among
15		court and counsel off the record and out of
16		the hearing of the jury and court reporter,
17		after which the proceedings continued as
18		follows:)
19		MR. MERANTO: Your Honor, may I approach
20		again?
21		THE COURT: Yes.
22		(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit G was
23		marked for identification.)

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

I'm going to show you -- I know you're going to have a bunch of exhibits, and I'll try to keep going back. Take a look at Exhibit G of the defense. And you're going to have to look through those pages. The first one you'll see, and then look through them page by page, and I think there's eight or nine pages. And after that we'll go through them.

**THE COURT:** Is this all part of his file?

MR. MERANTO: This is all part of, yes, the detective's file.

THE COURT: Yeah. The file that he's reviewed and testified he reviewed?

MR. MERANTO: Yes.

**THE COURT:** Okay. Can we move along?

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

Q Okay. Detective Mondora, let's go through this page by page. I mean, well, I'm just going to go through — the first page is basically something that says we contacted BCI because we want you to check specifically that — latent prints and the cigarette prints; right?

1	Α	Correct.

Q Because there's a latent print found on the cigarette that's found inside the crime scene; correct?

A Yes.

The next page -- and I'm not going to go through all of them, but the next five or six, they're basically all the same, correct, letters to BCI requesting exactly the same thing? Hey, here's a couple suspects, and we want you to check them on the latent prints and the print that's on the cigarette; correct?

A Correct.

Q The last one is a letter to the FBI basically telling them the same thing; correct?

A Correct.

And in addition to that, if you look down,

Paragraph 3 addresses a composite photo that was

created, which they also sent to the FBI; right? They

said, hey, we want you to check these latent prints and

the print that's on the cigarette, and there's a

composite photo that was done by an eyewitness; right?

A Yes, that's what this says. Yes.

**Q** Okay.

1	MR. MERANTO: May I approach again?
2	THE COURT: Yes.
3	(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit U was
4	marked for identification.)
5	BY MR. MERANTO:
6	Q I'm going to show you what's been marked with
7	Defense Exhibit U; okay?
8	A Yes, sir.
9	Q Take a look through that if you will.
10	THE COURT: Defense exhibit what?
11	MR. MERANTO: Excuse me? Exhibit U.
12	THE COURT: U?
13	MR. MERANTO: U as in unicorn.
14	THE COURT: I'll have to add that to the
15	list of exhibits.
16	MR. MERANTO: Thank you. That's our
17	fault, Judge.
18	BY MR. MERANTO:
19	Q If you look through there, that is basically
20	a bunch of police reports with regard to this they
21	refer to as Mrs. Informer; correct?
22	A Correct.
23	<b>Q</b> And describe to me if you would who

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1	Mrs.	Informer	was	based	on	those	notes.

- A Apparently she's someone who saw someone getting out of a vehicle in the K-mart parking lot.
- **Q** Go ahead.
  - A They took her to Youngstown Police

    Department. They showed her 2,800 -- yeah, 2,800

    photographs of known criminals in the area that were

    arrested by Youngstown Police Department to see if she
    recognized anybody. She did not recognize anyone, and
    after that they put a composite sketch together.
  - Q Okay. So once again, getting out of the car -- getting out of which car?
  - A Possibly the victim's vehicle that was parked at the K-mart parking lot.
  - Q Well, okay. We'll go with possibly for now.

MR. MERANTO: May I approach again?

THE COURT: Yes.

(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit C was

marked for identification.)

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

Q That's Defense Exhibit C. Is that not the composite photo that was then published in the paper in the Youngstown Vindicator?

- This is a composite that was published in the Vindicator dated 12/7 of '80. And this is only in the file because it was a newspaper article about the murders.
- Well, hold on. Are you telling me that composite was created in 1980?
  - A I don't know when this composite was created, but this composite here that you handed me, Exhibit Union, this is the one that was developed by the detectives' office.
- $\mathbf{Q}$  Go ahead to the next to the last page there.
- 12 There's a sketch there; right?
- **A** Two sketches, yes.
- I want you to go to the next to the last page.
- **A** This one?
- **Q** And there's a sketch there?
- **A** Right, and she corrects herself.
- **Q** She revises it?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** And the back one's the one they used?
- **A** Correct.
- **Q** And you're saying they didn't submit that to

- 1 | the newspaper, someone just made that up?
- 2 **A** I don't know where that came from.
- Well, let's go back now that you have those exhibits in front of you to Exhibit F.
- 5 **A** The list of 34 individuals?
- 6 Q No. That's E. F.
  - **A** Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.
  - **Q** Okay. You got F?
- 9 **A** Yes, I do.
- 10 **Q** Now, F is the list of 167 or so suspects;
- 11 correct?

7

- 12 **A** Correct.
- 13 **Q** And it says that they're eliminated in a
- 14 number of ways; correct?
- 15 **A** Correct.
- 16 Q In fact, it says X, eliminated, at the top,
- and then you go through and you see the X's; right?
- 18 **A** Correct.
- 19 **Q** Correct me if I'm wrong, pretty much -- not
- 20 all of them, but I mean a huge percent of them were
- 21 either eliminated because their prints didn't match or
- 22 the photo, they were photo eliminated?
- 23 **THE COURT:** They were what? What did

you say?

MR. MERANTO: They were eliminated by virtue of their photos.

THE COURT: Photo?

MR. MERANTO: Their picture. Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry. Maybe I

just didn't hear you.

MS. DOHERTY: I object.

THE COURT: Overruled.

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

Q Okay. So now there's a couple thrown out there. For example, No. 7 says too young. And once again, Detective Mondora, you read through all this, right, all of this paperwork? And will you agree with me that in some cases there's a name, and there's no investigation, and you don't know what the heck happened?

A Yes, there's a name -- we do have -- we do have BCI reports that show some of these names on this list, and in the other list, that their fingerprints were compared to prints at the crime scene, and they were eliminated from as a suspect that way.

Q I got you. But I don't think you answered my

1 question.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: He didn't answer your

question. Did you understand his question?

THE WITNESS: Can you ask me again,

please?

# BY MR. MERANTO:

Yeah, I will. Isn't it true that there were, in this vast amount of paperwork you gave me, like a name on a piece of paper, and nothing attached to it?

A Correct.

Q So we got no idea if they ever talked to 'em; right?

A Correct.

Q Pursued any leads, tried to find out who it is, took prints, took a photo, did anything; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. But their entire focus in '74 is hey, we got fingerprints, right, we got fingerprints on the cigarette, we got fingerprints on the scene; right?

A That's all they had back then, yes.

Q And a composite photo; right?

A Correct.

1		MR. MERANTO: May I approach again,
2		Judge?
3		THE COURT: You may.
4		(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit R was
5		marked for identification.)
6	BY MR. M	ERANTO:
7	Q	Defense R, tell me what that is, if you will.
8	A	This is a list of individuals in the house
9	when the	officers arrived the night the murders were
10	discover	red.
11	Q	Now, once again, you're you know, you
12	didn't p	repare this; right?
13	A	No, sir.
14	Q	But you've reviewed this whole file. And is
15	this not	a list what they did is they thought the
16	cigarett	e and the print on it was a big deal, did they
17	not?	
18	A	Apparently.
19	Q	Apparently they did. Well, let me tell you
20	somethin	g. They were there investigating the case in
21	'74. Do	you purport to know more than they do about

No.

this case?

A

22

- Q Okay. So apparently they did, because what they did here, right, correct me if I'm wrong, is they found out anybody that they thought, or was in that house, detectives, deputies, policemen, photographers, anybody that they knew was in that house, family members, including the deceased, Mr. Marsh Sr., and they found out if they smoked, if they smoked, what they smoked, and they eliminated them from this list; right?
- **A** Correct.
- **Q** Why did they eliminate them, in your opinion?
- **A** Because they were going to look at the fingerprint on the cigarette.
  - Q Fingerprint on the cigarette's a big deal, and they made sure they wanted to make sure, hey, we're covering everybody that might have been there, might have touched that cigarette?
- **A** Correct.
- Okay. Now, 1974, fingerprints, big deal; right?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Because you said that's all you got. You got a washing machine at home now?

**A** Yes.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

- 2 You don't send your wife down to the stream
  3 to beat her clothes on a rock, do you, because that's
  4 the way they used to do it?
- 5 **A** No.
- Okay. So now what do we have now that was not present in 1974? DNA?
  - **A** Yes. Oh, yes.
  - Q Okay. So -- by the way, you did all this investigation, and Ms. Doherty made painstaking efforts to show, hey, you didn't just get this one fingerprint and run off to the grand jury to get Mr. Ferrara indicted. You did some additional investigation; right?
- 15 **A** Yes.
- And you talked to him and he said, "I don't know. I ain't been there. I didn't touch anything."

  And then you went off to the grand jury pretty much;

  right?
- 20 **A** A few years later, yes.
- 21 **Q** Uh-huh. Okay. But you went, and you also 22 said when you got his prints because you wanted to get 23 his whole prints, that you did a buccal swab?

- 1 A Correct.
- 2 **Q** Tell the jury what a buccal swab is.
- That's a swabbing of the inside of the mouth on both sides.
- 5 **Q** And what do you -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.
- Swabbing of the mouth both sides, and we

  submitted -- because we had submitted the cigarette, we

  wanted to see if DNA on the cigarette matched James

  Ferrara. So we swabbed his mouth, and we submitted the

  swabs to BCI to see if they matched Mr. Ferrara, his
- 11 DNA.
- 12 **Q** Well, you had a fingerprint; right?
- 13 **A** Correct.
- 14 **Q** Of course, his name's not mentioned anywhere
- in all of this amounts of paperwork; right?
- 16 A No, he's not.
- 17 **Q** And you got no eyewitnesses or anything;
- 18 right?
- 19 **A** No.
- 20 **Q** Why did you submit his DNA?
- 21 **A** We wanted to cover all our bases.
- 22 **Q** And gee, DNA, it didn't work out, did it?
- No, sir, his DNA did not come back to

- 1 Mr. Ferrara. It came back to an unknown male.
- 2 But you had doubts. You had doubts about the
- 3 case so you submitted the DNA; right?
- 4 MS. DOHERTY: I object.
- 5 **THE COURT:** Overruled.
- 6 **A** I did not have any doubts about the prints.
  - **Q** You had no doubts?
- 8 **A** No.

- 9 Q That isn't what I said. I said you wanted
- 10 more; right? You wanted more, so that's why you
- 11 submitted DNA. So you weren't sure; right?
- 12 **A** I wanted a complete and thorough
- 13 | investigation.
- 14 **Q** You did. Okay. Let's talk about that. You
- 15 specifically said you reviewed all this information;
- 16 right?
- 17 **A** Yes.
- 18 **Q** Yes?
- 19 **A** Myself and Dave Benigas, yes.
- 20 **Q** You and Dave Benigas. And on Exhibit F, that
- 21 list of 167 people?
- 22 **A** Yes.
- 23 **Q** How many people did you talk to on that list?

- 1 A None.
- 2 **Q** How many -- oh, so you didn't even try to
- 3 | talk to any of them?
- 4 **A** No.
- 5 **Q** Do you know how many of them are alive or
- 6 dead?
- 7 **A** No.
- 8 **Q** Did you do anything with regard to all this
- 9 paperwork and investigation that was done in '74?
- 10 **A** That was already completed by the
- 11 investigators during that time, so I didn't go back on
- 12 what they already did.
- 13 Q Well, correct me if I'm wrong, you got
- 14 Mr. Ferrara's, what you believe are Mr. Ferrara's
- prints, on the outside of the garage door; right?
- 16 **A** Correct.
- 17 **Q** Nothing on the interior?
- 18 **A** No.
- 19 **Q** But you got DNA now that you found in the
- 20 house; right?
- 21 **A** We have a cigarette butt that was found in
- 22 the house days later.
- 23 **Q** Well, wait a minute. Wait a minute. Once

- again, see, I love that you're looking back at this 39 years later. Exhibit R, pick it up again. Take a look at it. I want to make sure we're clear. They made a big deal about making sure that anybody that could've touched that cigarette was eliminated; right?
- A Correct.
  - Q So you don't think it's a big deal now; right? Do you even test for DNA now, or do you just go out and dust for fingerprints these days?
- 10 A No. We do DNA.
  - Q It isn't your testimony that you think fingerprints are a bigger deal than DNA right now, do you?
    - **A** I think it's just as good.
    - Q Just as good. All right. Did you review the file with regard to Richard Gelbke and Frederick Gelbke?
- **A** Yes.
  - Q You did? Was there not, in fact, a witness who says that these guys came to his house, and one of them put blood on the door the morning of the murder?
- MS. DOHERTY: Objection.
  - THE COURT: Let me see counsel.

1	(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among
2	court and counsel off the record and out of
3	the hearing of the jury and court reporter,
4	after which the proceedings continued as
5	follows:)
6	THE COURT: Objection's overruled.
7	MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	May I approach again?
9	THE COURT: Yes.
10	(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit M was
11	marked for identification.)
12	BY MR. MERANTO:
13	Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as
14	Defense Exhibit M. Okay. Do you recall this?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Okay. So there's an informant that contacts
17	the department, and they say, hey, these Gelbke
18	brothers worked for me, and they showed up at my house
19	in what looked like the victim in this case, Marilyn
20	Marsh's car. And by the way, when they left, there's
21	blood on my door; right?
22	A Correct.
23	<b>Q</b> And you're telling me you didn't do anything

- 1 to go back and investigate these guys, or submit their
  2 DNA or anything like that?
  - A No. Gelbke's prints were eliminated as prints found at the crime scene.
- Well, eliminated from which one? The ones on the outer door or --
  - **A** The door, yes.
    - Q Okay. But they got DNA now. I guess what I'm asking you is, did you ever think about applying today's technology to yesterday's evidence with anybody except Mr. Ferrara?
  - A If I'm correct, Gelbkes had a criminal record, so their prints would've been on file, and those prints would've hit on the fingerprint on the cigarette.
  - **Q** So once again, I'm going to ask you the question again.
- **A** No, I did not apply.
- **Q** You didn't do any further investigation of these guys?
- **A** No.
- **Q** No, not at all. Okay. How about did you
  23 hear anything about a robbery -- or excuse me, burglary

1 | that took place at that house about six years earlier?

2 **A** Yes, I did.

Q Okay. And some coins were stolen; correct?

A Correct.

5 **THE COURT:** At that house, at that Marsh

house?

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. MERANTO: Yes, at the Marsh house,

Judge. May I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit L was

marked for identification.)

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

Q That's Exhibit L, Defense Exhibit L. Is that a guy named Pete Wallace Kithkart?

A Yes, it is.

Q And if you looked at the first page, there's a B & E report where the guy broke the glass in the

garage door for entry. You see that?

A Yes.

20 **Q** And do you recall they did an investigation

21 of Mr. Kithkart because someone said he had all kinds

of money in his locker at GM, and it was a coin

23 collection, wasn't it?

- 1 A I believe so, yes.
- 2 **Q** Did you do anything with Mr. Kithkart?
- $3 \quad \blacksquare \quad A \qquad \text{No, sir.}$

4

5

- Q Did you go check out his DNA, see if it was in that house?
- 6 **A** No, sir.
- 7 MR. MERANTO: Judge, may I approach
- 8 again, please?
- 9 THE COURT: Yes.
- 10 (WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit I was
- 11 marked for identification.)

#### 12 BY MR. MERANTO:

- I'm going to show you Defense Exhibit I.

  Take a look through that. Once again I apologize to
- 15 the court and the jury that -- I mean, there's a lot of
- 16 paperwork here. Do you recall this?
- 17 **A** Yes.
- 18 Q Okay. And, in fact, in your detective notes,
- 19 you -- this is actually something you talked to Ed
- 20 Nemeth about, isn't it?
- 21 **A** Correct.
- 22 **Q** Okay. So once again, correct me if I'm
- 23 wrong, there's all kind of -- by the way, let me set

- - **A** Correct.

- And in fairness that you didn't investigate anybody, there were some, I don't even want to call them crack pot calls, but you had somebody that called and said a psychic told them who did it; right?
- A Yes.
- Q And there probably wasn't much investigation done about that suspect, right, as you recall?
- **A** As I recall.
- And it would probably be the same today. You might make a phone call or something, but you're not going to go spend man hours on something like that; right?
- **A** Correct.
- **Q** But in this case, you got an informant,
  18 right, that says he overhears a guy at a bar talking
  19 about the murders; right?
- **A** That's what the report says, yes.
- Q Well, once again, do you have any reason to doubt the veracity or the trustworthiness of these
- 23 reports?

- 1 A No, I do not.
- 6 correct?

- A Correct.
- They heard, well, maybe we went there and thought the same people were living there, we thought we'd make another score on the coin collection, and it was the wrong people, and maybe that's what happened; correct?
- 13 **A** Yes.
- 14 **Q** Okay. So General Motors is investigating.
- 15 They're involved in this, too, aren't they?
- 16 **A** Correct.
- And Ed Nemeth gets a tip from an informant

  who says, hey, they're gonna steal GM's investigation
- 19 file of the Marsh murders; correct?
- 20 **A** Correct.
- 21 **Q** So Detective Nemeth and GM, they devise a 22 plan; correct?
- 23 **A** You're correct.

- 1 **Q** Where they get GM security to get the actual 2 file and hide it?
- 3 **A** Correct.
- 4 **Q** And make a dummy file and put a dummy witness name in it; correct?
- 6 **A** Correct.
- 7 **Q** And say that that witness is in a room at the Penn-Ohio Motel out in North Lima?
- 9 A Correct.
- 10 **Q** Lo and behold, a car's broken into at GM, and
- 11 that file is, in fact, stolen; is it not?
- 12 **A** Correct.
- 13 **Q** They then -- the Mahoning County Sheriff's
- Department, and Ed Nemeth, they set up a sting
- operation at the Penn-Ohio Motel; correct?
- 16 **A** Correct.
- 17 **Q** Wherein Ed Nemeth is in a room, pretending to
- 18 be the witness, and they have officers all around
- 19 staking out that hotel?
- 20 **A** Correct.
- 21 **Q** Yes? First day, nothing happens; right?
- 22 Second day, nothing happens. Third day, they see
- 23 individuals that match the description of one Bob

- 1 Parks, one Paul Parks, one Ed Farris; correct?
- 2 **A** Correct.
- And those were, in fact, the names that were being thrown around at the Tropics bar, which initially started this whole thing with regard to these suspects?
  - **A** Correct.

- So Ed Nemeth gets a call in the room and answers the phone, and whoever it is just hangs up on him?
- 10 **A** Correct.
- 11 **Q** Basically trying to verify that he's, in
- 12 | fact, in the room. Uses the witness' name; correct?
- 13 **A** Correct.
- 14 **Q** Those guys are going to that room, and the deputies swoop in, and they arrest them; correct?
- 16 **A** Correct.
- 17 **Q** And it is Ed Farris, Paul Parks, Bob Parks?
- 18 **A** Correct.
- 19 Q It's interesting because there's no guns
- 20 found on those guys; correct?
- 21 **A** Correct.
- 22 **Q** But if you look back in those pages, part of
- 23 this investigation, another informant told them, well,

- William Span, S-P-A-N, William Span was down the street with the guns. He had the guns because they were going to grab this witness and kill them. That's what the informant said; right?
- 5 **A** Correct.

6

7

8

9

10

- Q So they arrest those guys, and I don't know who, someone says you want to take a lie detector test, they say absolutely, yeah, we'll do that; right? And then a famous name appears, Carmen Policy shows up representing somebody; right?
- **A** I believe so.
- 12 **Q** And all the sudden, that's the end of it?
- 13 **A** Yes.
- 14 **Q** You don't hear anything else about those quys; correct?
- 16 **A** Correct.
- And by the way, you've got another informant there who's a deputy, I believe, that says Farris was at his house with the file in his possession, the stolen file; right?
- 21 **A** Yes.
- 22 **Q** And you talked to Ed Nemeth, and Ed Nemeth 23 said to you -- this is a couple years ago?

witness; right? That's it?

A Yes.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- 2 Ed Nemeth says to you, well, yeah, they
  3 said -- they were kind of mad about their names being
  4 thrown around, so they just wanted to talk to the
  - A Yes, they -- he had said that upon questioning they were mad because their names were being associated with killing a woman and a child, and that's why they were --
  - Q So they were just gonna go kill the guy that was saying it about them; is that it?
  - A I don't know if they were going to kill him or not.
    - Q Well, I mean, I give you some examples of some pretty good -- let's go, once again, back to the '70s. Pretty good evidence against some people; right? Except no fingerprints.
- 18 A I don't know if it's good evidence.
- 19 **Q** Well, the jury will decide that. I mean, you 20 say what you want.
- 21 **A** Right.
- 22 **Q** You think it's -- you think those are bad 23 examples. You want me to use some more examples? On

- - A Well, I know that the Parks brothers'
- 4 | fingerprints weren't in that house because they were
- 5 eliminated upon comparison. Mr. Span, his fingerprints
- 6 were examined and cleared, and his prints weren't in
- 7 | that house. I mean --
- 8 **Q** And neither were Mr. Ferrara's in that house?
- 9 **A** Ferrara's were found at the house.
- 10 **Q** In the house you said. Was his prints found
- 11 in the house?
- 12 **A** They were at the house.
- Okay. At the house, on the outside door.
- 14 You say.

- 15 **A** That he's never been to, yes.
- 16 Q Uh-huh. Tell me about the DNA of Mr. Parks,
- 17 both Parks brothers.
- 18 **A** I have no idea about the DNA.
- 19 **Q** Never checked it; right?
- 20 **A** No.
- 21 **Q** Never bothered?
- 22 **A** No.
- 23 **Q** That DNA's in the house, though; right?

- 1 Where were the murders committed? In the garage?
- 2 **A** In the house.
- 3 **Q** Outside the garage?
- 4 **A** In the house.
- All right. You would agree with me that there's 167 names listed there, but some of these then go on to list associates?
  - A Correct.
- 12 **A** Right.

guys; right?

