DISTRICT COURT
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON
STATE OF COLORADO
100 Jefferson County Parkway
Golden, Colorado 80401

DATE FILED: February 25, 2019 4:53 PM

Plaintiff:

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

٧.

Defendant:

ERIC JAMES ST. GEORGE

^FOR COURT USE ONLY^

Case No. 16CR2509 Division 1

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

The Jury Trial in the above-entitled matter commenced on February 1, 2018, before THE HONORABLE LILY OEFFLER, Judge of the District Court.

This is a full and complete transcript of the proceedings had on this date in the aforementioned matter.

APPEARANCES

For the People:

MIKE FREEMAN, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
KATHARINE DECKER, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
District Attorney's Office
First Judicial District
500 Jefferson County Parkway
Golden, Colorado 80401

For the Defendant:

ERIC ST. JAMES, PRO SE

For the Defendant (Advisory Counsel):
PETER MENGES, P.C.
The Law Offices of Peter D. Menges, P.C.
140 East 19th Avenue
Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80203

ī		2
1	INDEX	
2 3	VOIR DIRE BY MR. FREEMAN VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION BY MR. ST. GEORGE	78 141
4	OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. DECKER OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. ST. GEORGE	197 211
5 6 7	WITNESSES For the People:	PAGE
8	EMILY ELLIOTT DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FREEMAN	228
9 10		
11	E X H I B I T S People's Exhibits:	DAGE
12 13	NUMBER DESCRIPTION None. Defendant's Exhibits:	PAGE
14 15	NUMBER DESCRIPTION None.	PAGE
16		
17 18		
19 20		
21		
22 23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2018, 8:28 A.M.

(The following proceedings were had in open court outside the presence and hearing of the prospective jurors:)

THE COURT: So let's go on the record. This is People versus St. George, this is 16CR2509.

Can I have appearances, please.

MR. FREEMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Mike Freeman and Katharine Decker on behalf of the People.

Also with us is our advisory witness, Detective Jeff Larson, and our paralegal, Kirsten Lewis.

THE DEFENDANT: Eric St. George on my own behalf.

MR. MENGES: Good morning, Your Honor. Peter Menges appearing as advisory counsel for Mr. St. George.

MR. BURNETT: Ian Burnett, investigator.

THE COURT: All right. We're about ready to start. As soon as we can get jury lists -- as indicated, names are going to be supplied for the first two hours. No one references a juror by name because we've assigned them numbers and then we'll collect the name lists and we stick with the numbered lists.

To give everyone a heads-up, when the jury comes in, I'm going to welcome them. I am going to introduce the district attorney's. I am going to introduce

Mr. St. George and Mr. Menges. If you want other people introduced during that time, do it during your voir dire.

I tell them briefly what the case is about in that I read them a copy of the information. There was an objection to a synopsis. Then I give them some basic law. I tell them how we're going to select the jury. Then I'll ask them some questions about qualifications to sit as jurors. If they obviously don't have qualifications say for some reason they don't read, speak or understand English -- and, really, Mr. St. George, you should kind of listen to this because this might be -- some of this might be new as, generally, it is something I do as a practice.

So I'll go through jury qualifications. If somebody is unable to read, speak or understand English and it is clear from my questioning of them, I won't discuss it with counsel, I'll just excuse and will call somebody else up from the array in the back. It is a -- it is a qualification to sit as a juror in this state. So same if they're not a resident of the county, if for some reason they're 17, something like that, then I'll excuse them at that point.

If they are currently being paid by law enforcement, compensated employee of a public law enforcement agency, if it is a non-traditional law enforcement agency, I'll talk to them about it but

generally those individuals will be excused too because that's not permitted.

I'm going to then talk to them about the number of days, if there was anyone who would suffer an extreme hardship in this case. We have a lengthier trial. My guess is we'll get more people who would do that, I generally listen -- and have them go downstairs and reset if they cannot make it for the time period that we have. But, generally, I do that on my own.

I'll read them -- then I go through, I ask them if they know anybody seated at the tables, then I ask them about prior jury service, I'll ask them about law enforcement, just general questions.

Then we're going to go over here to the screen and I ask the jurors just to give me a little bit about themselves. Those are areas that you can follow-up on, if you like in your voir dire.

I generally take a break with the jurors between my questioning of the jurors and individual voir dire.