8

- Do you know if they were investigated, checked or anything at that time?
- 15 **A** I have no idea.
- And once again, we know you didn't do anything at this time with any of those names?
- 18 **A** Right.
- You didn't make a phone call about any one of those 167 or more people, did you?
- 21 **A** No.
- 22 **Q** Because you have a fingerprint, that's it.
- 23 From time to time, he said he wasn't there?

Α	Correct.

2.1

**Q** No DNA, though; right?

A No DNA.

MR. MERANTO: All right. Nothing else. Thank you.

**THE COURT:** Do you have any redirect?

MS. DOHERTY: I do.

THE COURT: All right. We're going to take a recess before that takes place.

Ladies and gentlemen, during your absence from the courtroom, please remember the admonitions. You're not to discuss the case at all among yourselves or with anyone else. Please do not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence. You're not to form or express any opinion about this case until it's finally submitted to you.

We'll be in recess until 10:30.

(WHEREUPON, a brief recess was had, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: All right. Do you still wish to redirect this witness, Ms. Doherty?

23

	REDIRECT/MON	DORA		
1		MS. DOHERTY:	Yes, Your H	onor. Thank
2	λo	u.		
3	REDIRECT EXA	MINATION		
4	BY MS. DOHER	TY:		
5	<b>Q</b> De	tective Mondora,	I have some	follow-up
6	questions fo	r you.		
7	<b>A</b> Ok	ay.		
8	<b>Q</b> At	torney Meranto a	sked you abo	ut the
9	ballistics a	nd the fact that	Andy Chappe	ll tested those
10	submissions	and indicated th	at they were	from a .38;
11	right?			
12	<b>A</b> Ye	s.		
13	<b>Q</b> In	your review of	the file and	all of the BCI
14	analysis bac	k to 1974, were	those items	analyzed during
15	that time?			
16	<b>A</b> Ye	S.		
17	Q I'	m going to show	you what's b	een marked as
18	State's Exhi	bit 63.		
19		MS. DOHERTY:	Can I appro	ach?
20		THE COURT: Y	eah. You sh	ould do it
21	be	fore you get up	there.	
22		MS. DOHERTY:	I know.	

THE COURT: I'd really like you to

1	remember the rules of this court.
2	MS. DOHERTY: I know, Judge.
3	THE COURT: Well, I know's not good
4	enough for me. I want you to follow the
5	rules; okay?
6	MS. DOHERTY: I will absolutely do that.
7	THE COURT: Thank you.
8	(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 63 was
9	marked for identification.)
LO	BY MS. DOHERTY:
L1	Q Can you tell us what that exhibit is if you
L2	recognize it?
L3	A This is a BCI submission sheet or response
L4	sheet from the BCI to O.T. DiLullo who is a
L5	investigator for the Sheriff's Department after the
L6	Marsh homicide.
L7	<b>Q</b> All right. And were those projectiles
L8	analyzed?
L9	A Six bullets. They were .38 special, 148
20	grain, lead, Remington wad cutters. They were all
21	fired from the same weapon.
22	<b>Q</b> All right. So long prior to Andy Chappell
23	looking at that information, you had information in the

- file indicating that they were fired from a .38; correct?
- Back in the initial investigation, yes, they did that.
- 5 **Q** And the analyst on that exhibit is who?
- 6 A Henry Dombrowski.
- 7 **Q** Is he available to testify, or has he passed away?
- 9 A I believe he's passed away, according to 10 Mr. Chappell.
- All right. You were asked about a composite that was put together back in 19 -- actually, 1975; correct?
- 14 **A** Correct.
- I'm going to show you Defense Exhibit U. Is that what this is? U?
- 17 MR. MERANTO: Yes.
- 18 MS. DOHERTY: It kind of looks like a 6,
- but it's a U; right?
- 20 MS. WEIBLING: I'm sorry. It's a U.
- 21 **MS. DOHERTY:** Can I approach, Judge?
- 22 **THE COURT:** Yes.
- 23 BY MS. DOHERTY:

- 1 **Q** What date was the vehicle, Mrs. Marsh's 2 orange Vega, discovered in the K-mart parking lot?
- 3 **A** I believe it was the night the victims were 4 found.
  - **Q** So December 13th, 1974?
- No. It would be the 14th. They were found on the 14th.
- 8 **Q** Yeah, 14th.
- 11 Q All right. And what is the date that
- 12 Mrs. Informer was interviewed according to that report?
- 13 **A** January 20th, 1975.
- 14 **Q** The composite that is -- I guess was created based upon her information, is it included within that
- 16 exhibit?

- 17 **A** Yes, it is.
- 18 **Q** And you were also shown an exhibit with the newspaper article; correct?
- 20 **A** Yeah. Correct.
- 21 **Q** From 1980. Are those two composite drawings
- 22 the same?
- No. No, they're not.

- Do you know where the one from the newspaper came from?
  - **A** No, I do not.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

You were shown the suspect at that time, suspect list, Defense Exhibits F and E. Actually, E is the elimination. I'm going to show you these. I have a couple questions on them.

MS. DOHERTY: Can I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

- Exhibits for the defense, E and F. First of all, I'm going to refer to the -- I think it's E, the one with the suspect list, the thicker one with a lot of pages. Is that the one you have?
- **A** F is the thicker one.
- Q Okay. That's the one I need then.
- 17 **A** Okay.
- 18 **Q** In some -- alongside a lot of those names --
- that's the list of 160 some names; correct?
- 20 **A** Correct.
- 21 **Q** And in your review of the files, and there 22 are voluminous files, were all of those persons
- 23 eliminated one way or another?

- 3 **Q** Okay. And either through fingerprints;
- 4 correct?
- 5 **A** Correct.
- 6 Q Or some of them in your review of the file 7 are dead?
- 8 A I believe so, yes.
- 11 **A** Correct.
- Okay. Defense Exhibit E that lists the elimination by fingerprints, look at that list.
- 14 **| A** E?
- 15 **Q** Yeah. And does that include family members of Marilyn and Ben Marsh?
- 17 **A** Yes.
- 18 **Q** So they're looking at everybody?
- 19 **A** Correct.
- 20 **Q** I mean, at least for elimination purposes
- 21 because they have latent prints that they don't know
- 22 who they belong to?
- 23 **A** Correct.

Q Okay. The cigarette, the L & M long cigarette, did you have the opportunity to review the submission to BCI and the report from BCI originally when it was submitted back in 1974?

A Yes.

Q All right.

MS. DOHERTY: Can I approach, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

(WHEREUPON, State's Exhibit No. 64 was marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. DOHERTY:

Q I'm going to hand you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 64. Can you tell us if you recognize that and what it is?

A It's a submission sheet from Detective Nemeth dated 2/25 of '75 including one fingerprint card of a suspect and one L & M long cigarette, and it says here the names of the following for comparison to items previously submitted on 1/23 of '75.

All right. And then the next page, does that analysis eliminate as suspects those people listed?

A Let's see. It says one fingerprint card of

A Let's see. It says one fingerprint card of the suspect, John Sirohman and one L & M long

1 cigarette. The names of the following for comparison 2 previously submitted. And it says the latent print was 3 compared with inked impressions of the above 4 individuals. The results revealed no identification. 5 All right. And I guess the whole point, 6 unfortunately I took too long to get there, was the 7 date of the submission to BCI of that L & M long 8 cigarette was what? 9 A 2/25/75. 10 Q All right. So almost a month after the 11 Marshes' bodies were found; correct? 12 Α Yes. 13 More than a month? Q 14 Α A month and a half. 15 Q Okay. 16 MS. DOHERTY: Can I approach, Judge? 17 THE COURT: You may. 18 (WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 65, 70 19 & 71 were marked for identification.) 20 BY MS. DOHERTY: 2.1 Q I'm going to hand you a bunch so I don't have to keep doing this. State's Exhibit 65, 70, and 71. 22 23 I'm going to have you first look at 65 and tell us what

1		
	that	lS.
L	Luat	T : 0 •

- A It's a \$10,000 reward notice that was sent out by the Mahoning County Sheriff's office for information regarding the Marsh murders.
- Q All right. And in your experience as a police officer, does the indication that there is a reward, maybe a monetary reward available, bring a lot of maybe useful, but unuseful tips?
  - A Correct.
- Q Okay. And in your review of all of these binders, the police received a lot of tips from psychics and informants and everything else; correct?
- **A** Correct.
- **Q** But never was an arrest made?
- **A** No.
- In your review of the files, was there an indication -- and talking to witnesses, was there an indication that the Marshes had had a bridge party the evening before?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** State's Exhibit 70 I believe that I handed 22 you, can you tell us what that is?
- **A** It's dated 8/18 of '76. Below are listed

- persons, comparison for latent prints found on the L &

  M cigarette.
- All right. And what does that list consist of? Even in '76 they were still reviewing that information?
  - A Correct. It's a list of individuals who have either been arrested by Youngstown Police Department or the Mahoning County Sheriff's office.
  - Q Okay. And the second exhibit I gave you, 71 maybe?
  - **A** Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

- 12 **Q** What is that?
- These are submissions and elimination —

  these are the names of individuals that were submitted

  by the Mahoning County Sheriff and then followed up by

  BCI telling them that the prints did not match the ones

  found at the crime scene.
  - Q All right. And not just the cigarette, but the prints on the back door; correct?
- 20 **A** Correct.
- 21 **Q** And I think you said, you know, the prints
  22 back then and now were a big deal for a police officer;
  23 fair to say?

I A COLLECT		Α	Correct
-------------	--	---	---------

Q The questions regarding the burglary at the Marshes' home six years prior to this -- these homicides, did the Marshes even live there six years before?

A No.

Q Was it concluded by the detectives in your review of the reports and with the elimination of any suspect connected to that crime, that it was unrelated? That burglary six years before was unrelated to these crimes?

MR. MERANTO: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A Correct.

You were asked about Paul Parks, his brother, and Ed Farris by Attorney Meranto. Were they excluded as well as contributors to the fingerprints on the back door of the residence, as well as the L & M cigarette?

All of them have criminal records, so their

prints would've been on file, and they were compared to the prints from the scene and the cigarette, and they

did not match.

**Q** Okay.

### RECROSS/MONDORA 1 MS. DOHERTY: Can I approach, Judge? 2 THE COURT: You may. 3 (WHEREUPON, State's Exhibits Nos. 66-68 4 were marked for identification.) 5 BY MS. DOHERTY: 6 All right. I'm going to show you State's Q 7 Exhibits -- you tell me what they are because they're 8 buried now underneath there. What exhibit number is 9 that? 10 67, 68, and 66. Α 11 Q All right. And have you reviewed the 12 contents of all of those binders? 13 Α Yes, ma'am. Yes, I have. 14 And in your review, up until 2009 when the Q 15 fingerprints located on that back door of the Marshes' 16 residence matched those of James Ferrara, was anyone 17 ever arrested, charged with these crimes? 18 Α No. 19 Were they all eliminated in one way or Q 20 another? 21 Α Yes. 22 **THE COURT:** What's going on now?

Judge, I'm sorry.

I'm

MS. DOHERTY:

2.1

just making sure I covered all the exhibits and had them right. I don't have anything further, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Do you have any recross?

MR. MERANTO: Yeah, Judge. I'll try to be brief, but I don't know.

### RECROSS EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. MERANTO:

Ms. Doherty just mentioned a bridge party. She mentioned a bridge party I think to infer that maybe someone else dropped that cigarette. Didn't they, in fact, go talk to one of the people at the bridge party, and she said no, it was a cookie baking party, and nobody smoked? Do you recall that?

A I don't recall that, no.

**Q** You don't recall that. But you recall the bridge party, though?

A I recall a party. I don't recall if it was cookie or bridge.

**Q** And you don't recall them going back and verifying that nobody smoked at that party?

A No, I do not.

- 1 Q Of course. Okay. Grab F if you would,
- 2 please. Do you got it over there, or did she grab it
- 3 back? I think you have it up there, Detective. My
- 4 Defense F.
- 5 **A** No, I don't. Oh, wait. Hold on.
- 6 Q Mine would be the blue ones.
- 7 **|| A** F.
- 8 **Q** Got it?
- 9 **A** E, F. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q Okay. Let's go through this. Go down to No.
- 11 12.
- 12 **A** 12, Paul Cole.
- 13 **Q** Yeah. How was he excluded?
- 14 **A** It doesn't say he was excluded.
- 15 **Q** I thought you just told Ms. Doherty that
- 16 everybody on this list has been excluded one way or
- 17 | another?
- 18 **A** That's not what I said.
- 19 **Q** So that's not true?
- 20 **A** No.
- 21 **Q** Okay. Let's go down to No. 14, Jeff
- 22 Fitzpatrick.
- 23 **A** Right. There's no X next to him.

- 1 Q John McGeehen, Mike Cavucci, Mark Cavucci, 2 Joe Colello. You want me to go on?
- 3 Α No.

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

- 4 Q So there's a ton of people that haven't been 5 excluded. You can't tell me anything about that?
- 6 I can't tell you why they were excluded by Α 7 the investigator at that too.
  - You can't tell me anything about it because Q you didn't do anything further to find out about it, did you?
- 11 Α No, I did not.
- 12 Q And once again, the ones that were excluded 13 were excluded by way of either fingerprints or the 14 photo?
  - Well, it just says photo. To me that could Α mean that they have a photo of that person. doesn't mean they were excluded by, I would say.
- Well, gee, you didn't ask Ed Nemeth that, did Q 19 Because I didn't see that anywhere in the notes. you?
- 20 Α No.
- 21 Q Okay. So you're just speculating at this 22 point?
  - Α I'm just going by here it doesn't say they

- 1 were eliminated by photograph. It doesn't say that.
- 2 It just says that there's a photo.
- 3 Q So you don't think they were eliminated by
- 4 use of the photo?
- 5 **A** I don't know that.
- 6 Q Grab Exhibit No. U again if you would. About
- 7 | five lines up, Mrs. Informer says -- describes the
- 8 suspect that they use in these composites, everything?
- 9 **A** Correct.
- 10 Q How old does she say he is?
- 11 A I believe it's in his mid 40s to 50s. Yeah,
- 12 | 40s to early 50s.
- 13 **Q** Late 40s to early 50s?
- 14 **A** It says late 40s, early 50s, slender build.
- 15 **Q** And in your investigation, what year was
- 16 Mr. Ferrara born?
- 17 **A** I don't recall.
- 18 **Q** 49?
- 19 **A** Yes.
- 20 **Q** So he would've been 25 in '74?
- 21 **A** Correct.
- 22 **Q** Not late 40s, early 50s?
- 23 **A** This is just a -- she doesn't know where --

- 1 **Q** I know. She doesn't know anything. Nobody
  2 knows anything except the fingerprint, right, in your
  3 estimation?
  - $oldsymbol{A}$  Right.

4

7

- 5 **Q** This is all worthless? Those guys shouldn't even have got paid probably for what they did, huh?
  - A The fingerprint didn't come into play until 2009.
- 9 Q Okay. Ms. Doherty handed you something that
  10 says that that cigarette was submitted in February;
  11 right?
- 12 **A** February 25th.
- Okay. Does it say when it was found at the scene?
- 15 **A** No.
- Okay. So you don't think it was found in February and, what, someone grabbed it and drove it right up there that day?
- 19 **A** I don't believe that, no.
- 20 Q Okay. It's trying to infer maybe that it
  21 wasn't found maybe in conjunction with the
  22 investigation?
- 23 **A** No.

### 732 RECROSS/MONDORA 1 You would agree with me that that was found in conjunction with the investigation of this crime? 2 3 Α Correct. 4 Q Was submitted as a piece of physical 5 evidence; correct? 6 MS. DOHERTY: I object. 7 THE COURT: Overruled. 8 Yes? Q 9 A Correct. And was used extensively. In fact, they took 10 Q painstaking efforts to exclude anybody who could've 11 12 been at that scene and touched or smoked or held that 13 cigarette. That was a big deal. 14 Α Yes. And it was then tested for DNA in the modern 15 Q 16 era; right? 17 A Correct. 18 MR. MERANTO: Okay. Nothing else. 19 THE COURT: Anything else from the 20 state?

\* \* \* \* \*

21

	FURTHER REDIRECT/MONDORA
1	FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MS. DOHERTY:
3	Q The cigarette, L & M cigarette that was
4	submitted by February 25th, 1975, is there any
5	indication where it was found on that submission?
6	A No.
7	Q Any indication who it was found by?
8	A No.
9	MS. DOHERTY: I have nothing further.
10	
11	* * * *
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

## FURTHER RECROSS/MONDORA

FURTHE	R RECROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR.	MERANTO:
Q	Well, you read through the investigative and
detect	ive notes, didn't you?
A	Yes.
Q	Wasn't it in fact found near a pile of ashes
in the	front room of the house?
A	There were ashes on the floor, yes.
Q	Yeah. They thought somebody was smoking, and
there	was speculation that maybe they got left at the
scene,	were waiting for a ride or something, and that's
where	they found it; correct?
A	All that's documented is they had found ashes
on the	floor.
	MR. MERANTO: Thank you. Nothing else.
	MS. DOHERTY: I don't have anything
	else, Judge.
	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.
	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
	THE COURT: Do you have any further
	evidence to present?
	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, the state
	rests subject to admission of the exhibits.

2.1

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, the court needs to meet with counsel out of your presence, so I'm going to have you go back to the jury room and remain there on recess. When I say remain there, I want you to be available in case this doesn't take too long. If it's going to take any amount of time, then we'll make some other plan.

But please, during your absence from the courtroom, you're not to discuss the case at all among yourselves or with anyone else.

You must not discuss the case with any of the other members of the jury. Please don't form or express any opinion about the case. The jury will be in recess.

(WHEREUPON, the jury left the courtroom, and the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: All right. Everyone can be seated. So are you going to introduce your exhibits or what?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, we would move to admit State's Exhibits 1 and 2.

THE COURT: Just tell me all of the exhibits that you're -- we're not going to do these one by one, because the defense may not object to anything, and then it's stupid to do them one by one. Read the numbers of the exhibits that you're submitting.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. I'm going to submit 1 and 2. 3 will be withdrawn because we did not talk about a 3. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. We're going to withdraw 16 through 21 because we didn't talk about those. Those were not introduced.

THE COURT: They were never introduced, so you're not withdrawing them. They were never --

MS. CANTALAMESSA: I just want to be clear for the record, we never talked about them.

**THE COURT:** Okay. They were never talked about.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: We move to introduce 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39. 40 we move to

admit, but we don't want it to go to the jury. They're bullets. They're projectiles. And 41, same thing, move to admit but not go back to the jury. 42. 43 we move to admit but not go back to the jury, and that includes — going back to 41, it includes 41A, B, C, D, E, and F, and then 43 has A through I. We move to admit those but not go back to the jury. Your Honor, we move to admit 44 and 45 but not go back to the jury.

THE COURT: I'm not sure what that means, admit them but not go back to the jury. What purpose is there in that?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Well, I want to admit them for legal purposes and for appeals purposes.

THE COURT: Well, they're -- yeah, if they're not admitted -- if the jury's not going to see them, they're still available for whatever appellate review there is, aren't they?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: They should be.

MS. DOHERTY: Yes.

1	MR. MERANTO: The ones that aren't
2	admitted aren't, because if you don't admit
3	something, it's going to be there for a
4	purpose.
5	<b>THE COURT:</b> The only reason I'm
6	admitting anything is for the jury to see.
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay.
8	THE COURT: What is this group
9	participation again? You forgot that part?
10	MS. DOHERTY: I'm sorry.
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Then we'll withdraw
12	those by
13	THE COURT: Man, I'm having trouble.
14	Didn't she get a rule sheet, Ryan?
15	THE BAILIFF: They were provided.
16	THE COURT: Huh?
17	THE BAILIFF: I believe they
18	THE COURT: Answer the question. Was
19	she provided a rule sheet?
20	THE BAILIFF: Previously, yes.
21	THE COURT: Previously, what does that
22	mean? For this case?
23	THE BAILIFF: Not for this case.

1	THE COURT: Go get one and give it to
2	her, please.
3	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Going back to 46, 47,
4	48. We'll withdraw 49.
5	THE COURT: 46, 47, 48 were never
6	testified to; is that right?
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: No. These were
8	testified to.
9	THE COURT: They were, but you're
10	withdrawing them?
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: No. We didn't 49
12	was never testified to.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Let's go back to 46.
14	I'm sorry.
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: That's all right.
16	We'll move to admit, 46, 47, 48.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MS. CANTALAMESSA: 49 was never
19	testified about.
20	THE COURT: Okay. So that's out.
21	MS. CANTALAMESSA: We move to admit 50.
22	51, 52, 53, 54, 55 through 59 were never
23	testified about.

1	<b>THE COURT:</b> 51 to 59?
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right.
3	THE COURT: They're out.
4	MS. CANTALAMESSA: We move to admit
5	60
6	THE COURT: Okay. Well, here's where
7	I'm lost because there's nothing listed for
8	what that is. So tell me what that is as we
9	go through the rest of these exhibits,
LO	please.
L1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: No. 60 is the diagram
2	that was shown on the
L3	THE COURT: The diagram sketch?
L 4	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Correct, Your Honor.
L5	THE COURT: Okay.
L6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: We're moving to admit
L7	it, but we're cutting off the portion that
18	has typed notes on it, because that was never
L9	shown.
20	THE COURT: It has typed what?
21	MS. CANTALAMESSA: It has typed notes at
22	the top of it. <b>THE COURT:</b> Just the sketch you're
()	TAR COURT: JUST THE SKELCH VOU'TE

1	moving to admit?
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right. We'll redact
3	that top portion.
4	THE COURT: All right.
5	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Withdrawing 61 and
6	62. Can I have one second, Your Honor?
7	THE COURT: Ryan, go back and tell the
8	jury we'll be until 11:30. They can move
9	about. Just be back in the jury room by
LO	11:30.
L1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: 63, move to admit.
L2	THE COURT: What is it?
L3	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Oh, I'm sorry. It is
L4	a BCI report from 1976.
L5	THE COURT: Okay.
L6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: 64, a BCI submission
L7	sheet from 1975.
L8	THE COURT: Okay.
L9	MS. CANTALAMESSA: 65, the we'll
20	withdraw that.
21	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Withdraw 66 which is
22	a notebook. 67 is a notebook of suspects.
2.3	And 68, a notebook of suspects.

1	THE COURT: And that's what?
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Withdrawing those,
3	66, 67, and 68. 69 was never testified
4	about. 70, move to admit.
5	THE COURT: What is it?
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: It is a elimination
7	sheet of officers from 1976.
8	THE COURT: Eliminated sheet of
9	officers? Is that what you said?
10	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, for prints
11	purposes. They eliminated all these
12	officers.
13	THE COURT: Oh, okay. Yeah, I remember.
14	71?
15	MS. CANTALAMESSA: We're going to
16	withdraw 71. It was BCI submissions over the
17	years.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MS. CANTALAMESSA: And 72 was never
20	testified about. It's not on your sheet
21	anyway.
22	THE COURT: Okay. So there is no 72?
23	MS. CANTALAMESSA: No. That's it.

THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Meranto, will
you go through these and tell me if you have
objections to any of them and deal with that.
MR. MERANTO: I object to 7 and 8. They
can have one, not the other.
THE COURT: Objection to 1 or no?
MR. MERANTO: No objection to 1, 2, 3
MS. CANTALAMESSA: There's no 3.
THE COURT: 3's withdrawn.
MS. CANTALAMESSA: It's 4.
MR. MERANTO: 4. Excuse me.
THE COURT: You have no objection to 1,
2 and 4?
MR. MERANTO: Correct. No objection to
5. Object to 6 and 7. I think they should
get one but not both of them, so I object to
both of them.
THE COURT: Which one do you want?
MS. CANTALAMESSA: 7, Your Honor.
Although, they are different photographs. I
mean
THE COURT: That's nice. Which one do
you want?

1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: 7.
2	THE COURT: Okay. 8?
3	MR. MERANTO: Judge, I object to 8.
4	They're in conjunction with 8 and
5	THE COURT: 8 and 12?
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: 8 and 12.
7	MR. MERANTO: Once again, I think
8	they're redundant. I would say give them one
9	but not the other.
10	THE COURT: Yes, I agree.
11	MS. CANTALAMESSA: We'd like 12 then,
12	Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Okay. 8 is out. 12 is in.
14	Okay. 9, 10, 11?
15	MR. MERANTO: 9's good. No objection.
16	10's good. No objection. 11.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. MERANTO: 13. Same thing, Judge,
19	with regard to 14 and 15, they're both
20	Mr. Marsh in the bed.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Which one do you
22	want?
23	MS. CANTALAMESSA: 15, Your Honor, we'll

take that.

THE COURT: Okay. So 14 is out. 15 is in. All right.

MR. MERANTO: We'd object to 22 through 36. These are the autopsy photos, and these are what we had the discussion with regard to Dr. Ohr. Once again, I don't think they're in for any other purpose than to shock the jury.

THE COURT: Okay. What's the state's response to that?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, we had them identified by Mr. Boyle, their face shots, to identify who the autopsies were actually performed on, and that's the specific reason we had Mr. Boyle testify to them.

THE COURT: Yeah, I understand. You have his testimony, and there were autopsies performed on all of them. Why does the jury have to see an autopsy photo?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Well, they see the --

**THE COURT:** Because they've got these

other photos of these folks lying dead.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Well, they can see the exact location of the injuries by seeing all the autopsy photos. At least each --

THE COURT: All that was testified to; correct?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Correct.

THE COURT: I don't want to allow photos in that are going to incite the jury or prejudice the jury, and you should have that same concern. I just -- Mr. Meranto didn't object to the photos of these folks lying dead in the home, one or the other, in each of those situations. But he is objecting to these other photos.

So autopsy photos are normally admissible for the probative value to show — or to demonstrate, show the wounds. You do have to prove serious physical harm. All of these matters were questioned by the defense, so I'll allow one autopsy photo of each of these persons for purposes of showing the wounds. So what do you want regarding

23

1	Mr. Marsh?
2	
3	MR. MERANTO: Also, Judge, the objection
4	would extend to Exhibit No. 42 which was also
5	one of the autopsy photos.
6	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, we'll
7	take No. 42 with regard to Mr. Marsh.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	MS. CANTALAMESSA: No. 30 with regard to
10	Marilyn. And No. 33 with regard to Heather.
11	THE COURT: So regards Heather, 34, 35,
12	and 36 are out. With regards to Marilyn, 31
13	and 32 are out. And as regards Ben Marsh, 22
14	through 29 are out. Everybody on the same
15	page there?
16	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yeah.
17	THE COURT: Okay. So we're into the
18	coroner's report.
19	MR. MERANTO: I object to the coroner's
20	reports going in, Judge. Testified to. 37,
21	38, and 39.
22	THE COURT: What's the state's response?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, they are

self-authenticating documents. They are business records. They show the injuries. We would, of course, redact the history that's included.

THE COURT: Yes. The history will be redacted, and the court will want the redaction --

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: -- to be completed before jury instructions are given and for both sides to approve them with the redactions so we don't have any issues on somebody forgetting to do that.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So we're on 40 and 41. You want it admitted but not go back to the jury?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Well, they're the bullets. We'll withdraw those, Your Honor, so that they say --

THE COURT: With the understanding, you can file them with the reporter. They should be a part of the record. My belief in that

1	regard, we're only going to admit them so the
2	jury can see them. If you're not doing
3	that
4	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yeah. I don't want
5	them to open them.
6	THE COURT: Well, you know, given the
7	testimony concerning deterioration of those
8	projectiles, who knows what issues there may
9	be in the future.
10	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right.
11	THE COURT: All right. So those are not
12	in. All right. You withdrew 43; is that
13	right?
14	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Is that the same thing, same
16	type of thing?
17	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Same thing.
18	THE COURT: And you have BCI reports,
19	44, 45?
20	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right. I put them
21	over here. Withdrawn.
22	MR. MERANTO: Oh, you withdrew them?
23	THE COURT: Robin Ladd, Andrew Chappell.

1	MR. MERANTO: Okay. Those are out.
2	THE COURT: Those are withdrawn.
3	MR. MERANTO: 46, 47, 48, and 50 without
4	objection.
5	<b>THE COURT:</b> 46, 47, 48. 49 was
6	withdrawn?
7	MR. MERANTO: Right.
8	THE COURT: And 50 is in. Okay. 51
9	through 59 are out. They were never
10	testified to.
11	MR. MERANTO: 60, again, they're going
12	to redact the portion with regard to any
13	notes I guess.
14	THE COURT: The diagram, you have no
15	objection to that?
16	MR. MERANTO: No.
17	THE COURT: Okay. That's in. 61 and 62
18	are out. 63 and 64 are BCI submissions.
19	MR. MERANTO: Objecting to 63.
20	THE COURT: What is it?
21	MR. MERANTO: Where the bullets were
22	tested. Chappell testified to something
23	completely different on the stand. Unless

they're going to submit Chappell, too,
because Chappell says they only got two
identifications. Four of them are .38s. Two
are from the same gun. This says it's all
six from the same gun. They heard both
evidence, so if they want to put them both in
they can put them both in, but they're not
putting one without the other, with all due
respect.
MS. CANTALAMESSA: Well, I'll move to
admit Mr. Chappell's report which is 45 then.
MR. MERANTO: Let me see if I didn't cut

MR. MERANTO: Let me see if I didn't cut
my head off --

THE COURT: 45 is the report of Chappell. So they're both in?

MR. MERANTO: No. I'd object to them both, Judge. I'm sorry. I apologize.

THE COURT: You're moving now to admit 45?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Well, if he was going to withdraw his objection to 63 if I admitted --

THE COURT: It was conditional.

1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Right.
2	MR. MERANTO: And I can't, Judge, so I'm
3	objecting to both. Testimony I believe was
4	testified to, and I think the jury will have
5	to recall that on their own.
6	THE COURT: I agree with that. So 63 is
7	out. The court sustains the objection.
8	Okay. 64 is what? Here's 63 here.
9	MR. MERANTO: Oh, I'm sorry, Judge. 64
10	I believe is an example of what was done in
11	167 names, and once again, we talked about
12	this and gave testimony. I would object to
13	this. Do you want to see it?
14	THE COURT: Yeah. I haven't seen any of
15	these exhibits. You are objecting to this?
16	MR. MERANTO: Yeah.
17	THE COURT: This is something that
18	somebody conducted long ago?
19	MR. MERANTO: Yes.
20	THE COURT: All right. I will sustain
21	the objection.
22	MR. MERANTO: No objection to 70.
23	THE COURT: All right. 65 through 69

1	are out; right?
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor. 70
3	there's no objection?
4	MR. MERANTO: Yes, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: And 71's withdrawn. Okay.
6	That takes care of exhibits. What else?
7	What else from the state?
8	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Nothing, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Anything from the defense?
10	MR. MERANTO: Yes, Judge. At this time,
11	the state having rested and moving for the
12	admission of their exhibits, I would ask that
13	the state grant me a motion for acquittal
14	pursuant to Criminal Rule 29.
15	THE COURT: State? They're not going to
16	do it, I can tell you right now.
17	MR. MERANTO: The
18	THE COURT: You want me to do it?
19	MR. MERANTO: I'd ask the court for I
20	already asked them, Judge. You're right.
21	They said no. They were very uncooperative.
22	THE COURT: They're not interested in
23	that. Well, tell me why you think this

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

should be -- you should have a directed verdict of acquittal.

MR. MERANTO: Judge, unless I missed it, there's testimony that purports to be a fingerprint that was taken from the crime scene on the night in question. Testimony as it came in, even if you were to -- well, strike that. No one can testify as to when that print was placed there, nor is there any direct testimony or evidence linking my client to the scene inside where the crimes took place other than the alleged fingerprint on the outside, which even in a light most favorable to the state, certainly the way in which they were taken, if they were, in fact, taken or observed, and the quality and testimony with regard to that foundation, the authentication is in serious question, from my point of view.

Other than that, Judge, I guess the state would argue that Mr. Ferrara stated he was never there. Well, that only goes to the fingerprint evidence. It's not an admission

of any sort. Then you have the fact that he has a predilection, if you believe Detective — or Deputy Fitzpatrick who testified that he after 40 years decided he wanted to give that information to somebody, so he decided to tell the deputy that he had a predilection for .38 specials, which once again, I would say may be some evidence, and obviously the court didn't exclude it, so believed that somehow it might be relevant, but certainly that is not an admission either.

So you are stuck at this point with a fingerprint on the exterior of that residence, taken at the time or about the time when these crimes were alleged -- well, certainly were committed. But no other evidence whatsoever linking Mr. Ferrara to the crime. I mean, as far as -- I know the standard is for you to view it in the light most favorable to the state, and I just find it hard to see how anybody could conclude based on that evidence that Mr. Ferrara is,

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

in fact, the guy who committed these murders.

THE COURT: To bridge that gap, to take that leap of faith from the evidence that is presented to finding beyond a reasonable doubt that this man murdered those three people?

MR. MERANTO: Correct.

**THE COURT:** What's the state's response?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, not -it's not just on any door that his fingerprints are found. His fingerprints are found at the point of entry, where the glass is broken, through another door by which he would have to go to kick in the door from the garage to the house. So he had to make entry at that point. That is an outside door. gets rained on, snowed on, wind on. His is the only print that's found on that door. And it's his -- not just one finger, not two Three fingers of his left hand, as if to push open that door when he opened it, when he broke that window. And just like any burglary where we have prints around the

#### MOTIONS

window or prints around a door at the point of entry and stuff stolen, here we have prints on the door at the point of entry, and three people murdered.

So this in a light most favorable to the state, the jury could find that the defendant is the only one there that could've committed these murders. He's the only one that's not involved at that scene. He's the only one who says he wasn't there, yet we have three of his left hand fingerprints on the door that was broken in to get entry to that house.

THE COURT: Rule 29, the court on motion of the defendant or on its own motion after the evidence on either side is closed, shall order the entry of a judgment of acquittal of one or more offenses charged in the indictment, if the evidence is insufficient to sustain a conviction of such offense or offenses. The court may not reserve ruling on a motion for judgment of acquittal made at the close of the state's case. This case is

#### MOTIONS

tried to a jury by choice of the defendant, not tried to the court. So the motion's overruled.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.

**THE COURT:** So what do you have?

MR. MERANTO: We have --

THE COURT: Now I call upon you to present evidence if you have any. Do you have any evidence?

MR. MERANTO: We do, Your Honor. We would like to call Ms. Gerardi from the BCI laboratory.

THE COURT: Okay. So let's do that.

(WHEREUPON, the jury returned to the courtroom, and the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: The state has rested its case. You folks can be seated, please. The state has rested its case, which means it's concluded the presentation of its evidence against the defendant. The defendant is now called upon to present evidence if he chooses. He's not required to present any

#### MOTIONS

evidence, because again, he does not bear any burden of proof. Does the defense wish to present any evidence?

MS. WEIBLING: Yes, Your Honor. At this time we would like to call Brenda Gerardi from BCI.

THE COURT: Very well.

THE BAILIFF: This witness objects to being photographed.

THE COURT: All right. You've got to stop over at the podium there to get sworn in; okay?

THE WITNESS: Sure.

THE COURT: Please raise your right hand.

\* \* \* \*

19

20

21

22

23

1 WHEREUPON, the Defendant called 2 3 BRENDA GERARDI, 4 5 who, being first duly sworn, testified as follows: 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Please be seated 8 here in the witness chair. You probably know 9 this, but these are the ladies and gentlemen 10 of the jury. They need to hear and 11 understand everything you have to say, so 12 please speak loudly and clearly enough for 13 them to understand your answers, and please 14 answer your questions out loud; all right? 15 THE WITNESS: All right. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 BY MS. WEIBLING:

Q Good morning, Mrs. Gerardi. I'm Attorney
Kristie Weibling. I have some questions for you this
morning. If you can't hear me or need me to repeat
something, just ask. Can you please state your full
name for the record?

- 1 A Brenda Gerardi, G-E-R-A-R-D-I.
- 2 **Q** Are you currently employed, Mrs. Gerardi?
- 3 **A** Yes.
- 4 **Q** And where are you employed?
- I'm employed with the Ohio Attorney General's office, Mike Dewine's office at the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation, commonly
- 8 referred to as BCI.
- 9 **Q** And what is your current position at BCI?
- 10 A My current position is DNA laboratory
- 11 supervisor.
- 12 **Q** And what department at BCI do you work in?
- 13 **A** The DNA section.
- Okay. And how long have you been a
- 15 supervisor at BCI?
- 16 **A** A year and a half.
- 17 **Q** What is your function as a supervisor?
- 18 A supervisor in the DNA section basically
- oversees all of the quality assurance program to ensure
- 20 that all cases that go out of our section are reviewed
- 21 and that the analyst had interpreted the result
- 22 reliably.
- 23 **Q** Prior to becoming supervisor, what was your

1 position at BCI?

- **Q** And as a forensic scientist in the DNA section, what were your job responsibilities?
  - A I analyzed physical evidence for the identification of physiological fluid such as blood, urine, feces, semen, and saliva, and I also did subsequent DNA analysis of those samples.
  - Q And can you explain for the jury what your educational background is, please?
    - A I have an associate of science in biology from Kent State University and a bachelor of science in biology also from Kent State University. I've continued I've completed continuing education in the areas of molecular biology, biochemistry, genetics, and statistics.
    - Q In order to perform your function as a DNA analyst, did you have to undergo any specialized training?
- **A** Yes. When I was hired at the Attorney
  22 General's office I went through an extensive -- it was
  23 about a year training in DNA analysis and

- interpretation. I also completed a course conducted by
  the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia in the areas of

  DNA analysis and interpretation.
  - Q While you were performing your job as a DNA analyst, were you required to take certain proficiency tests on a regular basis?
  - A Yes. Our section was required to take two proficiency tests a year.
  - **Q** Ms. Gerardi, in how many cases have you testified where evidence that you analyzed was used for purposes of trial?
- **A** I've testified over a hundred times.
- **Q** Ms. Gerardi, do you remember receiving any
  14 evidence related to this case from the Mahoning County
  15 Sheriff's Department in June of 2009?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Do you remember what evidence was received?
- **A** For our section, the DNA section, a cigarette butt was submitted.
- **Q** When evidence is submitted to your laboratory, what happens with that evidence?
- **A** Normal practice is when the evidence is 23 submitted to our laboratory, it goes through our office

2.1

assistants that takes in that submission from the department. The evidence is tagged with a unique identification number and then placed on a shelf in our locked evidence vault until the DNA analyst or any analyst retrieves it.

MS. WEIBLING: May I approach, Your

Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit T was marked for identification.)

#### BY MS. WEIBLING:

- Ms. Gerardi, I'm going to and you what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit T. Do you recognize this document?
- A I can recognize State's Exhibit T as being the submission sheet of the items submitted to our laboratory June 23rd, 2009.
- Q Is that State's Exhibit T or Defendant's Exhibit T?
- **A** Defendant's Exhibit T. Excuse me.
  - Q This evidence submit sheet, was this prepared in the ordinary course of business at BCI?
    - A Yes.

- And does this evidence submission sheet
  reference the cigarette butt that you spoke of that was
  uncovered at the victim's residence?
  - A Yes.

4

8

9

10

11

12

- After you received this evidence in June of 2009, did you do anything other than log and store this evidence?
  - A The evidence was stored in our what we call a backlog waiting to get worked. Within several months there the -- it was processed.
  - Q In February of 2010, did you receive any additional evidence from the Mahoning County Sheriff's Department?
- 14 **A** Yes.
- 15 **Q** And what was that evidence that was received?
- 16 **A** It was a known reference sample from James P.
- 17 | Ferrara.
- 18 **Q** And can you explain what a known reference sample is?
- 20 **A** Yes. A known reference sample is typically
  21 an oral swab, like a Q-tip oral swab, or a blood draw
  22 from an individual that we can ensure that DNA type
  23 came from that individual.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	
2	sample from Mr. Ferrara, what was done with that piece
3	of with that standard?

A Well, that evidence was also processed for -- to develop the DNA profile.

MS. WEIBLING: May I approach, Your

Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

(WHEREUPON, Defendant's Exhibit P was marked for identification.)

# BY MS. WEIBLING:

At this time I'd like to hand you what has been marked as Defendant's Exhibit P. If you can just look at the first page of that document, do you recognize the first page of Exhibit P?

A Yes, I do recognize the first page of Defendant's Exhibit P as being another submission sheet that was submitted to our laboratory.

**Q** And was this document prepared in the ordinary course of business?

A Yes.

Q If you look at the top part of Exhibit P, does that document list the suspects or subjects?

- 1 A Yeah. They're listed as subjects, yes. Two.
- 2 Q And what are the names of the two subjects
- 3 | listed?

- **A** James Ferrara and Joseph A. Weeks.
- Ordinarily when you receive a submission referencing two subjects, do you typically receive a DNA standard for both subjects, both subjects
- 8 referenced?
- 9 A If we get one, that's okay. We still process
  10 the evidence. But if there are two subjects listed, it
  11 is common to get both, yes.
- 12 **Q** And in this particular case, who did you get a DNA standard from?
- 14 **A** I got a DNA standard from James P. Ferrara.
- Joseph Weeks, who's also listed as a subject, did you receive a standard from Mr. Weeks?
- 17 **A** No.
- 18 Q Once you received the DNA standard from
- 19 Mr. Ferrara, what did -- for Mr. Ferrara, what did you
- 20 do next?
- 21 **A** The DNA analysis will begin. So I can
- 22 explain that process.
- 23 **Q** That would be fine.

A DNA, deoxyribonucleic acid, it is a long
string-like molecule which contains the genetic code or
the blueprint for life, and it is found in all living
cells with the exception of red blood cells, and it's
unique to each individual, with the exception of
identical twins. So we're looking for the DNA on these
items. We have a known reference sample from an
individual, and we have an evidence sample. These are
processed separately at a different place and time, and
once we develop the profile we'll compare the known
reference sample to the evidence sample to either
include or exclude that individual as being a
contributor to the DNA on the evidence. In this
particular case I did the processing for the evidence,
developed the profile and then compared it to the known
reference sample.

- Q So in this case you compared the standard for James Ferrara to the cigarette that was found at the scene?
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** And if you could refer to Page 2 of Exhibit
- 22 P, do you recognize this document?
  - **A** I can recognize State's -- or excuse me,

Defendant's Exhibit P as being an accurate copy of the report that I generated with my findings. I can assure you that it's a true and accurate copy by my initials and signature on the second page, as well as the initials of the laboratory supervisor that reviewed this data.

- And after you conducted your analysis of the standard of Mr. Ferrara to the cigarette, did you arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not his DNA contributed to the DNA found on the cigarette?
- A Yes.
- **Q** And what was your conclusion?
- James P. Ferrara is not a contributor to the
  DNA from the cigarette recovered inside the victim's
  residence.
  - And did you arrive at this conclusion with a reasonable degree of medical certainty? I'm sorry.

    Did you arrive at this conclusion with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty? I apologize.
- **A** Yes.
- **Q** Mrs. Gerardi, were you aware that there were 22 over 167 suspects in this particular case?
- **A** No.

Q	Did y	ou send	your	conclu	isions	that	_	
Mr. Fe	rrara was	not a	contr	ributor	to th	e DNA	on ·	the
cigare	tte found	inside	the	residen	nce to	the	Sher	iff's
Depart	ment?							

A a normal course of practice at BCI, all reports are mailed, generally within a day or so after the date that's on my report.

**Q** And what is the date listed on your report?

**A** March 2nd, 2010.

Subsequent to March 2nd, 2010, did you receive any other DNA standards from the Mahoning County Sheriff's Department relative to the cigarette butt that was found inside the Marsh residence?

A No other standards were submitted under this case number.

Mrs. Gerardi, Attorney Meranto made quite a big deal earlier in this case about exhuming some bodies of potential suspects that he — that were thought could have possibly contributed to this DNA. In order to get a valid standard for an individual, would you actually need the body to be able to obtain that DNA?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Objection, Your

1 Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A No, you do not actually need the body.

**Q** What can you use to obtain a valid DNA -- or a valid standard from the individual for DNA analysis purposes?

A There are instances when you can determine when something specifically came from an individual. Mothers keep baby teeth. But you have to ensure that it came from that individual. To be most certain, you can use biological parents or biological children to basically do a reverse paternity to identify whether or not someone could potentially be a contributor to something. So there are other methods.

So for instance, Ed Farris was a potential suspect. If he had a child, could you use swab — could you use DNA found from his child to analyze and compare the cigarettes?

A You inherit half of your DNA from your mother and half of your DNA from your father, so half of a biological child's DNA would be consistent with the father. So yes, you could use a child to determine whether or not half of the DNA is present on the

### CROSS EXAMINATION

### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

Q Hi, Brenda. Do you know what brand of cigarette? Is that in your notes, your bench notes? Do you keep that?

A I'm afraid I do not have that information.

**Q** Do you know whether it was a cigarette butt, or was it a full cigarette?

A In this particular case when I opened up the evidence, it was -- it became apparent to me that it's not a cigarette butt, per se. The cigarette wasn't technically smoked. If you could picture someone putting a cigarette in their mouth and lighting it, this particular cigarette was lit on the filter end. If you're not a smoker, once that happens -- just so I can explain, you can't smoke the cigarette. So it got basically set back down. So the filter's burnt, and the tobacco end is not. So this was placed wherever. I don't know where it was recovered. Wherever it was. And it was submitted for DNA analysis. And because of that, because of that fact, I took DNA samples from both ends of the cigarette.

Q Okay. And do you know whether or not this

1 cigarette had been submitted to BCI prior to 2009?

A Yes.

Q And where -- when was it submitted? Do you

4 know?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

23

**A** For the exact date, I can look in my notes.

I have some information from the previous years, but

I -- it was 1975.

Q Okay. Do you have in your notes where exactly this cigarette was recovered from?

**A** I don't have that in my notes, no.

**Q** Do you know who recovered that cigarette?

A No, I do not.

13 Q Back in 1975 when it was submitted, where did

14 this cigarette -- who tested this cigarette at BCI?

15 **A** The cigarette came into BCI for our latent

16 print section. 1974, DNA really wasn't thought of,

wasn't handled for DNA. If you're handling an item for

DNA, it is totally different than handling it for, say,

19 fingerprints. Fingerprints you're not going to create

20 a fingerprint by -- if you're wearing gloves, you're

21 not going to create a fingerprint. But if you're

22 handling evidence around you or touching things with

gloves on, you could transfer DNA. If you handled a

bloody shirt five minutes ago, and still have those same gloves on, you could transfer to picking up, say, any article; for instance, a cigarette butt. In this particular case, it was submitted to our latent print examiner, and it was processed for latent prints.

Now, in your lab, in your DNA lab, you wear gloves, obviously. Do you wear anything on your face so that you don't get any DNA on this evidence?

A In our DNA section, we are required to wear protective gear, which is our lab coats. They wear facial masks and gloves. Up until maybe a few years ago, we did not wear facial masks. Now, understanding that the strength and the power of how strong — just a tiny bit of spit while you're talking over the evidence could basically contaminate the evidence. But we're talking about 1975, and I'm not even aware if they wore gloves at a crime scene, because they didn't think about DNA. They may have wore gloves, but did they handle other things? They may not have put a latent or a fingerprint on it.

But the main thing with the cigarette butt that I am concerned about is that when it goes into our latent print section, they use tools like a powder

- brush and other things to dust -- I don't know if this
  has been explained before, but they will use tools that
  are not sterile. So any case that they process prior
  to this could potentially be transferred over to that.

  So when we look at items of evidence of this nature, we
  just interpret it with caution.
- **Q** And you know it had been to latent prints 8 prior to you; right?
  - A That is correct. But the request was made, so we do honor those requests.
  - And you're not aware of whether they wore gloves in the lab back then in the latent print lab; is that right?
  - A They probably wore gloves. Whether they changed them frequently between pieces of evidence, I would -- and I can't say, because I wasn't there.
- **THE COURT:** Well, then don't say.

#### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

- Q And none of us have a time machine, so --
- **A** That's right.
- **Q** And you said you just -- did you say you just 22 started wearing masks in the lab as well?
  - A Within the last two years, masks are now

2.1

required. It was voluntary before that, but gloves and lab coats, yes.

Q Tell us about the security of the evidence at BCI. You track and keep all your evidence secure?

A Yes. All the evidence that comes into our laboratory, upon submission, it's given a bar code label and placed into a locked evidence vault. The only people that have access to these vaults are the analysts, as well as the supervisors and our office assistant that's bringing in the evidence. So it's pretty secure.

Once the evidence is taken out of our evidence vault, it is scanned to the analyst that is handling it. We actually each have our own bar code labels, very similar to the scanners at the grocery stores that we scan the evidence to ourselves. And once it's out of my possession or goes to another section, they scan it to them, and then back to the locked evidence vault until they return it to the department. After it's returned, I don't know the chain of custody.

Now, you're looking for possibly very sensitive DNA, sometimes we call it touch DNA; isn't

that right?

DNA that's not associated with a body fluid. So it could be sweat or things like that, but it's not really something that we're looking for. We're not looking to identify a fluid. We're looking for what we call touch DNA, and that could be anything. If you touch an item, you potentially could transfer your DNA to that item. And it could stay there for a long time, until it's cleaned.

Q And is that one of the other reasons why you wear the masks, so you won't be confused with that very minimal amount of DNA?

A The masks are mainly because people talk, and little tiny pieces of spit come — will come out while they're talking, even if you don't see it, and that potentially could influence the results.

Q With this cigarette, even if you place it in your mouth, is it possible to put a cigarette in your mouth and never leave DNA, if you don't actually smoke it, if it's lit on the wrong end like this?

A The paper itself does absorb spit and fluid.

Typically lips are a little bit more moist, and I would

2.1

expect to see some transfer, but it is potentially
it's not an absolute to get a full DNA profile, meaning
that we may get bits and piece, but maybe not the
whole

- And you talked about being very careful these days. Is it possible for an analyst to transfer their own DNA on a piece of evidence if they're not careful with it?
- A Absolutely. We all know our DNA types. We know everybody's type in the lab because there's the potential from even another analyst that's not in our section to maybe transfer to a door knob that transferred to a glove that transferred to the evidence. So we're very aware of the sensitivity, and we keep track of that. We can basically look at the profile and determine whether or not I am a contributor to this.
- What about the person who actually collected it, too, if they didn't wear gloves? They could possibly transfer their DNA on it; is that right?
- A I would expect someone handling the evidence, especially without gloves, to transfer their DNA, yes.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: I have nothing

1	further.	Thank	you,	Your	Honor.

2 **THE COURT:** Any redirect?

MS. WEIBLING: Just briefly, Your Honor.

# REDIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MS. WEIBLING:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

- Q Mrs. Gerardi, when you add DNA to an item, does that cause other DNA to fall off the item?
- A No, it doesn't.
- Q If you take a look at Exhibit P again, Page
- 10 2. And once again, your conclusion is what?
  - A My conclusion is James P. Ferrara is not a contributor to the DNA from the cigarette recovered inside the victim's residence.
- 14 **Q** And you -- that conclusion was made by you 15 with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty?
- 16 **A** Yes.
- Is there any way that adding additional DNA to that cigarette would cause you to change your conclusion at this time?
- 20 **A** Can you repeat it?
- 21 **Q** Sure. Is there any way -- if you were aware 22 that additional DNA was added to that cigarette, would 23 that cause you to change your conclusion that you came

to in -- strike that. That was my fault. I apologize. If the cigarette had been contaminated, would that cause you to change your conclusion with regards to the standard submitted by -- I'm sorry. Strike that. Once again, can you please review your conclusion with the jury at this time?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Objection, Your Honor.

MS. WEIBLING: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Overruled.

#### BY MS. WEIBLING:

Q If you can take a look at Page 3 and just go over your conclusion one time.

A James P. Ferrara is not a contributor to the DNA from the cigarette recovered inside the victim's residence.

MS. WEIBLING: Thank you. No further questions.

**THE COURT:** Anything else from the state?

\* \* \* \* \*

#### FURTHER REDIRECT/GERARDI

# RECROSS EXAMINATION

### BY MS. CANTALAMESSA:

Q Ms. Gerardi, you can say there are two DNAs on the cigarette, though; right?

A Yes.

**Q** At least two?

A At least two.

**Q** Can you tell anything else about those two

9 DNAs that you did find?

you.

A When you say two DNAs, I — basically when we have a DNA profile, you get half from your mom, half from your dad, as I explained earlier. So you have two types at every location that we're looking at. When I say location, that means we're looking at several locations. If there's more than two types at a location, that's an indicator to me that there's more than one contributor to this DNA profile that I obtained. So basically what you're referring to is that I have a mixture. I have a mixture of at least two individuals on the cigarette.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: That's it. Thank

MS. WEIBLING: Your Honor, I just have

1		one more question.
2	FURTHER RE	DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MS. WEI	BLING:
4	Q	Mrs. Gerardi, have you heard the expression,
5	can I bum	a cigarette?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q .	And what does that mean to you?
8	A	That means I if I have a cigarette, I
9	would hand	it to somebody.
10	Q	Have you ever observed two people maybe share
11	the same c	igarette?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	You indicated that there were a mixture of
14	two unknow	ns on this cigarette; is that correct?
15	A	That's correct.
16	Q .	Are either one of those two knowns
17	Mr. Ferrar	a's DNA?
18	A	No.
19		MS. WEIBLING: Thank you. I have no
20		further questions.
21		MS. CANTALAMESSA: Nothing, Your Honor.
22		Thank you.
23		THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

You're excused. Do you have other evidence to offer, Mr. Meranto?

MR. MERANTO: No, Your Honor. Subject to the admission of our exhibits, the defense would rest at this time.

THE COURT: All right. So ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to adjourn you for lunch, and I would like you to return to the jury room by 1:30. Make it 1:15 if you will. And we'll resume at that time. Please don't discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone else. Don't allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence. Please do not form or express any opinion about the case. See you in the jury room about 1:15.

(WHEREUPON, the jury left the courtroom, and the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. You folks can be seated. Does the defense have your exhibits in order? Are you going to be a while?

MR. MERANTO: I'm going to be a couple minutes.

1 (WHEREUPON, a brief recess was had, 2 after which the proceedings continued as 3 follows, outside the presence of the jury:) 4 MR. MERANTO: Judge, you don't have all 5 these written in, but we want to move to 6 admit C. 7 THE COURT: You want C? 8 MR. MERANTO: Yeah. The article with 9 the sketch. I --10 THE COURT: C, I. 11 MR. MERANTO: R, which you don't have, 12 which is an exclusion list about the 13 cigarette where they found out who smoked, 14 who didn't. 15 THE COURT: R. Yes. 16 MR. MERANTO: And then U which is with 17 regard to Mrs. Informer who was a witness to 18 the person that dropped the car off 19 supposedly and then composed the composite 20 sketches. 2.1 THE COURT: Okay. Does the state have 22 any objection? So you're moving to introduce 23 C, I, U and R; is that right?

1 MR. MERANTO: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Does the state have any objection? Somebody see if they're listening when the judge asks a question. What in the world is going on here?

MR. MERANTO: Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor. She asked me what was -- I apologize.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, we object to C.

THE COURT: Let me just urge everybody here participating as a litigant in the courtroom that, you know, maybe I'm old fashioned, you know, maybe I'm egotistical. I'm not sure what the reason is. But I really think that when a judge says something, or demands something, that you people ought to pay attention.

MR. MERANTO: I apologize, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm that way. I don't know.

And if you're going to be here, you're going to be that way, too. I'm about sick and tired of this crap. So I'm sitting here talking, I'm the judge, and you guys are

having some sort of a meeting back there, disrespecting this court, and paying no attention to what I'm doing. So Zena's sitting here, and Lou, and in the old days, I'd have you in jail. I've grown -- I don't know if patient is the right word. I guess I just have been beaten down over the years from this type of disrespect from the bar, but I've had enough. So if it happens again, somebody's head's gonna be taken off.

MR. MERANTO: I apologize again, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me ask again.

MR. MERANTO: I wouldn't do well in jail, so I --

THE COURT: The defense is seeking,
moving to introduce its Exhibits C, I, U, and
R; is that correct?

MR. MERANTO: Correct. Yes, Judge.

**THE COURT:** No other exhibits?

MR. MERANTO: No.

THE COURT: All right. What is the state's position on the defense exhibits?

1	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, we would
2	object to C as it's a newspaper article. It
3	contains a composite. But it's a newspaper
4	article which
5	THE COURT: What? Newspaper articles
6	are not admissible; is that right?
7	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Well, it tells the
8	story of the case. I mean, it's a history.
9	The case that was already testified about.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Do you object if the
11	rest of that is removed and just the
12	composite is submitted?
13	MS. CANTALAMESSA: No.
14	THE COURT: What's your position on
15	that?
16	MR. MERANTO: That's great, Judge.
17	That's fine with us.
18	THE COURT: All right. Then it's
19	admitted with those redactions. Simply the
20	composite. Okay. Next is I?
21	MS. CANTALAMESSA: We object to I, Your
22	Honor.
23	THE COURT: What is it?

MR. MERANTO: I is the complete story, kind of start to finish with regard to the sting operation that was conducted, and wherein the file was stolen from GM, and they set up a sting at the Penn-Ohio Motel. Once again, the reason I included that, that's the only --

These are police reports? MR. MERANTO: That's the only stuff that Mr. Mondora seemed to think was important enough to discuss with Mr. Nemeth. I mean, I was half tempted to try to admit the whole file, but that's ridiculous.

THE COURT:

See, I'm not real big on THE COURT: giving things to the jury that has already been disclosed to the jury. You did a great job of telling that whole story through Mr. Mondora, Pat Mondora -- Detective Mondora, I'm sorry. But my understanding is from the rules that you can do that. You can submit police reports. So the objection's overruled. Next is U, the police reports?

> I thought R comes before MR. MERANTO:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
0	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
7	
8	
9	
0	
	2 3 4 5 6

21

22

23

U.

THE COURT: Yes, it does, but you didn't introduce them that way. You had U testified to before R, and so it appears ahead on my list. But we'll go to R. Let's do R first.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: A list of individuals in the house.

MR. MERANTO: Yes. This is what we discussed. This is a report prepared to show that they took efforts to exclude everybody that could have possibly touched that cigarette that was found and sent to BCI for purposes --

THE COURT: What's the state's position?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: No objection, Your

Honor.

**THE COURT:** That is received. And U is police reports regarding Ms. Informer?

MR. MERANTO: Mrs. Informer. That's what they called her.

THE COURT: This is just a moniker given to a confidential informant or somebody that

1	wanted to
2	MR. MERANTO: Yes.
3	MS. CANTALAMESSA: We don't object to
4	the pictures on U, Your Honor, but we object
5	to the report.
6	MR. MERANTO: Well, the report is
7	once again, it's a police report that was
8	prepared, and it gives the details about how
9	this lady, what they went through with regard
LO	to scaling down that picture, refining that
L1	picture, in order to actually exclude.
L2	THE COURT: Let me see if I can probably
L3	cut through all of that.
L4	MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Judge.
L5	THE COURT: These are police reports
L6	prepared by Crater and Nemeth?
L7	MR. MERANTO: Yes, Judge.
L8	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Does it have the
L9	pictures on them?
20	MR. MERANTO: Yeah. They're attached.
21	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay. Just making
22	sure.
23	THE COURT: There are two?

#### MOTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

2.1

22

23

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you want to see the exhibit?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: No. I saw it. I just wanted to make sure.

THE COURT: Okay. So that is all of the Defendant's Exhibits. So is there anything else the defense wishes to present?

MR. MERANTO: No, Judge. Just at this time we'd like to renew our motion for acquittal pursuant to Criminal Rule 29.

Other than what I stated prior to at the end of the state's case, we now have additional evidence with regard to DNA that was found at the scene and excludes this defendant, so that leap, I believe, that we're asking the jury to take from a fingerprint on a — fingerprints on the outside of the door that then leads you to believe that he killed these people and left in the car and all that good stuff, once again, I think it was demonstrated during the case that the investigators at the time believe this was

# MOTION

2.1

critical evidence in that they used it.

As I stated with regard to the exhibit that's been admitted, Exhibit R, they went painstakingly through to try and exclude anybody who might have touched that cigarette, and then they checked everybody, and I introduced also a number of letters that were sent to BCI and the FBI saying, hey, check this cigarette out, the latent fingerprints on it. Well, then at the advent of DNA, they found the DNA, and at that point I believe it was sufficiently shown that they — whatever, they either had some doubts or wanted to make sure or whatever, and they sent that BCI down to BCI and it excluded Mr. Ferrara.

THE COURT: What is the state's -- were you done? I'm sorry.

MR. MERANTO: Yes, I am. Thank you, Your Honor.

**THE COURT:** What is the state's response?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, we stand

on our same argument with regard to showing that this defendant did this. The defense can't show, and we can't show if it had the defendant's DNA on it, where the cigarette came from, who handled it, where it came from inside the house, when it was collected. We can show it was sent in on — in February of 1975, by Detective Nemeth. We can't show where it's from. So we're as the state kind of happy it doesn't have his DNA on it, so how are we going to show where it was from anyway? So we don't think it disproves any of the state's case at this point.

THE COURT: So that's your basis for the Rule 29, what you said before and what you just said?

MR. MERANTO: Yeah, Judge. And basically with regard to that evidence, I mean, I just find it ironic the state's arguing in light of what was presented with regard to those fingerprints and how --

THE COURT: Well, you're both getting ready for argument. That's why you're both

2.1

talking that way now, so that's all right.

On those bases, the motion for Rule 29 motion is overruled.

So we're going to start with argument and charge this afternoon. We do have — we've got one juror who indicated she's — she would like to go to Cleveland tonight. Not knowing how this thing would proceed, I indicated to counsel that we should be careful and that you should be careful in the selection of an alternate. So I'm open to suggestion as to what we're going to do here about how to proceed. What is the state's pleasure regarding argument and charge and what to do with the juror?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, I think we keep our argument and charge this afternoon, and maybe end at 4:00. She said if she could leave by 4:00 she'd still be fine for a juror.

**THE COURT:** What's the defense position?

MR. MERANTO: I'd defer to the court.

If the court would want to let her go now and

start tomorrow morning, whatever you want to do, we can work on instructions and that.

THE COURT: I'm not going to waste all this time today. It would be my intention to at least do argument today, or to do argument and charge and have them deliberate with or without her, or to do argument and do charge in the morning with deliberations tomorrow. Those are the options. So I probably should've said that before I asked you what you wanted to do. Does the state have a preference?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Your Honor, I'd still like to do argument and charge -- our preference is tomorrow argument and charge.

THE COURT: I'm not doing that.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Okay.

THE COURT: I already said that. I try and have everybody listen, but I feel like I'm married to you folks.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: We'd also like to bring up the fact that the defense has brought up the suspect Weeks on the DNA

report which we tiptoed around throughout the testimony of Detective Mondora. We want to put Detective Mondora up to explain why there's a suspect Weeks on that DNA report so that the jury doesn't have any questions about that, just to say that at that point when they got the prints back, they did research and found that a known associate of Mr. Ferrara was Weeks, and that's why at that point before the DNA, they put Mr. Weeks on that DNA suspect list.

THE COURT: When did you hatch this idea? I'm glad you finally revealed it to me. When was this figured out? Just now?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: No. We were talking about it while Ms. Gerardi was on the stand. However, we were doing exhibits and that kind of thing, and you were asking about the charge. We didn't want to get too far ahead without telling you.

THE COURT: Okay. So we'll do that, and I'm going to tell everybody here, we're going to limit it to that, and it's going to be

1	brief, and it's going to be efficient. We're
2	going to try that for a change in this case.
3	Okay. So let's get back to the issue then if
4	that takes five or ten minutes and we're at
5	the same position. We're going to resolve
6	all this other stuff right here and now. So
7	I'll just do it, or I'll allow you to offer
8	your preference. Do you wish to offer a
9	preference as to how we proceed?
10	MS. CANTALAMESSA: No, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Okay. How about you?
12	MR. MERANTO: No, Judge. Whatever you
13	prefer.
14	THE COURT: Okay. So we have to go
15	through this charge. I'm going to give it
16	today. What do you folks want for argument
17	for the state?
18	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Forty-five minutes,
19	Your Honor, both parts.
20	<b>THE COURT:</b> How about the defense?
21	MR. MERANTO: I think I should be able
22	to handle it in that length of time, Judge.
23	<b>THE COURT:</b> Okay. The parties have each

2.1

submitted requests for charge. The court has reviewed them. The court has prepared its charge to the jury. Nobody's breached the subject, but I think the subject needs to be breached. The indictment is brought in terms of the statute as they exist today, not in terms of the statutes as they existed at the time of these crimes. So what do you want to do about that?

MS. DOHERTY: Judge, I believe that when we — we obtained the statute from 1974, and the only difference, I guess, in the way the language is, but it was included in the bill of particulars, is that it's committing robbery and/or burglary, aggravated robbery and/or burglary.

**THE COURT:** That's not the only difference.

MS. DOHERTY: Okay.

THE COURT: Are you folks aware of that or not? The crimes of aggravated murder are defined as including aggravated robbery and/or aggravated burglary, and those crimes

then have to be defined as elements of the aggravated murder. And within Count Five, the aggravated robbery, you include the firearm, which is not a part of the statute at the time. And you also include that the defendant displayed it, brandished it, indicated he possessed it, or used it. Those are all part of the new statute, not the old statute. The burglary — the burglary charge talks about the commission of a criminal offense, and at the time the law charged commission of a theft offense or any felony. So those are differences that probably need to be resolved before the jury is charged.

MS. DOHERTY: I agree, Your Honor.

Those counts were dismissed due to the statute of limitations, and --

**THE COURT:** They're still elements of the charges of aggravated murder?

MS. DOHERTY: Correct.

THE COURT: So they still have to be defined by the court in its instruction to the jury.

1 MS. DOHERTY: I agree. And I do have 2 copies of the statutes from 1974 for 3 aggravated robbery and aggravated burglary. 4 THE COURT: Well, what is that -- I 5 asked you how to resolve this. Having copies of the statutes doesn't mean a whole lot to 6 7 I have copies of the statutes, too. me. 8 MS. DOHERTY: Well, I understand that, 9 but it defines how the instructions should 10 read for the aggravated murder count with 11 having to do with aggravated robbery and 12 aggravated burglary. I mean, obviously we 13 wouldn't give today's definition. 14 THE COURT: I don't know if I agree with 15 that. What's the defense have to say? 16 MR. MERANTO: With regard to the 17 I believe he's entitled to the instruction? 18 instruction that existed at the time or now, 19 whatever is to his benefit. I think that's 20 clear. 2.1 THE COURT: Okay. So who gets to decide 22 what benefits him? 23 MR. MERANTO: You.

THE COURT: I mean, obviously this is not something that has been thought through by either of you.

MR. MERANTO: That's true, Judge. I'll tell you that's true. I mean, I thought about it with regard to the instruction and the research with regard to that, because obviously that's a critical issue.

THE COURT: Well, the state has charged additional elements in each of these charges. Having a firearm and brandishing it, possessing it, using it, inflicting, displaying, all that ridiculous statutory language. And also has diminished the definition in Count Four by claiming any criminal offense rather than theft or any felony. So the court's going to define Count Four as it originally was written, theft or any felony, unless the defense objects.

MR. MERANTO: No.

THE COURT: And the court will give the instruction on firearm. The state has to prove its a firearm and also has to prove the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

\_ -

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

displayed, brandishing, possessing or using the weapon as they've charged in the indictment, unless the defense objects.

MR. MERANTO: No objection.

THE COURT: All right. The court will give the general OJI instruction, standard instruction. Do you wish an instruction on the defendant not testifying?

MR. MERANTO: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. The court will give an instruction on expert testimony and on exhibits. The court will instruct on felony aggravated murder, including aggravated robbery and aggravated burglary. Define purpose, will include the use of a deadly It will also include that proof of motive is not required. The court will define causation, what it means while committing or attempting to commit a crime. The court will define knowingly. The court will define aggravated burglary as an element of aggravated murder with all of the attendant definitions, purpose, what a

2.1

criminal offense is -- I'm sorry, what a felony is, trespass, knowingly, course, stealth, deception, occupied structure, physical harm, capability of a deadly weapon. The court will further define theft and aggravated robbery. The court has to define a firearm since that was specified in the indictment. Again, deadly weapon. Again, theft offense, capability of a deadly weapon. The court has to define serious physical harm. The court has to define firearm. The court will give the general conclusion.

I have the jury verdict forms prepared, if you do not have a copy. Ryan, do you want to copy these and make sure each of the lawyers get copies. And then do the common closing remarks. If we have an alternate, I will keep the alternate sequestered individually while the jury is deliberating.

And now on to the requested instructions. The state has requested an instruction on consciousness of guilt and requested the court charge on the lesser

included offense of murder. No reason to do the lessers. That request is denied. The case wasn't tried that way. It's either this guy did it or didn't do it.

Furthermore, the instruction of consciousness of guilt is an instruction that is used when a defendant is present and is identified and is a part of what went on and leaves, and his flight has to be explained. This is — the question here is whether or not it was this guy at all, not whether or not he fled or whoever it was fled. I don't think under the circumstances of this case that instruction is appropriate. So that's refused, both of those.

Defendant's proposed instruction is on circumstantial evidence as it existed at the time when the crime was committed. My -- I hate to try and flatter myself, but my educated and experienced opinion is that this instruction should be given because it was the law that existed at the time. And I believe that instruction is -- can be

1 reconciled with the current instruction that 2 either direct or circumstantial evidence or a 3 combination of the two is sufficient. 4 However, despite my educated and experienced 5 opinion, I'm bound by the law as dictated by 6 the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio that 7 that instruction can't be given anymore, so I 8 refuse that instruction also. 9 So what -- I told you I'm going to give, 10 I'm going to give. The State vs. Webb, 70 11 Ohio St.3d 325, and State vs. Bennie Adams 12 from our own Seventh District Court of 13 Appeals confirmed the court's ruling on that 14 issue. So is there anything else from the 15 state? 16 MS. DOHERTY: No, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Anything else from the 18 defense? 19 MR. MERANTO: No. Thank you, Your 20 Honor. 2.1 THE COURT: Okay. So we should probably 22 start about 1:30 to give you guys enough time 23 to get squared away. That all right?

1	MS. DOHERTY: That's fine.
2	MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Judge.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
4	(WHEREUPON, the Court recessed at 12:40
5	p.m., November 20, 2013 and reopened at 1:35
6	p.m., November 20, 2013 and the proceedings
7	continued as follows:)
8	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
9	PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Good
LO	afternoon.
L1	THE COURT: That's pretty good. The
L2	defense has rested his case, and now the
L3	state would like to put on evidence in
L4	rebuttal. So you may call your witness,
L5	please.
L6	MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, Your Honor.
L7	The state would call Detective Mondora.
L8	THE COURT: You've already been sworn.
L9	You're subject to that same oath. Please
20	follow the same rules, and you can resume the
21	witness stand.
22	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

			808
1	* *	* * *	
1 2 3			
3			
4 5			
6 7 8 9			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			

# REBUTTAL DIRECT/MONDORA

1	WHEREUPON, the State called
2	
3	DETECTIVE PATRICK MONDORA
4	
5	who, having previously been sworn,
6	testified as follows:
7	REBUTTAL DIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MS. DOHERTY:
9	Q Detective Mondora, you heard Brenda Gerardi,
10	the defense witness from BCI mention the name Joseph
11	Weeks; correct?
12	A Yes.
13	<b>Q</b> And who is Joseph Weeks?
14	A After developing Mr. Ferrara as a suspect in
15	this crime, looking into his background and his
16	friends, we came up with the name Joseph Weeks.
17	<b>Q</b> As a known associate?
18	A Yes. A known associate who worked at GM with
19	him and was also a committeeman with him at the time,
20	GM Lordstown.
21	MS. DOHERTY: All right. I don't have
22	anything else, Judge.
23	MR. MERANTO: Nothing else.

1	THE COURT: Okay, sir. Thank you.
2	THE WITNESS: Thank you. Let me see the
3	reporter here with counsel.
4	(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among
5	Court and counsel out of the hearing of the
6	jury as follows:)
7	THE COURT: Okay. We're at side bar out
8	of the hearing of the jury. Does the state
9	have anything else to offer?
LO	MS. DOHERTY: No, Your Honor.
L1	THE COURT: Okay. So you're resting?
L2	MS. DOHERTY: Yes.
L3	THE COURT: And does the defense have
L4	anything else to offer?
L5	MR. MERANTO: No, Judge. I mean, other
L6	than renewing my Rule 29 motion.
L7	THE COURT: On the same basis?
L8	MR. MERANTO: Yes, Judge.
L9	THE COURT: Okay. Overruled. Thank
20	you.
21	(WHEREUPON, the following proceedings
22	were had back in the presence of the jury:)
23	THE COURT: Okay. The state has now

rested. I can't talk unless she's ready.

The state has now rested its case, and the next order of business is to have the lawyers address you in final argument.

Final argument is just that; it's an argument. It's an attempt to persuade you to see the case their way, and they'll tell you why you should see it their way. As I've told you before, the statements of the lawyers during argument, opening statement and otherwise is not evidence of any kind, so they can't — what they say is not evidence, but they can comment on the evidence and the law and argue the case to you.

The State of Ohio is given the opportunity to go first because the State of Ohio has the burden of proof. The defense will then argue, and the state is then given the opportunity to get the last say, to close the argument. At the completion of the closing arguments, the court will instruct you in the law, and then you will begin your deliberations.

2.1

I am not ignorant of your situation, so
I'm aware of that, and you should not be
concerned about that. All right. So is the
state ready to begin?

MS. DOHERTY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Would you please do

so? Are you folks splitting the argument?

MS. DOHERTY: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Doherty is going to do the opening, and then Ms. Cantalamessa will do the close?

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.
Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Very well.

MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, Your Honor.

May it please the court, counsel, Detective

Mondora, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. I

know it seems like we've been here a really

long time. It really has only been a couple

days. We appreciate your attention that

you've paid to this and to all of the

witnesses.

What I'm going to do now is talk to you

# 

a little bit about what the evidence has shown. I'm not going to go over everything everyone said. That's what you've been listening to. You know what the witnesses talked about and what their purpose, what the state's purpose was in putting them on the stand. But I am going to summarize some things that I would like you to consider, the state asks that you consider and think about.

But more importantly, the 12 of you when you're deliberating, what's important to you in this case? What witness or witnesses or evidence stood out to you and will help you make this decision? So I'm going to talk to you about some things. But even if you go back there and don't discuss anything I talked about, whatever is most important to you in making this decision, that's what you need to rely on. And you need to do that collectively.

We talked originally about an individual decision, but also a collective one. That's what there are 12 of you for. You're going

to talk about the evidence in this case.

You're going to determine what happened here.

And you're going to determine who did this.

That's your job.

The things that I talk to you about, the judge already said that this part of the trial, the closing arguments, they are not evidence. If I say something that differs from what your recollection is, by all means, go with your recollection. As you can see, Attorney Cantalamessa and I are looking at notes and doing 10 different things, so I certainly don't mean to mislead you. I'm recalling what the testimony was as well.

I asked you initially also to look at the demeanor of the witness, listen to their answer, determine whether or not they have any reason to not be truthful with you, if they have any reason, any bias. That's something that you look at when you're making the determination of credibility, who to believe.

I'm going to talk to you a little bit

2.1

about the charges. The judge is going to give you jury instructions. He's going to tell you what constitutes aggravated murder, the three counts that pertain to Ben Marsh, Marilyn Marsh, and Heather Marsh. The judge is going to give you those instructions, but I'm going to talk to you a little bit about that.

Aggravated murder in this case is purposely causing the death of another; Ben Marsh, Marilyn Marsh, Heather Marsh.

Purpose. And you can tell what purpose is by the manner in which it's done. This wasn't a car accident where someone accidentally ran into someone. This was purpose. This was taking a gun and shooting someone in the back of the head. Taking a gun and shooting Ben Marsh four times.

Taking that object or some object and beating Heather Marsh to death. That is purpose.

You can infer purpose from the manner used to inflict the injuries. Purposely caused the death. That's what James Ferrara did.

OFFICIAL SHORTHAND REPORTERS
MAHONING COUNTY YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 In addition to that is whether or not 2 that purposeful murder was committed while 3 committing or after committing aggravated 4 burglary and/or aggravated robbery. 5 aggravated burglary, trespassing, going into 6 somebody else's house by force. Going in 7 that back door of the Marsh house, quiet 8 neighborhood, breaking out that window, 9 leaving your prints as you push open the 10 door, to gain entrance into that house. That 11 is aggravated burglary, because we know that 12 he had a firearm because we know that he 13 killed those people with it. That is 14 aggravated burglary. He had a firearm. Не 15 trespassed into that occupied structure. 16 Aggravated robbery. Nothing in that 17 house, by any account, was stolen inside the

Aggravated robbery. Nothing in that house, by any account, was stolen inside the house. The paycheck was still there. The TV was still there. Didn't appear to be ransacked. But Marilyn Marsh's vehicle was gone. That is a fact. That is an aggravated robbery committed while committing or fleeing after committing and having that firearm

again. The judge is going to give you those instructions.

I don't mean to confuse you with it. I just wanted you to have in mind what constitutes aggravated murder in those three cases — or in those three victims.

Purposely causing the death in connection with either an aggravated robbery or an aggravated burglary.

Each witness that came in here and talked to you had something to say. Whether they had something very personal, this affected their family, or whether or not they collected evidence, saw evidence being collected, analyzed evidence, every one of them, hopefully you realize the purpose in putting them on. We didn't want to waste your time, but everyone had something significant to say. They all added a little bit to the puzzle that makes up this case.

Granted, we are hampered by the fact that this took place in 1974. I'm sure the defense is hampered. However, that doesn't

change the fact that what we have now is physical evidence putting James Ferrara there. Passage of time does not change that. Passage of time is not changing the fact that his fingerprints are on that door that was broken into to gain entrance into that house.

The judge is going to give you an instruction regarding circumstantial and direct evidence. And he talked to you a little bit about it initially. Direct evidence is what someone saw, what someone picked up, what someone collected.

You heard from Mike Finamore. He talked about witnessing — being present at the collection of the evidence. He saw the bodies. He is a direct witness. He's testifying about things that he actually saw.

Circumstantial evidence is proof of facts or circumstances by that direct evidence that you can — by that direct evidence that you can infer what logically flows from that direct evidence. And he'll give you a more specific instruction, but

2.1

circumstantial evidence, the fingerprints on the door connecting him to the inside of the house where those murders were committed, that is circumstantial evidence. You can reasonably infer, and you're permitted to do that.

And circumstantial evidence and direct evidence have the same weight. There is nothing in the law that tells you that, well, direct evidence is a lot more important. They are both of equal weight, and the court will tell you that.

Unfortunately, one of the things that the state has to prove is that Ben, Marilyn, and Heather were alive at one point. And although we hate to do it, we had to put Mr. Marsh on to testify about the death of his brother, his sister—in—law, and his niece. And that was really to establish that they did live. They were here, they were on this earth, and now they're not.

The testimony from Mr. Boyle, again, he, along with Mr. Marsh Sr., Ben's dad, found

2.1

their bodies. He described to you not being able to reach them. GM couldn't reach them, couldn't reach Ben. And I'm sure it pained him to go back to that place; but again, we had to put him on for that reason. We had to establish that Ben, Marilyn, and Heather, were found dead, murdered, in that house, and that that house was in Mahoning County, in Canfield.

Mr. Boyle described to you the scene.

That is significant, because as the jury, you have to know what that house -- what that scene consisted of. You have to know how these people were killed. You have to know where they were. Because they were inside of a house where James Ferrara's fingerprints are on the door that was broken into to get into that house. That's why that is so significant.

Mr. Boyle could tell you, he couldn't get in that front door. He couldn't -- the doors were locked. He described for you the screen door on the front of the house was

locked. The inside door -- I'm talking about the main entrance into the house. The inside door was locked. So clearly no perpetrator went in through that door. James Ferrara went in through the back door.

Mr. Boyle said he and Mr. Marsh had to physically take the screen door off because it was locked. And then Mr. Marsh Sr. used his key because that inside door entering into the foyer was locked as well. I'm not going to put this up high. Hopefully you can at least see.

He described going into that house where Marilyn was, what condition Heather was in. He couldn't even go down the hall to see where Ben was, but he learned from Mr. Marsh that he was also killed.

And why is it significant that those front doors were locked? And why is it significant that that garage door, the car garage door, was closed? Because we know that James Ferrara entered through that back door, kicked in the door going into the

family room kitchen area off the garage.

Didn't leave any prints there. He kicked in the door. The only prints found on that door were Ben Marsh's. And we know that he left the same way he came in, through the garage, but he took the car. He took the car out of the garage and left.

We know that the garage, from Mr. Boyle, had a Genie garage door opener. So James Ferrara didn't even have to get out of the car to close the garage. Got in the car, opened the garage door, left, closed the garage door, and he's gone, leaving one set of prints going in that back door.

Mike Finamore, it seemed like he was on the stand for a really, really long time. It probably wasn't that long. I guess it's fortunate that he's still with us, because through no one's fault, obviously, because James Ferrara's prints were not identified and confirmed until almost 40 years later, most of the investigating officers had passed away. He was kind of criticized on cross for

that, for, you know, being the only person around. Well, fortunately he was, because he not only was there and could identify, could talk about the scene, identify the photographs, where these people were located, what kind of injuries they had, but he also was with Bernie Albert, the crime scene agent who came to process the scene.

Now, he was cross examined at length about his lack of experience at that time. He was just a deputy for a year and a half. He couldn't have possibly known what he was doing. He observed the crime scene agent from BCI lift those prints. He probably could've lifted them himself, but the protocol at that time was because the Mahoning County Sheriff's Department didn't have a crime scene unit. They had deputies who responded to cases and could collect evidence, but this is a triple aggravated murder.

You think it's illogical for a Sheriff's Department to want to call in the state

agency who specializes in collecting evidence? That's not illogical at all. Not illogical at all and makes perfect sense. I would be surprised if it wasn't any other way. They still do that to this day you heard testimony. Even when they have — even when a department has their own crime scene unit, they still call in BCI.

So Mike Finamore, for all the criticism, he was a deputy. He had been there for about a year and a half. He told you he was interested. He wanted to become a detective. He wanted to move up in his career. So absolutely he was going to want to be there and help and learn what he could. That's not a fault. That is not a personality fault. That is something that's a good thing, and that's what he did.

He paid close attention to what Bernie Albert was doing. He stayed with him while he was collecting evidence. He told you he was there from about 9:30 that night when the bodies were found to sun up the next day,

8:00, 7:30. This wasn't just some kid. It was somebody dedicated, even at that time, to make sure that they found if the killer left anything there, that it was found, and that's what they found.

They didn't know it then. They didn't know it then. It took almost 40 years to figure that out. They had no idea. Mike Finamore had no idea that those prints that he watched Bernie Albert lift off that back door would someday lead to the killer, but they did it. They covered as many bases as they could.

I'll talk to you about I guess the big deal about prints back then. And I don't know how old everybody is, but back in 1974, as you've heard described by a number of witnesses, things were just handled differently. Fingerprints were the gold standard. When you found fingerprints, hallelujah. There was no DNA. There was no swabbing. There were no buccal swabs. So when you found prints that logically were

connected to the crime, you knew you had something. And you knew that if you could place those fingerprints, match them to an individual, that you had your guy.

That's why the police department, the Mahoning County Sheriff's Department, went through so many volumes. I mean, you saw those volumes of people. Known criminals, anybody they could think of. Tips. They followed up on psychic tips. They followed up on everything just trying to match prints.

They had that cigarette as well, but there was no DNA back then. They had it. They collected it. Someone did. We have no idea who. But they knew that those fingerprints on the back door were gonna lead them to who did this. They kept them at BCI all of that time. Nobody gave up on this case.

Andy Chappell from BCI, you heard him say that originally when the projectiles were submitted to BCI, they were indicated that they were fired from the same gun, and they

were 30 special -- fired from a .38 special. The deterioration of the lead over the years because of the containers that they were in wouldn't allow him to conclusively say that the other fragments and projectiles were fired from the same weapon. But we did have that information originally from BCI.

His analysis, because quite frankly the analyst originally who had done it was deceased and it happened so long ago, is significant, and the fact that those projectiles were identified years ago, back in the '70s as having been fired from a .38 is also significant. Because you heard from Deputy Fitzpatrick who was cross examined by Attorney Meranto, in some way trying to allege that he made up the statement that James Ferrara had told him about his weapon of choice being a .38 special because it didn't leave any brass.

That information that this was a .38 that was used in this crime was known years and years and years ago. He didn't make that

up. He would have no reason to make that up. Credibility, logic, common sense. We don't know why James Ferrara decided to tell him that, but he did. His weapon of choice. And he's a military guy. He knows.

He told Detective Mondora, he knows about guns. And he told Deputy Fitzpatrick that his weapon of choice, specifically, was a .38 special because it did not leave brass. It did not leave casings. Didn't leave casings. And that's huge, because that's exactly what was used here. No casings, just the projectiles.

Robin Ladd, the only person in the world -- now, she said, I didn't check everybody's prints in the world, but she sat here and she can tell you -- she told you about fingerprints. They're unique. They are one person. And she identified those prints as belonging to James Ferrara. And he is the only person in the world that has those prints. The only person. And that evidence is uncontroverted. You have heard

#### STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

nothing to the contrary.

Like she said, yeah, other people could examine them. If there was any difference, if somebody else thought that those were not his prints, you would've heard about it.

They're there. They can be examined. Any fingerprint expert. That evidence is uncontroverted, and you heard nothing else.

And that's what you have to rely on. Those are his prints.

I'm going to ask you to -- when the judge talks about common sense and logic, that's what you have to do here. You all have life experiences that allow you to make this decision. You may not have wanted to be here. You may not want to have to make this decision, but you are here for a reason. You're intelligent. You can look at the evidence. You can talk to each other. You can determine what happened. And from the evidence, you can determine who did this.

You heard a lot about other suspects and DNA and lack of DNA of James Ferrara and the

### STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

Parks brothers and Ed Farris. The investigation that compiles all of those notebooks. And they tell you that by trying to divert your attention from what's really important here, by trying to divert your attention to lack of DNA on the cigarette from James Ferrara. All of those other suspects; all the other suspects that Pat Mondora didn't go track down. That's just trying to divert your attention from what's really important here.

What's really important here are the fingerprints of James Ferrara located on that back door. A house that he told Detective Mondora, I've never been there. I don't even know Ben Marsh. I don't even know where Canfield is. We know he lives in Austintown. He didn't know where Canfield was?

Sure, everybody would deny. But you know what? You're especially going to deny knowing anybody or ever being at that house if you killed the three people who lived in it. And that evidence, too, is

uncontroverted. That's what he said. You have heard nothing else. No explanation, nothing. He didn't know Ben Marsh. He had never been to the house. Didn't know where Canfield was. Never met the guy.

Talk with each other. Rely on each other. You all heard the evidence. And you're going to make this decision, and you're going to find that James Ferrara killed — he committed aggravated murder. He beat Heather to death when he ran out of bullets. He shot Ben Marsh four times. And he shot Marilyn Marsh in the back of the head. And he left Christopher there.

I guess the only consolation in this case is that Christopher was too young to identify him. But not Heather. You heard Frank Boyle talk about how smart she was, how articulate she was. She could identify him, and that's why she's dead. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Doherty.
Mr. Meranto.

MR. MERANTO: Thank you, Your Honor.

2.1

May it please the court and counsel, good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Ladies and gentlemen, there is one thing that's uncontroverted here, and that is that the Marshes were killed on the evening of the 13th. That's true, and to that extent, I certainly feel sorrow and compassion for the family members and friends that have been present in the courtroom throughout this.

And in your heart you gotta feel that, too. But as jurors, that can't play a part. So you've got to separate that part of it from the juror part and decide collectively because it's uncontroverted that this happened, but you got no why, you got no how, and you got no who.

What the state wants you to take is not a step like when they were baking a cake in voir dire or baking cookies or a BLT, whatever it is. You know, bacon, lettuce, tomato. What they want you to do is they want you to jump, literally jump from that back garage door all the way into that house.

I don't know what it is. It's the Grand Canyon of leaps with regard to this trial, but they're hoping that they shock you by the who, because this happened, and that you're going to just focus on that and get the only person you can. And that's Jim Ferrara, because he's the only guy sitting there.

He's the only guy on trial for this.

They want you to ignore all these other suspects. They want you to ignore, well, it wasn't done, because after all, I'm just trying to cloud the issues. So they started out — because remember, they have the burden of proof in this case. They started out and put on Mr. Marsh, Mr. Boyle. They tell you how terrible it was when they came to the scene, found that, those bodies. And it's horrible, and it is. They didn't tell you anything about Mr. Ferrara.

So you got a fingerprint on the outside of a door that's supposedly Mr. Ferrara's, and that leads you to believe that he killed these people. And by the way, just for good

measure, got in the car and drove away from the scene.

So let's talk about what evidence there is here. They seem to be hanging on the fingerprint and trying to bolster

Mr. Finamore and his testimony. Because he's the only one alive. He's the only warm body they could bring here that happened to be at the scene. And he was there to learn, and that's a good thing. I mean, you know, you shouldn't hold that against him. He's there to learn.

You know, I guess, you know, my son's 10. He's wants to be a doctor. I should probably go home and let him cut me with a steak knife and take my appendix out. Does that make any sense at all?

The guy comes to the courtroom and tries to tell you that based on a couple hours' training he knows how to collect evidence, and he can tell you what was done there.

Now, I think over the course of the time he was cross examined, I at least hope, it

became painfully obvious that this guy didn't know anything. He basically showed up at the scene, and they said, hey, carry this guy's lights, move the furniture, do what you can. Help him. It was obvious he doesn't know anything about the taking or collection of evidence, or certainly didn't at that time. And that's right, he was on the deputy — the Sheriff's Department for about a month and a half — or a year and a half at that time. But it's the all important fingerprints on the outside of the door. They get you to that big leap into the room where these murders happened.

Put Dr. Ohr on. Dr. Ohr was more shock value, because, see, they had a —— they had a break with Mr. Finamore. Once again, the quality of that testimony, so they put on Dr. Ohr to further shock you. Then they put on Andy Chappell and Ms. Ladd from BCI to tell you, well, Chappell says, well, they're .38s. They're from a .38 special which is all going to that statement that he supposedly made to

Deputy Fitzpatrick that you heard this morning. So they tell you that you got .38s, and, well, in '74, '75, that's analyzed, and there's six out of six, and they match, and this and that.

Well, today then -- or yesterday he testifies and says, well, there's two that match, and there's another two that don't match, and they don't match each other, and the other two I can't tell you anything about. So once again, they got this exact science and evidence to tell you, but inquiring minds, two people, two different times, they got different opinions about.

But that's not a big deal. You're not supposed to -- not supposed to worry about it because you got fingerprints. Ms. Ladd testified about the fingerprints and said they're absolutely only one fingerprint per person on earth. Now, fingerprint evidence, yeah, I get it. Okay? But you can't make a statement like that.

Then I asked her, well, why is the FBI

still putting together databases and stuff to try and maybe eventually show that? But she can't show that. She don't know that. Same thing with her. Two reports, two different periods of time, and, well, they're different results, but it's subjective. There's a subjective piece to this. So then it's not an exact science. So I don't know what to believe. I got a guy that said something in '74, and I got her saying this in 2013.

Now, Mr. Finamore and Ms. Ladd had something in common. While I believe Mr. Finamore certainly more critical — because Mr. Finamore's there to try to tell you that the evidence they're hanging their whole case on is really what it purports to be, fingerprints that Ms. Ladd then says are Mr. Ferrara's.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, the Judge is going to instruct you about your job, and that is to judge the credibility of the witnesses. And by credibility, it doesn't necessarily mean someone's lying. You judge

credibility about the way they testify, how they act. The opportunity they had to hear and see the things and know the things that they're testifying about.

So Mr. Finamore got in, hey, I saw that card. I saw him put some initials on it, this and that. Okay. Well, you're with the guy about eight, nine hours by your own testimony. 11:00 at night until 7:30, 8:00 in the morning. Where did Bernie Albert live? I don't know. Well, did he work that day? I don't know. Well, did he — you know, did he come from another crime scene, work all night, all day?

See, because we human beings understand, you can't work 24, 36, 48 hours. That's a big deal. You might miss something. You might screw something up. Can't tell you anything about that. And see, unfortunately for us, Mr. Albert's not here. You can't hold that against Mr. Ferrara. Not his fault that it's 39 years later.

So I said, well, did you collect any

evidence? No, I didn't collect any. Well, what did he do with it? I don't know. Put it in a briefcase? I don't know. Put it in his car? I don't know. Were there other cases in his car? I don't know. Where did he live? Did he go home? I could go on for hours. The guy didn't know anything. That goes to the quality of his testimony and the credibility of his testimony. Ms. Ladd, the same thing.

Ms. Ladd, where was the evidence? I don't know. Well, you went and got it. When did you go get it? I don't know. 2009 I went and got it. Well, where was it in '74? Well, I assume that was in our lab. Well, that was moved, though, 12 years ago. Well, when they moved it, who moved it? I don't know who moved it. Well, I mean, was it in the same spot? I don't know, but I analyzed it.

Then you've got Deputy Fitzpatrick who miraculously gets my client to tell him that -- you almost can see it. Picture it.

Picture the lights dimming, and we're in a corner like one of those old movies, and I say, hey, man, .38 special, that's my weapon of choice. I mean, is this ridiculous? And he doesn't report it for a week.

MS. DOHERTY: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. MERANTO: He says it happened on the 7th and reports it on the 13th or the 12th; okay? Ladies and gentlemen, you ever see — maybe you all got — maybe somebody got stopped by a policeman, whatever. You think they write the report about an incident a week later? No. Once again, they got a fingerprint outside the door where inside all these things happen, see, so they're grabbing at whatever they got.

Detective Mondora decides, hey, I got some time to kill. Let me look at these cold cases. Can we look at these cold cases?

Noble thing, because certainly the family and friends are entitled to see if there's anything that can be done about this. So he

finds out that supposedly -- now, once again, you gotta keep this in mind, gotta always go back to Mr. Finamore and that crime scene that night. But he says BCI got the prints. Run them, boom, hit, match.

They kept using those words. And we cleared that up for you because that don't mean anything. They got the prints and ran them through a computer, and the computer spit out a bunch of people and rated them. That's what Ms. Ladd did. She then analyzed them and says they're Mr. Ferrara.

But based on that bit of information, they say, well, let's go find out where Mr. Ferrara is, and let's ask him if he'll talk to us. And he talked to him.

Mr. Mondora told you, he talked to him a couple days, a couple hours. They said, do you want to waive your right? I don't want to waive my rights. I know my rights. I'll talk to you.

Now, we talked about the quality of memory when you're going back 10, 20, 30

years. I asked Detective Mondora as an example, do you know where you were junior year? Do you know where you went, whose house you went to, what you did, what you touched, who you were hanging out with? I mean, think about it for yourselves. Can any one of you tell me that? So he says, I was never there. I don't know where it is. I don't know what it is. Boom.

Mr. Mondora told you, he talks to suspects all the time. Some of whom get charged, some of whom don't. And what do they do? I wasn't there. I didn't do it. You'd say the same thing either way. I mean, that is not out of the realm of possibility if you're thinking about being talked to, being asked about something, and you don't know anything about it, you go, I don't know. I wasn't there.

But here's something that's a little crazy to me. They got this fingerprint, and they're telling you, that's it. Ladies and gentlemen, we could go home, because we got a

print and we got Mr. Ferrara saying, I was
never there. That's pretty much it.
That's -- let's go home.

Cigarette, DNA, what? That's —
that's — that's not a big deal. That's not
a big deal. They want to tell you now,
they're trying to argue that we don't really
know where that came from. We don't know
where it was. I don't know when it was
submitted.

Then I asked Detective Mondora, right, remember the pile of ashes, smoking, and the theory was whoever did it was sitting there smoking, waiting to leave, and that's where the ashes were and there's a cigarette?

Well, I don't know for sure where it was found. Well, if that evidence isn't important at all, why did they send it to BCI? If they don't want you to consider it, why did they send it to BCI to have it analyzed, to check for DNA?

You see, because once again, like I said, we got washing machines now. We don't

go down the stream and beat our clothes on rocks to get them clean. We throw them in the washing machine and do it. They want you to ignore DNA.

See, because another big leap. See, while Mr. Ferrara physically, and I don't mean — I mean, while he left into that house there and killed these people, he made sure he didn't bump a wall, touch anything else; okay? This guy that's so stupid, that he put his prints on a door and then went oh, God, I better put my gloves on now because I'm going to kill people. No prints. And the only DNA found at this scene excludes him. Can't be him.

Well, there's mixed DNA. Couldn't have been -- I mean, I'm sitting here watching it. I don't believe it. They're trying to say, well, they could add DNA. Someone at the lab could've touched it. Someone -- you sent it down. You must have thought it was important. You wanted to slam dunk

Mr. Ferrara and say his DNA's there, too, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

oops, no DNA. Got some prints, though, now, so forget about the DNA because, see, we got the prints, and here's the prints.

Outside door. Outside of the door.

Don't know when they were made. Everybody told you that. Don't know when they were made. They could've been made, who knows, 10 years before.

Well, they want you to also ignore any other suspects. Well, let me just -- let me ask you -- I don't want to go back through all the people I talked about. I'm trying to forget about the guy because there was a robbery there six years earlier, at that same house, and they thought maybe those guys did it again. And there's a guy with a coin collection, which is what's stolen in the robbery, that around that time it is -- they find him at General Motors. They ignore that They ignore the people that they got a suspect and says, hey, they came there in what we believe was the car stolen from the Marsh residence, and by the way, he got blood

on my door. No.

You know why? They sent some fingerprints down, and the fingerprints -- no, don't worry about that.

So let's talk about a couple people.

Let's talk about Mr. Ferrara and if you
believe these are his prints on the back door
here. Because that's what they want you to
do. They want you to take a Grand Canyon
jump from that to he must have murdered them
then, murdered these people. Okay.

You got a guy -- not a guy, a group of guys, someone steals the investigative file at GM. Steals it. They find out about it. They got an informant that tells them someone's going to steal a file, so they put a dummy file. They find the file. In the file is a name of a dummy witness, and they put a fake name on the register at the Penn-Ohio Motel in North Lima.

Lo and behold, three guys go in, and they're approaching the room. They call the room. Then they approach the room. The

deputies surround them and grab him. They're going to get this witness. In the possession of one of those guys, a few days before, once again, another informant that told them, is the file. So they know one of these guys is — has the file that was stolen from GM. He's with another two guys, and they're at the Penn-Ohio Motel, gonna go into this room.

For what, I don't know. To ask the witness if he wants room service? Because they got another guy that says — another informant told the police the guy with the gun's right down the street because they're gonna go get that witness and kill him.

Okay. I'll stop right there. Think there's more evidence that they were involved in this crime than a fingerprint on an outside of a door that no one knows when was made, when it was made and placed there? So okay, I got it. Let's check their fingerprints. Let's exclude them.

But see, once again, we're not beating our clothes on the rocks in the stream

anymore. We got DNA. You thought it was important enough to send it down and check and see if we could slam dunk Mr. Ferrara. But now it excludes him, we'll just tell the jury it's not important, and we'll hang our heads and our hats on this fingerprint. So why even bother to check any of these other people, any of this other evidence to see who's involved?

If you remember, Mr. Chappell testified with regard to these bullet fragments from a .38 and said there could be three guns that were involved. That's what Mr. Chappell said. Could be three. But no, see, because we got this guy here. Let's just get him instead of maybe trying to get the person who did this. Got this guy.

I'm busting my butt, man, doing this investigation. Well, there's 167 suspects, Mr. Mondora. Did you call any of them?
Well, no. Did you know how many of them are alive? Well, no. We got our guy. We got our guy. We got our guy. We got our guy. We got a print.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a search for the truth; okay? You promised me when you were selected as jurors that you would not only be fair to Mr. Ferrara, but that you would hold the state to its burden. Its burden of proving not just that there's a fingerprint, that Mr. Ferrara murdered three people. And you promised me that you would make them prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, for a period of time, Ms. Doherty, boy, she was bolstering Mr. Finamore. And I felt bad for the guy. I'll be honest with you. I was worried maybe I was bullying him or something. You know what, but it's a search for the truth here. Answer a question. What color's the carpet? Well, I don't know. Could be orange. Could — answer it. Everybody knows it. Answer the question. No.

They wanna fight you. They don't want you to find out the truth here, because this is the only truth they want you to believe.

He did it, Ferrara; convict him. That's what you're supposed to do. Got a fingerprint.

Got a fingerprint.

So ladies and gentlemen, you're at the light at 224 and South Avenue, and you're about to make a left-hand turn, and Mr. Finamore says, go ahead and drive.

Drive, man. Traffic's clear. Ain't nobody here. Are you gonna make that turn without looking? I mean, he might hand you his license and say, hey, next time we'll take my 747 because I got a driver's license. I can fly a 747. What's the difference? Anybody can do that.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is about not only what was done, but what wasn't done. For the state to tell you now after sending the DNA that it's not important after the detectives in '74 took painstaking efforts to talk to people, everybody that was there to make sure they couldn't have been or left that cigarette, and they were comfortable with that. So comfortable that they were

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

using that print to also exclude people as suspects.

See, when the state starts the case, they tell you they're going to go step by step by step, and you take them at their word. And the problem is, they lead you to the edge of a cliff, and they want you to -rather than jump off, they want you to take the only out that they've offered you, Mr. Ferrara. Think about whether you would rely on this evidence to convict somebody for murder as you would rely on it making any important decisions. I -- I could tell you buying a house, having children, where your children go to school, I can't -- I don't know if I'd rely on this kind of evidence to go decide whether I want to have chicken or turkey. Bottom line is, even if you believe there's a fingerprint at the garage door, and that fingerprint, or fingerprints, belonged to Mr. Ferrara, how do you logically say that means he committed the murder?

I'm going to tell you one other thing I

want you to look at, too. You're going to get some evidence sent back with you. And there's a bunch of pictures of that car.

Because by the way, I didn't hear anybody testify that, certainly, that he saw

Mr. Ferrara, and by the way, they saw

Mr. Ferrara drive the car away and all that; you know? They got a composite photo, and you're going to see some of that evidence about who this individual was that dropped off the car after the murders, the night of the murders. And they say he's 40, 50 years old. Okay. Well, let's forget that.

But ladies and gentlemen, you're going to get a bunch of photos of this car; okay? Take a look at the photos. The car looks like they just had it detailed inside. I mean, I don't know what the deal is. They'll probably tell you, well, yeah, they probably took it and got it — I mean, you heard about this crime scene. You heard about this blood. You heard about how terrible everything was. And then whoever did it got

in the car, drove away, dumped the car at K-mart.

And you look in there, there ain't a speck of blood. There ain't -- there's nothing there to show anybody even drove the car. I mean, it's insane. And it's not like they drove it to -- into the middle of the woods. They drove it to K-mart and got out of the car and walked past Mrs. Informer who you're gonna see back there in evidence. Then they draw a picture and said some 40, 50-year-old guy.

And they investigated everybody. They excluded people because they didn't look like this person. Excluded some of these 167 suspects because they didn't look like this guy.

So I guess here's what you got. You got a fingerprint. Got the fingerprint. And they want you to forget anything that you don't have, any investigation that wasn't done, and just serve it — here, eat what we got. I know you want steak. I know you want

MAHONING COUNTY YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

lobster. But you know what, we got hamburger. Eat it. They want you to eat it. They want you to do what they want you to do because this is 40 years old, and these poor people need some closure, and you gotta give it to them.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that's not your job, and the judge is going to tell you that that's not your job. Your job is that search for the truth. Here it is right here. You 12 people are on a search for the truth. You decide what's the truth or not.

And I'm telling you you can't -- you may not know who it is, but you know who it isn't. You can't believe that Mr. Ferrara did this based on a fingerprint outside the door. That is a Grand Canyon of a leap, and you wouldn't make it in any decision you make any day of your life.

Now, I'm done here because I've rambled around long enough. Ms. Cantalamessa's going to get up here, and she gets to talk to you last because the state has the burden of

proof here. So she's going to say some stuff, and I bet some of it's going to make me want to jump up and respond, but I can't because the judge will throw me out in the cold weather, and I don't want to have that happen.

So you people promised me you'd give me a fair shake, and you believed all those things we talked about beyond a reasonable doubt, and the state's burden of proof. So you're going to have to remember that when you get back there. You're going to have to think about whatever she brings up now and the points that I would make. Say, well, Meranto probably would've said this, and Meranto probably would've said that. I know I can't make you do that, but I'm asking you to.

The last thing I want to tell you before I leave you is I did probably get a little testy with some of the witnesses here. And you know what, my philosophy is I'll be nice until it's time not to be nice. I'm

searching for the truth here, and if I want to ask you a simple question, and you don't want to give me a simple answer, then it's going to get ugly, and I apologize for that. You know what, I won't apologize for it. I just hope I didn't offend anybody, because I did my job, under the circumstances, with these people that did not.

For some reason they want to hide the truth from you. They don't want you to hear what went on. All I'm asking is that you don't hold it against Mr. Ferrara because he ain't got no control over me.

So I thank you for your time and your attention, and please don't fall into the trap of taking what they give you. They didn't give you enough, and that means not guilty, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Meranto.

Ms. Cantalamessa.

MS. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, Your

Honor. Mr. Meranto keeps asking who's hiding
the truth. He's telling us we're hiding the

truth, our witnesses are hiding the truth.

We're the only ones presenting people from
that time, from who are at the scene who
could tell you with first-hand knowledge what
that scene was like, with first-hand
knowledge where those prints were taken from,
with first-hand knowledge of where those
projectiles are. We're the only ones
presenting that.

He wanted to tell you that we haven't proven the why. The judge is going to read you the instruction. I've already told you, proof of motive is not required. We don't know why anyone would do this. No one could know why someone would break into someone's house and murder three people. We don't know why.

He wants to tell you that we didn't prove how that person did it. We sure did. We showed you through testimony, through evidence, that Deputy Finamore when he gets there, there's one set of tracks in the snow around that garage. That window to that

garage door is broken open. One set of footprints around the back of that house to that garage door with the window. This garage door that's open to the elements; this garage door that gets rained on, snowed on, wind hitting it.

They find fingerprints. Not just one fingerprint. Not just one finger. They find three. Three, all in a line, from Mr. Ferrara. Right above that door knob after he breaks the window, reaches in, unlocked the door, pushes that door open to get through. And by that time he gets into the house, into that — into the separation between the garage and the family room, kicked that door open.

And they lift that shoe print, and they find a matching shoe print in the bedroom.

Shoe prints aren't unique, though.

Fingerprints are unique. Three fingerprints.

We've shown you the who. We've shown you that it's James Ferrara. We've shown you that, yeah, they went through a lot of

suspects. They didn't have any leads back then.

So what did they look at? Bad guys; 167 of them. They looked at bad guys who didn't even have fingers until they found out they've been amputated. They looked at bad guys whose names came up and didn't know if they were dead at the time, that were in jail at the time, that were in the hospital at the time. They eliminated 167 people. Not just that year. They kept going for the next several years. They kept submitting more fingerprints.

But there's only one guy whose
fingerprints were there. James Ferrara. And
his fingerprints just weren't on a card by
themselves like they were slipped into that
file. They were on the same card that
contained fingerprints of the victims from
the other doors. Because Deputy Finamore
testified, they dusted a lot of that house.
What they lifted is places that they could
see the fingerprints pop up.

Robin Ladd even told you, the worst that could happen is that someone lifts a print, it gets smudged, and she can't even use it.
But what she found when she looked at those prints, those prints that have been locked up since 1974, at BCI, she found sufficient ridge detail. She found what she thought was more ridge detail than the last guy who did it back in the '70s.

So she started looking at it, and now that they have AFIS, she put it in. She put it into the AFIS. And they don't punch in numbers, so it's subjective. It's not what she thinks the fingerprint looks like. It looks like a crown. It looks like a ridge. No. They put it in the computer. It scans it, and it pops out a hit. A hit on James Ferrara.

She doesn't then run to the phone and say, hey, it's James Ferrara. No. She has to pull his card and pull that fingerprint again and do a manual comparison. And she doesn't say, okay, now it's James Ferrara.

She tells Detective Mondora, go get James
Ferrara's fingerprints. I need to confirm.
I need to make sure that AFIS had the right
card even.

And so he does that, and she does it again. She manually looks at it, and it is him. It's that left hand, that little finger, ring finger, middle finger.

I don't see what the defense's argument is that Deputy Finamore doesn't have any experience. He's been trained. But Deputy Finamore's not even the one lifting the prints. He's watching Bernie Albert lift the print. He's watching Bernie Albert put it on that card. He's watching Bernie Albert mark it. And he's there to learn, to experience what it's like.

Mr. Meranto wants you to believe that we put Dr. Ohr on for shock value. We have to prove that three people are dead. We have to prove that those people didn't die naturally. We have to prove that their deaths were caused from gunshots, from hemorrhages to

their head by the beating they took through the skull, like Heather, like Ben. We have to prove that to you.

Mr. Meranto wants you to believe that
Andrew Chappell said it could be three guns.
Now, there's only one set of footprints.
There's only one set of fingerprints. And back in 1975 when they had all six bullets, brand-new, brand-new from the scene, they all matched the same weapon.

Because that person's dead, we have to have them reanalyzed. And the lead's been knocking around. They talked about the lead being soft. And all he could say — he's honest. We want to represent that to you. Only two he can say matched now that are consistent from the same weapon. But the other two, they're not from a .45 and a .40. He can say that they're from .38s as well. He can still say that.

Mr. Meranto wants you to not focus on the prints but focus on the cigarette. We couldn't get that cigarette into evidence.

We didn't have anyone who saw that cigarette on the scene. We didn't have anyone known to collect it. I don't have anyone with a collection tag, where it was found in the house, where are the ashes. Those ashes aren't from that cigarette. It was lit on the wrong end. I don't know where that cigarette's found.

And guess what, back in the '70s, they're touching everything, picking up bloody clothes. So they run that risk, because that cigarette was a big deal in the '70s, they run that risk, and they have it tested. And yeah, it's not James Ferrara. We don't know who it is. It could be anybody at the scene. It could be anybody at their party they had from two nights before. And we still don't know where it's from. It wasn't even submitted until February of 1975.

When Detective Mondora submits that cigarette -- it's always been the belief that this house is way too remote for this defendant to have just walked there, for

2.1

James Ferrara to have walked to Canfield to this house. It's out in the middle of nowhere at the time. Someone would've had to drop him off. They've always been looking for some kind of association. There's still no match. There's still only one set of footprints. There's still only one set of fingerprints. And there's still three dead bodies.

This is the same evidence you would use in any type of case, any type of criminal case. The same standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

These three fingerprints are found on that back door. The door's kicked into the house, and there's three dead bodies. Six shots fired. Four into Ben, including the one found on the floor of the bedroom, one into the ceiling. One into Marilyn. And then Heather is beaten.

It's a revolver. It's a .38 special revolver; one of the ones that are on that list that Andy proposes that could be a match

### STATE'S FINAL CLOSING ARGUMENT

2.1

to one of these gun markings, the markings on the bullets.

If it's not his prints, I already told you, the defendant enjoys the same rights we all do. The defendant has the right to subpoena witnesses. He brought in Brenda Gerardi. Fine with us. We can't put the cigarette in. He could've brought in a fingerprint expert as well.

But he knows those are his prints. He knows there's no other prints on that door, no other fresh prints from when that door was broken open, that point of entry into the house where three people are murdered.

need to use your reason and common sense.

Use that reasoning. He's the only one that didn't belong. Mr. Ferrara didn't know

Mr. Marsh. Mr. Boyle testified he even -- he was Mr. Marsh's best friend. Over at the house all the time. They're over at his house all the time. He didn't know

Mr. Ferrara. So Ferrara was not known to

### STATE'S FINAL CLOSING ARGUMENT

Mr. Marsh. Not a friend. Not someone who would be at the house. Not someone who would leave his fingerprints.

You have to make your decision based on only the evidence presented, not rumor, not theories, not conjecture, and certainly our statements aren't evidence. But the defense attorney's statements aren't evidence either. They're just argument.

You have that same evidence they had in the 1970s. It's as if we took a time machine and we've traveled back, but now we have the benefit of knowing who did this. We have the benefit of having that technology that we could put those prints into AFIS, and we could get that hit, and we can compare it to Mr. Ferrara and find out that it was him.

We don't know why, but we don't have to prove that. We can prove he trespassed in that house. He went in with a weapon, being a gun, a .38, a revolver, and he killed three people. And he left Christopher there, a one-year-old. And Christopher had to sit

2.1

there with his parents, with his sister, nobody around, for over 24 hours before someone discovered their bodies.

James Ferrara was brutal. He didn't let up, and he didn't leave any witnesses. But he did leave something for us. He left a signature, his unique fingerprints on that back door. And that back door isn't by coincidence. That's the point of entry. It's not like we found his fingerprints on some window that wasn't broken. We found his fingerprints on the point of entry. And don't think it's a coincidence that Mr. Ferrara worked for GM at the same time Mr. Marsh did.

Please look at the evidence, collectively remember everyone's testimony. Think about it with logic, with your common sense. Talk about what's reasonable. And I'm sure you will find the defendant guilty for all three aggravated murders in this case. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Cantalamessa.

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 Okay, folks. The next thing is the 2 instructions of law. And we're going to take 3 about a 10-minute recess before I give you 4 all of the instructions so that all these 5 things can be moved out of the way and the 6 exhibits can be gathered and properly 7 assembled for submission to you. So during 8 your absence from the court, please do not 9 discuss the case at all among yourselves or 10 with anyone else. Please do not allow anyone 11 to discuss the case with you or in your 12 presence. You should not form or express any 13 opinion about the case. We'll be in recess 14 for 10 minutes. 15 (WHEREUPON, a brief recess was had, 16 17 follows:) 18

after which the proceedings continued as

Those of you in the rear of THE COURT: the courtroom are welcome to stay, but the court will lock the door during instructions so there's no interruption with people moving in and out. The instructions should be a half an hour to forty minutes. So you're

2.1

welcome to stay if you wish. Is the door locked? All right. Please give me your close attention. This is the law that will govern you during the course of your deliberations.

Members of the jury, you've heard the evidence and the arguments of counsel. The court and the jury have separate functions.

You are to decide the disputed facts, and the court provides you with the instructions of law. It is your sworn duty to accept the law as it is given to you. You are not permitted to change the law, nor to apply your own conception of what you think the law is or what you think the law should be. So you must follow these instructions.

As you know, a criminal case in the Court of Common Pleas begins with the filing of an indictment. The indictment, a piece of paper, was delivered to the defendant to inform him that he was charged with these crimes. The defendant entered a plea of not quilty to those charges, and that's why

you're here, to decide whether or not the state can meet its burden of proof. You are not to consider the fact that an indictment was filed for any other purpose.

The plea of not guilty entered by the defendant is a denial of the charges and puts into issue every essential element of each of the charges.

As you know, the defendant is presumed to be innocent unless or until his guilt is established by proof beyond a reasonable doubt. In other words, the defendant must be found not guilty unless the state produces evidence which convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of every essential element of the offense or offenses charged in the indictment.

Reasonable doubt is present when, after you have carefully considered and compared all of the evidence, you cannot say you are firmly convinced of the truth of the charge. Reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason and common sense. Reasonable doubt is not

mere possible doubt, because everything relating to human affairs or depending upon moral evidence is open to some possible or imaginary doubt. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof of such character that an ordinary person would be willing to rely and act upon it in the most important of his or her own affairs.

The case must be decided based upon the evidence that was or was not presented. Evidence is all of the testimony received from the witnesses, and it will include exhibits that you'll have with you in the jury room.

You may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence in determining whether or not the state has met its burden of proof. You must decide then from all of the direct and circumstantial evidence taken together whether or not the state has proven all of the elements of the charges herein beyond any reasonable doubt.

Direct evidence is the testimony of a

witness who has seen or heard or smelled or felt or somehow perceived the things concerning which he or she testifies. It includes the exhibits you'll have with you in the jury room.

Circumstantial evidence is different.

Circumstantial evidence is the proof of facts or circumstances by direct evidence from which you may then reasonably infer other related or connected facts which naturally and logically follow, according to the common experience of mankind.

You'll remember during voir dire I gave an example of that, and so did the lawyers give examples of what circumstantial evidence is.

To infer, or to make an inference, is to reach a reasonable conclusion of fact which you may but are not required to make from other facts that were established by direct evidence. So you may infer a fact or reach a conclusion only from other facts that have been proven by the greater weight of the

2.1

evidence. However, whether or not an inference is made rests entirely with you. You don't have to make any inference if you choose not to.

The evidence does not include any statements of counsel, nor does it include the indictment in the case as I indicated before. So the opening and closing statements of counsel are not evidence.

The evidence does not include any statements that were stricken by the court or that you were instructed to disregard. You must not speculate as to why an objection was sustained to any question or what the answer to that question might have been because the court sustained an objection to that particular question.

Furthermore, you're not to consider as evidence anything that was asked in a question asked by one of the lawyers that was then objected to and I sustained it. The lawyers asking a question is not evidence.

It's what the witnesses have to say that

1 provides evidence.

So as I am the judge of the law, you, ladies and gentlemen, are the judges of the facts of this case, and the credibility or believability of the witnesses, and what weight or value you should give to the evidence before you.

To weigh the evidence you should determine — to determine the greater weight of the evidence you should consider the credibility or the believability of the witnesses, and you should use the tests of truthfulness that you use in your daily lives.

As I indicated to you before, witnesses can be telling you the truth, or they can be lying to you, or they can be mistaken about what they have to say. Those are the types of things that you have to determine.

These tests include the actual appearance of that witness upon the witness stand; the way that they acted; their manner of testifying; the reasonableness of their

testimony; the opportunity the witness had to see and hear and know the things concerning which he or she testifies; the witness' accuracy of memory; frankness or lack of it; intelligence; interest in the outcome of this case, and bias, if any; together with all the facts and circumstances surrounding the testimony. Using these tests and any tests you use to determine whether or not someone is worthy of belief, you should assign to the testimony of each witness such weight or value as you deem proper.

You are not required to believe the testimony of any witness simply because he or she came in here and swore an oath to tell the truth. You may believe all or part or none of the testimony of any witness. It is entirely within your province to determine what testimony is worthy of belief and what testimony is not worthy of belief.

As you were previously instructed, the law of this country provides that it is not necessary that the defendant take the witness

stand in his own defense. He has a constitutional right not to testify. The fact that he chose not to testify may not be considered by you for any purpose whatsoever.

Generally a witness is not permitted to express an opinion. However, someone who follows a particular profession or a special line of work or who does something that the rest of us don't do, may express an opinion on that subject because of that person's education, knowledge, and experience. Such testimony was admitted for whatever assistance it may provide to help you arrive at a just verdict.

That's the instruction regarding what's called expert testimony. I always like to tell juries that I'm an expert, because I used to be a Roto-Rooter man. I went to college at Youngstown State at night. I went to work seven days a week for Roto-Rooter cleaning people's sewers. So if I was called as a witness to talk about that I would be an expert because I know more about that Ihan I

really like to know, but I sure know a lot more about that than most of the rest of you know. So an expert is someone who knows something about -- something more about a particular subject than the rest of us do.

In evaluating that, as with other witnesses, upon you alone rests the duty of deciding what weight should be given to the testimony of an expert, someone who was given the opportunity to express an opinion.

In determining its weight, you should take into consideration that person's skill, experience, knowledge, veracity, familiarity with all of the facts of this case, and the usual rules for testing credibility and determining the weight to be given to the testimony.

A number of exhibits and the testimony relating to them have been introduced. You may consider whether the exhibits are the same objects and in the same condition as originally taken by the deputies and/or lab agents. You will determine what weight, if

any, the exhibits should receive in light of all of the evidence.

So in this case the defendant has been charged with three particular criminal offenses. They are all called aggravated murder.

And in Count One, aggravated murder relates to the death of Benjamin Marsh. In Count Two, aggravated murder relates to the death of Marilyn Marsh. And in Count Three, aggravated murder relates to the death of Heather Marsh. So I'm not going to read the definition of aggravated murder three times. I'm going to read it once, but it applies to each of those three counts concurrently and respectively to those victims that I have named.

So in Counts One, Two, and Three, the defendant is charged with a crime called aggravated murder. In each of these separate counts, you must determine them separately and independently from one another. Before you can find the defendant guilty, you must

2.1

find beyond any reasonable doubt that on or about the 14th day of December, in 1974, in Mahoning County, Ohio, this defendant, James P. Ferrara, did purposely cause the death of another — again, in Count One, Benjamin Marsh; Count Two, Marilyn Marsh; Count Three, Heather Marsh — while he was committing or attempting to commit, or in fleeing immediately after committing or attempting to commit the offenses of aggravated robbery and/or aggravated burglary.

The state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that this defendant acted purposely.

Purpose is an essential element of the crime of aggravated murder.

A person acts purposely when it is his specific intention to cause a certain result. So it must be established in this case that at the time in question there was present in the mind of this defendant a specific intention to cause the death of another human being. In Count One, Benjamin. In Count Two, Marilyn. In Count Three, Heather.

Purpose is a decision of the mind to do an act with a conscious objective of producing a specific result. To do an act purposely is to do it intentionally and not accidentally. So purpose and intent mean the same thing.

The purpose with which a person does an act is known only to himself, unless he expresses it to others by telling them what he's going to do, or he indicates it by his conduct. The purpose with which a person does an act can be determined from the manner in which it is done, the means and/or the weapon used, and all the other facts and circumstances in evidence.

The court instructs you that if a wound is inflicted upon a person with a deadly weapon in a manner calculated to destroy life, the purpose to cause the death may be, but is not required to be, inferred from the use of the weapon. The inference, if made, is not conclusive.

Proof of motive is not required. The

presence or absence of motive is one of the circumstances bearing upon the issue of purpose.

The state must also prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the acts of the defendant was a cause of the death of each of those three persons individually and/or collectively. So cause is an essential element of the offense of aggravated murder.

Cause is an act which directly produces the death of another, and without which it would not have occurred.

The state charges that these aggravated murders occurred while the defendant was committing or attempting to commit, or while fleeing immediately after committing or attempting to commit aggravated burglary and/or aggravated robbery. And that means that the death must occur as a part of the acts leading up to or occurring during, or immediately after the commission of aggravated burglary and/or aggravated robbery, and that the death was directly

2.1

associated with the commission of one or both of those crimes, or the flight immediately after committing one or both of those crimes.

So the state says this occurred while committing or attempting to commit aggravated robbery or aggravated burglary. And again, by proof beyond a reasonable doubt, the state would have to establish that an attempt was made if the actual crime was not committed.

And an attempt occurs when a person purposely engages in conduct that, if successful, would result in the commission of the offense of aggravated murder.

So again, the elements that the state has to prove in each of the three counts is that on or about -- and it's proof beyond a reasonable doubt. I'm required to legally say that. It's that important. And sometimes I'll just say to prove it, but to prove it means to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, each and every time that I say that.

So the state does have to prove beyond a

reasonable doubt in each of those three counts, that on or about December 14th, 1974, in Mahoning County, Ohio, this defendant, James P. Ferrara, did purposely cause the death of another while committing or attempting to commit, or while fleeing immediately after committing or attempting to commit aggravated robbery and/or aggravated burglary.

So because of the way these charges are brought, aggravated burglary is an essential element of the crime of aggravated murder.

So the state must prove aggravated burglary beyond a reasonable doubt.

That is, that the defendant, with purpose to commit a theft offense, or any felony, trespassed by force, stealth, or deception, in an occupied structure when another person, other than an accomplice of the defendant, was present in that structure, and the defendant inflicted or attempted to inflict physical harm on that person, and that he had a deadly weapon on or about his

1 person or under his control.

Purpose has already been defined for you.

And so the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant had a purpose to commit a theft offense or any felony in the home of the Marshes.

The state must also prove a criminal trespass, and that's proved beyond any reasonable doubt, that the defendant, without privilege to do so, knowingly entered or remained on the land or premises of the Marsh family.

Privilege is an immunity, license, or right conferred by law or bestowed or expressed by implied grant, or arising out of status, position, office, or relationship, or growing out of necessity. Without privilege is, like, without permission.

The state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant knowingly trespassed on the land or premises of another, and so they must prove that the defendant acted

2.1

knowingly, regardless of his purpose, and that he was aware that his conduct would probably cause a certain result.

Since you cannot look into the mind of another, knowledge is determined from all of the facts and circumstances in evidence. And you will determine from these facts and circumstances whether there existed at the time in the mind of the defendant an awareness of the probability that he was trespassing in an occupied structure of another.

That trespass would have to be by force, stealth, or deception.

Force means any violence, compulsion, effort or constraint exerted or used by any means upon or against a person or thing to gain entrance.

Stealth means any secret or sly act to avoid discovery and to gain entrance into or to remain within a structure of another without permission.

I didn't make these up. These are

statutory definitions, and they're really not how the rest of us talk.

Deception means knowingly deceiving another or causing another to be deceived by any false or misleading representation by withholding information, by preventing another from acquiring information, or by any other conduct, act or omission that creates, confirms, or perpetuates a false impression in another, including a false impression as to law, value, state of mind, or other objective or subjective fact. So force, stealth, or deception.

In an occupied structure. That means any house, building, outbuilding, watercraft, aircraft, railroad car, truck, trailer, tent, or other structure, vehicle, or shelter, or any portion thereof which at the time is occupied as the permanent or temporary habitation of any person, whether or not any person is actually present.

They must also prove that there was physical harm to persons caused, prove that

beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant inflicted or attempted to inflict physical harm to another. And that means any injury, any illness, or any physiological impairment, regardless of its gravity or duration.

The state must also prove in order to establish this element of aggravated murder that the defendant had a deadly weapon on or about his person or under his control.

A deadly weapon is any instrument, device, or thing, capable of inflicting death, and designed or specially adapted for use as a weapon, or possessed, carried or used as a weapon in this case.

A deadly weapon then is any instrument, device, or thing that has two characteristics. The first characteristic is that it is capable of inflicting or causing death. The second characteristic is in the alternative; either the instrument, device, or thing was designed or specially adapted for use as a weapon, or it was possessed, carried, or used as a weapon in this case.

These are questions of fact for you to determine.

They must also prove that there was a specific intention, a purpose, to commit a theft offense or any felony. A theft offense is when any person, with purpose to deprive the owner of property or services, knowingly obtains or exerts control over the property or services without the consent of the owner or any person authorized to give consent. So they must prove that it was his intention to commit a theft offense or any felony.

This is how strange the law can be. I looked up the definition of felony. A felony is a serious crime, a crime for which someone can be incarcerated in a penitentiary.

That's my definition. But the legal definition that our legislatures have written and the Supreme Court has approved is; felony means an offense defined by law as a felony. So go by the definition I gave you.

So as one of the elements of aggravated murder, the state must prove beyond a

reasonable doubt an aggravated burglary, which I've just defined for you, and I'll summarize again.

The state must prove this element beyond a reasonable doubt, that on or about December 14th, 1974, in Mahoning County, Ohio, this defendant, by force, stealth, or deception, trespassed in an occupied structure with purpose to commit therein any theft offense, or any felony, and that he inflicted or attempted to inflict physical harm on another, and that he had a deadly weapon on or about his person or under his control.

In the charge of aggravated murder, in each of those three counts, the state has also charged the commission of an aggravated robbery. So the state must prove as an element of aggravated murder the offense of aggravated robbery.

And that is that on or about

December 14th, 1974, in Mahoning County,

Ohio, the defendant, while committing or

attempting to commit, or in fleeing immediately after committing or attempting to commit a theft offense, had a deadly weapon; to wit, a firearm, on or about his person or under his control, and that he displayed, brandished, indicated that he possessed, or used the weapon, and that he inflicted or attempted to inflict serious physical harm on another.

And again, respectively, Benjamin, Marilyn, and Heather Marsh.

A criminal attempt occurs when a person purposely engages in conduct that, if successful, would result in the commission of a particular crime. In this case, a theft offense in the aggravated robbery element. So before you can find that the defendant was committing or attempting to commit a theft offense, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, with purpose to deprive the owner of property or services, knowingly obtained or exerted control over the property or services of another without

the consent of the owner or a person authorized to give consent.

The act of having the deadly weapon on or about his person or under his control and displaying, brandishing, indicating possession of it, and inflicting or attempting to inflict serious physical harm must occur during or immediately after the theft offense.

The state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, again, that the defendant had a deadly weapon on or about his person or under his control. Again, that is any instrument, device, or thing capable of inflicting death, and designed or specially adapted for use as a weapon, or possessed, carried, or used as a weapon in this case.

To brandish means to wave or exhibit in a menacing or challenging way.

The state must also prove that the defendant inflicted or attempted to inflict serious physical harm upon another.

Serious physical harm means any mental

2.1

illness or condition of such gravity as would normally require hospitalization or prolonged psychiatric treatment, or any physical harm that carries a substantial risk of death, or any physical harm that involves some permanent incapacity, whether partial or total, or that involves some temporary, substantial incapacity, or any physical harm that involves some permanent disfigurement, or that involves some temporary serious disfigurement, or any physical harm that involves acute pain of such duration as to result in substantial suffering, or that involves any degree of prolonged or intractable pain.

The state must also prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the deadly weapon employed by the defendant was a firearm.

A firearm is any deadly weapon capable of expelling or propelling one or more projectiles by the action of an explosive or combustible propellant. Firearm includes an unloaded firearm, and any firearm which is

inoperable, but which can be readily rendered operable.

When deciding whether the firearm is capable of expelling or propelling one or more projectiles by the action of an explosive or combustible propellant, you may rely on circumstantial evidence, including but not limited to the actions of the individual exercising control over the firearm.

So in this element the state must prove, as the element of the aggravated murder, the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that this defendant, in committing — in attempting or committing a theft offense, or in fleeing immediately after such attempt or offense, did have a deadly weapon; to wit, a firearm, on or about his person or under his control, and did display it, brandish, indicate that he possessed, or used said firearm, to inflict or attempt to inflict serious physical harm on another.

So those are the definitions applicable

to the charges in Counts One, Two, and Three, aggravated murder, while in the commission of aggravated burglary and/or aggravated robbery.

If you find that the state proved beyond a reasonable doubt all of the essential elements of any one or more of the offenses charged in separate counts of the indictment, your verdict must be guilty as to such offense or offenses, according to your findings.

If you find that the state failed to prove any one -- failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any one of the essential elements of any one or more of the offenses charged in the separate counts of the indictment, your verdict must be not guilty as to such offense or offenses according to your findings.

The charges set forth in each count in the indictment constitute separate and distinct matters. You must consider each count and the evidence applicable to each

count separately, and you must state your finding as to each count, uninfluenced by your verdict as to any other count.

The defendant may be found guilty of or not guilty of any one or more of the offenses.

So the court has instructed you on all the law necessary for your deliberations.

I'll now instruct you on how to conduct your deliberations and prepare your verdict forms.

You must not be influenced by any consideration of sympathy or prejudice. It is your duty to carefully weigh the evidence, to decide the disputed questions of fact, to apply the instructions of law to your findings and to render your verdict accordingly. Your duty as jurors is to arrive at a fair and just verdict. So you must consider all of the evidence and make your findings with intelligence, and impartiality, and without any bias or sympathy or prejudice, so that the State of Ohio and this defendant will feel that their

2.1

case was fairly and impartially tried.

If during the course of this trial this court said or did anything that you feel is an indication of how I think the case should be decided, you're instructed to disregard that. This case is being tried to you.

That's your decision, not mine.

If you don't remember a portion of these instructions, I'll repeat them for you. Anytime that you communicate with us once you're locked in the jury room is by ringing the buzzer in the jury room, and the bailiff will come up there and retrieve your written question. Any question you ask must be in writing, however. Any questions you have have to be in writing.

And when we come up there, after I discuss the question with the lawyers, we'll come up there to answer the question. So we'll knock on the door. We'll enter the jury room with the court reporter and me. I'll read your question and answer after I've consulted with counsel. They'll be at the

2.1

jury room door to hear what's going on. They have that right. And I'll answer that question.

You can't ask anything out loud. You can't discuss anything with us. We can simply answer a written question if you have one. And that's how you must communicate with us.

If you need a portion of the instructions repeated, then that's how you should do that. The instructions now, by law, are to be reproduced for you, but because I do this not from script, the court reporter will have to do that, and it'll take a little while before that will occur. So if you need repetition of any of the instructions before then, please let me know that.

You're reminded that you are not to discuss or consider in any way the subject of punishment. Of course, if the defendant is not guilty, then pretty silly to discuss punishment. If he's guilty, it's equally

inappropriate because that is not your business. By law, that is a duty placed upon the court if the defendant is found quilty.

Your initial conduct upon commencing deliberations is very important. As I told you during voir dire, each of you is to make your own impression, think about how you feel, and then tell the others what you think and what you feel. But you're also supposed to hear what they have to say before you decide, and let yourself be influenced by what the others say, because they took the same oath you did. They're just as interested in resolving this case as you are. And you should try and work together to reach a unanimous verdict if you're able to do that.

That's the only way the case will be decided is if there's a unanimous verdict of guilty or a unanimous verdict of not guilty.

So if you do talk about how the case should be decided right away, sometimes your pride gets aroused. Sometimes, you know, you

don't want to listen. Whatever it is, your duty is to agree if you can possibly do so. So that's what you have to work on when you go back there.

Respect what the others have to say.

Consider their views, and be willing to change your opinion if the others can convince you that you should see it their way. You should not disturb your individual judgment just to be congenial or to get this thing over with. That's not what this is about. This is about the right result in this case.

I have prepared verdict forms. There are three of them you'll have with you in the jury room. Each of them says State of Ohio vs. James P. Ferrara. It has the case number and my name. And then it has verdict on Count One, Aggravated murder as it relates to Benjamin Marsh; Count Two as it relates to Marilyn Marsh; and Count Three as it relates to Heather Marsh.

And each of them say, "We the jury, duly

impaneled and sworn, find the defendant,

James P. Ferrara, "blank. In the blank you
insert the words "guilty" or the words "not
guilty of aggravated murder of" -- and each
of these has the name of the particular
decedent -- "in the manner and form as he
stands charged in Count One of the indictment
as it relates to Benjamin Marsh."

There are 12 lines for you to sign. You have to sign in ink, and there's a space for you to date the verdict when you do reach a verdict. That likewise has to be filled in in ink.

We have an alternate juror here, and as previously instructed, Ms. Makosky, you're going to be held here in a separate room all by yourself, sequestered in case you are called upon to take the place of any of the other jurors.

The court wishes to thank all of you for your service in this case. Part of my job is to keep an eye on you, and everyone seemed very alert and attentive, and it seems that

you've honored your obligation admirably to this point. It is quite a burden that we impose upon you. It's a very high calling. You can't worry about what anybody thinks. You have to do what is right based upon what you heard or didn't hear and make that decision. It's a decision of law that you have to make. And if you do it the right way, we're going to thank you for your verdict, no matter what it may be.

When you do reach a verdict, you are to fill out the verdict forms completely, and then push the buzzer, and the bailiff will come up and you'll so inform him. And then I'll gather everyone here in the courtroom. That usually takes a little bit of time. And we'll have you down to the courtroom to render your verdict. The foreperson will give the verdict forms to the bailiff when we're here in the courtroom, and I'll read them to the parties. And you may be polled. As I indicated to you, it's not a big deal. And then you'll be released.

You're not permitted to discuss the case at all outside of that jury room, with anyone at all, even if you're with other jurors outside of that jury room. You can't discuss the case unless all 12 of you are together in that jury room.

When you go back there you should select a foreperson to preside over your deliberations. We have to say foreperson.

We can't say foreman anymore because the ladies get upset about that. And even one time I got criticized for saying foreperson.

Everybody's a little too touchy for me, I guess. But anyhow, one of you should be selected by the rest of you to preside over the proceedings there.

The foreperson doesn't have any more power than the others. The vote doesn't mean any more. The purpose is simply to allow everyone to be heard and to make sure that the discussions are orderly. Additionally, the foreperson has charge of the exhibits and the verdict forms and will return them to the

2.1

court at the appropriate time.

So the only other thing when we come back to the jury room, if we do, to answer a question or just to discuss anything with you, we'll knock on the door. Please make sure there's nothing there that would indicate to us the status of your deliberations. It's not our right to know that, what the vote is or which way you're heading or anything like that. So just make sure there's no papers on the table there that anyone could view and find out what's going on there.

Okay. May I please see counsel at side bar?

(WHEREUPON, a discussion was had among court and counsel off the record and out of the hearing of the jury and court reporter, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: All right. The court has met with counsel at side bar, and there are no additions or deletions for the charge, and

so the court instructs you ladies and gentlemen to retire now and begin your deliberations. Good luck to you.

(WHEREUPON, the jury left the courtroom at 3:47 p.m., to begin their deliberations, and the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. As I indicated, Juror No. 4, I think you folks know that she was going to go to Cleveland tonight?

MS. DOHERTY: Yes.

MR. MERANTO: Yes.

THE COURT: So it's 10 to 4:00. She's going to have to get going pretty quick. I don't know if -- sometimes people change their minds. I don't know if she wants to stay or if we're going to have them come back tomorrow or if we just put Ms. Makosky in her place. We did talk about selecting an alternate with Ms. Crump's situation in mind. But before I decide that, I'll allow the state and the defense to offer your opinion as to what you think we should do.

MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, Judge. I guess

my concern would be if Ms. Crump left and was replaced today with the alternate, if something were to happen this evening and they didn't reach a verdict, tomorrow we would be in big trouble. I mean, not to say they — I guess if it was early in the morning and she had to leave and the jurors would have the remainder of the day, but I guess at this late time of day, I would be concerned that replacing her now could create a problem. I mean, you never know what could happen to a family member or a juror if we don't have an alternate available.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's a legitimate concern. My counterpoint on that, though, and this is how I've always felt from the time I've started, when you let a jury go at this point, they're subject to outside influence. And so it's always been my preference to keep a jury together until they reach a verdict. So I appreciate what you have to say also. What about the defense? What do you have to say?

MR. MERANTO: Judge, I can just say, I mean, I -- I'm a little tired after what's been going on, and they've been putting in the same day, and it's been tight schedule-wise. And I'm concerned, too, just if something happens, and we gotta do this over again.

THE COURT: You don't like the 8:30 to 4:30 routine?

MR. MERANTO: Pardon me?

THE COURT: The 8:30 to 4:30, that working you over?

MR. MERANTO: It's been good, but it's a little more than I'm used to. My wife never worked me that hard ever, not one time.

**THE COURT:** So what's your pleasure?

MR. MERANTO: I think -- I just think you should let them go at 4:00, let them start fresh in the morning. Not only the concern of Ms. Doherty raised, but also -- I mean, it's been a long day. And I understand the outside influence thing, but let's face it, you know, if someone's got that

proclivity that they're going to let themselves hear something or see something, that's probably already happened in the last three days.

THE COURT: Well, all right. So is the state agreeing to that?

MS. DOHERTY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So we'll keep them for a little bit and see what happens. I'd be inclined to honor the joint request of the parties and adjourn for the evening after they've deliberated a little while. Okay.

(WHEREUPON, a brief recess was had, after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

(WHEREUPON, at 4:42 p.m., November 20, 2013, the Court, bailiff and court reporter entered the jury room, and the following proceedings were had in the presence of counsel and the defendant:)

THE COURT: I'm in receipt of several communications. The first of which was, "Can we have a large whiteboard or chalkboard?"

That was already taken care of.

Then I wanted to know if you wanted to stay or leave, and I got this cursive note, "Leave."

And then I got another note, "Change of plans. We will stay a few minutes."

And then I got the final note. Well, the last note. "Where do we put the notes? Where do we put evidence? What time do we come back? We are ready to go," question mark. So I guess it's, "We are ready to go?"

All the things that you have you can gather and put in a pile. The bailiff will secure those things, and we'll get them to the court reporter. She'll keep them in their evidence area, which is secure. And you're excused for the night. We're going to start again at 8:30 and would like everybody to be here on time. Is the alternate up there?

THE BAILIFF: She's in the witness room.

THE COURT: Go get her, please, because

I have to give the instructions before you

1

leave.

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

(WHEREUPON, the alternate juror entered the jury room, and the proceedings continued as follows:)

Okay. So ladies and THE COURT: gentlemen, we're going to discharge you for the evening. Again, I did tell you this before, when you're outside of the jury room you're not permitted to discuss the case with anyone. Please don't let anyone discuss it with you.

In days past what we've done is sequester a jury in this situation, keep you together, put you in a hotel if you can't reach a verdict. In the old days also we used to keep you together until you reached a It didn't matter how long it took, 1:00, 2:00 in the morning. We don't do that anymore because we trust you to do what's right.

You have to avoid any publicity at all about this case. You have to avoid any contact with anybody about the case and make

sure that you keep all of this the way that it should be done. Avoid any outside influence.

Thank you very kindly for your service today. We look forward to seeing you in the morning. And you can resume your deliberations in the morning, but not until all 12 of you are here. I'll have you,

Ms. Makosky, report here. I want to make sure all 13 are here before we start. You can't get started until we say go; all right? So just come in and talk about the Redskins.

We're going to make a comeback this year still.

(WHEREUPON, at 4:47 p.m., November 20, 2013, the Court, bailiff, court reporter, counsel and defendant left the jury room, and the jury suspended deliberations for the evening.)

\* \* \* \* \*

(WHEREUPON, the jury resumed deliberations at 8:37 a.m., November 21, 2013.)

# JURY QUESTION

(WHEREUPON, at 10:10 a.m., November 21, 2013, the Court, counsel, Defendant and court reporter enter the chambers of the Court, and the following proceedings were had out of the hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: We're on the record in chambers. The jury has communicated with the

chambers. The jury has communicated with the court twice this morning. First of all for coffee that has been supplied to them, and secondly, quote, "Can we get a verbalization of Detective Mondora's testimony regarding the defendant's statements of knowledge of Ben Marsh and/or knowledge of Ben Marsh residence?" The court will ask each side what your proposal is for answering the question.

MS. DOHERTY: Judge, I believe the answer is no.

**THE COURT:** How about the defense?

MR. MERANTO: I concur.

THE COURT: Okay. I agree with that completely. I will tell them I will not give them a verbalization, nor will any transcript

# JURY QUESTION

(WHEREUPON, at 10:11 a.m., November 21, 2013, the Court, bailiff and court reporter entered the jury room, and the following proceedings were had in the presence of counsel and the defendant:)

THE COURT: All right. Good morning,

PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

THE COURT: We have your question. "Can we get a verbalization of Detective Mondora's testimony regarding the defendant's statements of knowledge of Ben Marsh and/or knowledge of Ben Marsh residence?" No, you will not receive a verbalization, nor any transcript, as you were previously

(WHEREUPON, at 10:13 a.m., November 21, 2013, the Court, bailiff, counsel, Defendant, and court reporter left the jury room.)

(WHEREUPON, at 11:50 a.m., November 21, 2013, the Court, counsel, Defendant and court reporter enter the chambers of the Court, and the following proceedings were had out of the hearing of the jury:)

with a communication from the jury. It's 11:50. The inquiry is, "Can we break for lunch? Are we allowed to leave?" I'm not going to respond to them yet. Probably 10 or 15 minutes before I respond. My intention is if they're still going and they want to go to lunch is just to properly instruct them and let them go to lunch and give them an hour and come back. Any objection from the state?

MS. DOHERTY: No.

**THE COURT:** From the defense?

MR. MERANTO: No. Thank you. I wanted to add a little drama of my own, Your Honor. That's why I paused.

THE COURT: Okay. So that's what we'll do. Probably 10 or 15 minutes, we'll go back there and do that.

(WHEREUPON, the Court, counsel, Defendant and court reporter left the chambers of the court.)

\* \* \* \* \*

(WHEREUPON, at 12:05 p.m., November 21, 2013, the Court, bailiff and court reporter entered the jury room, and the following proceedings were had in the presence of counsel and the defendant:)

THE COURT: All right. We are in receipt of your latest note. "Can we break for lunch? Are we allowed to leave?" Yes, you can break for lunch. You can lunch together if you wish. You can stay in if you wish. You can go separately if you wish. But you cannot discuss the case at all until you're all back here and we tell you to resume deliberations.

If you do go out, please avoid any publicity or any conversation about the case. You know all the other rules, and it's very important that you make sure you're not influenced in any way by any outside source.

1	So an hour should be okay. We'll see you
2	back here about 1:00. Have a good lunch
3	folks.
4	(WHEREUPON, the Court, bailiff, counsel,
5	defendant and court reporter left the jury
6	room, and entered the jury room of the
7	alternate juror, and the following
8	proceedings were had:)
9	THE COURT: Our jury has asked to go to
10	lunch.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
12	THE COURT: And I let them go.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
14	THE COURT: So you can go, too, for
15	about an hour, and just come back. Be back
16	about 1:00.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
18	THE COURT: Please avoid any publicity
19	about the case or any conversation with
20	anyone about the case.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
22	THE COURT: And take a break.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
	II

1	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
2	(WHEREUPON, at 12:08 p.m. November 21,
3	2013, the Court, bailiff, counsel, defendant
4	and court reporter left the jury room of the
5	alternate.)
6	* * * *
7	(WHEREUPON, the jury took a lunch recess
8	from 12:00 p.m. until 1:00 p.m.)
9	* * * *
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(WHEREUPON, the following proceedings took place at 1:32 p.m., November 21, 2013, in the courtroom, all parties present, outside the presence of the jury:)

I've been informed that the THE COURT: jury has reached its verdict in this case. I'm about to bring them down to the Those of you as spectators here courtroom. in the courtroom of course are welcome. There hasn't been any difficulty at all. But I do wish to inform you that there is to be absolutely no reaction of any kind whatsoever to whatever this jury does. This jury's been duly impaneled and sworn, selected by the parties, and listened to everything. They've reached a verdict, and that verdict's going to be respected. So if you can't take it, get out, because if you react in any way, I'm going to have the deputies arrest you, and I'll deal with that later. All right. Bring the jury in, please.

(WHEREUPON, the jury returned to the courtroom, and the proceedings continued as

1	follows:)
2	THE COURT: So, ladies and gentlemen of
3	the jury, I've been informed that you've
4	reached your verdicts; is that correct?
5	PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes,
6	Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Ross, you were the
8	foreman of the foreperson of the jury?
9	MR. ROSS: Yes.
10	THE COURT: You may hand the verdict
11	forms to my bailiff, please.
12	(WHEREUPON, the juror complied.)
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
13	THE COURT: Thank you.
13	THE COURT: Thank you.
13 14	THE COURT: Thank you.  All right. We have three verdicts.
13 14 15	THE COURT: Thank you.  All right. We have three verdicts.  Counts One, Two, and Three, dated this 21st
13 14 15 16	THE COURT: Thank you.  All right. We have three verdicts.  Counts One, Two, and Three, dated this 21st day of November, 2013. In each of the
13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: Thank you.  All right. We have three verdicts.  Counts One, Two, and Three, dated this 21st day of November, 2013. In each of the verdicts, the jury has unanimously found the
13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: Thank you.  All right. We have three verdicts.  Counts One, Two, and Three, dated this 21st day of November, 2013. In each of the verdicts, the jury has unanimously found the defendant guilty of the charge of aggravated
13 14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: Thank you.  All right. We have three verdicts.  Counts One, Two, and Three, dated this 21st day of November, 2013. In each of the verdicts, the jury has unanimously found the defendant guilty of the charge of aggravated murder. Is there anything further from the
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE COURT: Thank you.  All right. We have three verdicts.  Counts One, Two, and Three, dated this 21st day of November, 2013. In each of the verdicts, the jury has unanimously found the defendant guilty of the charge of aggravated murder. Is there anything further from the State of Ohio regarding the jury?

1	defense?
2	MR. MERANTO: Judge, we would ask the
3	jury be polled, please.
4	THE COURT: Very well. All right.
5	Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you
6	I've recited that each of the three verdicts
7	on Counts One, Two, and Three, is a finding
8	of guilty, and I'm going to ask you if these
9	are your verdicts. A simple yes or no is the
LO	appropriate answer, depending upon what the
L1	answer is. So Mr. Ross, are these your
L2	verdicts?
L3	MR. ROSS: Yes.
L4	THE COURT: Ms. Catanzarite, are these
L5	your verdicts?
L6	MS. CATANZARITE: Yes.
L7	THE COURT: Mr. Wright, are these your
L8	verdicts?
L9	MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Ms. Crump, are these your
21	verdicts?
22	MS. CRUMP: Yes.
7 3	THE COURT: Mr Dray are these your

1	verdicts?
2	MR. DRAY: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Frankford, are these
4	your verdicts?
5	MR. FRANKFORD: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Ms. Metzinger, are these
7	your verdicts?
8	MS. METZINGER: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Ms. Sotlar, are these your
10	verdicts?
11	MS. SOTLAR: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Bruno, are these your
13	verdicts?
14	MR. BRUNO: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Ms. Wheatley, are these your
16	verdicts?
17	MS. WHEATLEY: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Ms. Starkey, are these your
19	verdicts?
20	MS. STARKEY: Yes.
21	THE COURT: And Ms. Schneider, are these
22	your verdicts?
23	MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

2.1

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. MERANTO: No, Your Honor. Thank

you.

THE COURT: All right. So ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'd like to thank you on behalf of the parties to this case and our community and this court for your service in this case. It is a difficult task that we impose upon you, but we've observed your conduct throughout, and it appears that you have honored your obligation to serve and to see to it that justice is done. We'd like to thank you for your service in this case.

I'm going to have the lawyers review the verdict forms before I do finally release you, but you're released subject to review by the lawyers of the verdict forms. As I indicated to you previously, you can't discuss the case at all up until this point, but now that the case is completed, you are permitted to discuss the case with anyone you choose to discuss it with. You do not have to discuss it with anyone if you choose not

# | VERDICT

1	to. The lawyers may wish to speak with you.
2	I'm going to come up to the jury room
3	when I'm done here and speak with you. And
4	others may wish to speak with you. It's up
5	to you whether you talk to them or not. No
6	one will insist upon conversation with you.
7	That's improper. So subject to the review of
8	the verdict forms by the parties, you are
9	excused. We thank you for your service in
LO	this case.
L1	(WHEREUPON, the jury left the courtroom,
	and the proceedings continued as follows:)
L2	<u>-</u>
	THE COURT: All right. Are they
L2 L3 L4	
L3	THE COURT: All right. Are they
L3 L4	THE COURT: All right. Are they satisfactory as far as their being filled out
L3 L4 L5	THE COURT: All right. Are they satisfactory as far as their being filled out and completed by the jury?
L3 L4 L5 L6	THE COURT: All right. Are they satisfactory as far as their being filled out and completed by the jury?  MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.
L3 L4 L5 L6 L7	THE COURT: All right. Are they satisfactory as far as their being filled out and completed by the jury?  MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.  MS. DOHERTY: Yes.
L3 L4 L5 L6 L7	THE COURT: All right. Are they satisfactory as far as their being filled out and completed by the jury?  MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.  MS. DOHERTY: Yes.  MR. MERANTO: Yes, Your Honor.
L3 L4 L5 L6 L7 L8	THE COURT: All right. Are they satisfactory as far as their being filled out and completed by the jury?  MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.  MS. DOHERTY: Yes.  MR. MERANTO: Yes, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So then the jury is
L3 L4 L5 L6 L7 L8	THE COURT: All right. Are they satisfactory as far as their being filled out and completed by the jury?  MS. CANTALAMESSA: Yes, Your Honor.  MS. DOHERTY: Yes.  MR. MERANTO: Yes, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So then the jury is discharged. What is the pleasure of the

members and relatives from out of the area, so as soon as we could, even this week yet if that's possible.

**THE COURT:** What about the defense?

MR. MERANTO: Judge, no objection.

THE COURT: All right. The court will set sentencing for tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m.

MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The court will enter judgments on the verdicts and order them filed.

\* \* \* \* \*

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above and foregoing is a true and correct transcript of all evidence introduced and proceedings had in the trial of the within-named case as shown by my stenographic notes taken by me

during the trial and at the time the evidence

was being introduced.

CHASTITY M. FEEZLE, RPR, CRR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

DATE:

REPORTER'S NOTE
THE EXHIBITS IN THIS CASE, BEING TOO
CUMBERSOME TO ATTACH TO THIS TRANSCRIPT OF
RECORD ON APPEAL ARE HEREBY, UNDER SEPARATE
COVER, TRANSMITTED TO THE CLERK OF COURTS AND
ARE TO BE CONSIDERED AS A PART OF THIS
TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD ON APPEAL AS IF THE SAME
WERE PHYSICALLY ATTACHED THERETO.

STATE OF OHIO	)	SS.	IN	THE	COURT	OF	COMMON PLE	LAS
COUNTY OF MAHONING	)			CAS	SE NO.		-CR-633 1-MA-4	
STATE OF OHIO			)				1 121 -1	
Plaintiff			)	EXHIBITS				
-vs-			)					
JAMES FERRARA			)					
Defendant			)					

# TO THE CLERK OF COURTS:

THE EXHIBITS IN THIS CASE, BEING TOO CUMBERSOME TO
ATTACH TO THE TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD ON APPEAL ARE
HEREBY, UNDER SEPARATE COVER, TRANSMITTED TO THE CLERK
OF COURTS AND ARE TO BE CONSIDERED AS A PART OF THE
TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD ON APPEAL AS IF THE SAME WERE
PHYSICALLY ATTACHED THERETO