We'll see if somebody needed a break just before. I won't take another break, but if we haven't had a break and it is been an hour or so or longer, I'll take a break then.

We'll excuse everyone and them come back and do the individual voir dire and then we'll do peremptory challenges. Peremptory challenges, you stand and ask that

Juror Number X, whatever it is, be excused.

After we've selected our jury, we'll swear them in. Depending on where we are in the case, we'll probably have a break and then we'll start with opening arguments.

Okay. So are there issues that we have to deal with now prior to going to trial?

MR. FREEMAN: Just a couple of housekeeping matters, Judge. Jeff Larson, as I indicated, is our advisory witness. He's also a witness in four other cases that are going to be in trial probably at some point during the next five to six days, so he's going to be probably coming and going a lot.

I'm not asking the Court to do anything about that, I just want to let the Court know that he's going to be in and out of the courtroom quite a bit.

Also, we just found out, I think yesterday or the day before, that Devon Trimmer, Agent Trimmer who is the listed victim in a few of the counts as gotten married and her last name is now Meyers. I think for simplicity, we'll probably still refer to her as Agent Trimmer because that's how the case is charged. We're not asking to amend the complaint at this point, but I just want to let the Court know that she now goes by Meyers.

And then, lastly, our investigator, Investigator Kim Gallerani, she's not on the good faith witness list.

She's probably going to be coming and going as well.

She just wanted me to let the Court know in case the Court has any concerns.

THE COURT: I do have her as number 8 on your list.

MR. FREEMAN: On our good faith?

THE COURT: Well, the list I'm using is this People's list of anticipated witnesses.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay.

THE COURT: If there are people you don't want me to read to the jury, let me know because there's a lot of names on the list.

MR. FREEMAN: I didn't realize she's on the witness list, okay. I'll let her know.

THE COURT: She is, okay. Is there a question for sequestration?

MR. FREEMAN: The People make that request, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll impose that.

So, Mr. St. George, along with the district attorney, you'll have to explain that to all of your witnesses and to others what sequestration means and what you can and can't do.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. St. George, do you have any motions or issues to bring to the Court's attention?

MR. ST. GEORGE: I don't have anything at this moment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So we're going to get you those lists of names for two hours and then we're going to collect them and then we'll all just have the numbers, please.

While the jurors -- the jurors are going to have the numbers on their lanyards. And on the reverse side of the lanyard is going to have that they're a juror, so that when they're out and about in the courtroom, they can flip the badge so everyone will know that they're a juror.

Okay. So we're ready to get our jurors. We'll adjourn. It is going to take us about 15 minutes to get them. So nobody gets the list before we have them.

MR. BURNETT: It is going to take about 15 minutes to get the jurors?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Thank you, Judge.

(A recess was taken.)

THE COURT: I'm taking a look at the exhibit book that was handed up to me by the People, which is just a copy, I think of the exhibits that are going to be shown to witnesses and shown on the screen. Is there a copy that we can put at the witness stand, potentially, because we are going to be handing up all exhibits through bailiffs?

MR. FREEMAN: I don't think we currently have one. If the Court wants, we can try to generate one.

THE COURT: Or if necessary, you can use this one and I can review from the projection.

MR. FREEMAN: Just to limit the trips back and forth?

THE COURT: To limit the trips back and fourth.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I'm not in possession of one of those booklets. I don't have one of those. This is all I've been given.

THE COURT: Okay. You have seen all the copies of the exhibits though?

MR. ST. GEORGE: If they're already included in discovery, I can be sure that I've seen them. But I don't have them at my table at the moment.

THE COURT: Right. It is generally the practice for one side to show the other side the exhibits so they know it and can take a look at it before it goes up. This was prepared for me so if there's an argument about the exhibits while we're doing it, I don't have them. You know what it is, the prosecution knows what it is, but I don't know what it is.

But my thought was perhaps we should have one up here so we could limit the number of trips back and forth showing the witness the exhibit.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, let me just whisk through this list real quick making sure there's nothing on here that I can't -- some of these file names and descriptions are a little bit nebulous, aerial photo one, as an example. Without knowing what aerial photo that is, I can't really make a determination whether or not I'm familiar of what we're looking at.

THE COURT: Well, certainly, you can go ahead and object if you feel that it hasn't been given to you in discovery. What is the practice is that the People or you, whichever side is introducing an article of evidence or photograph, et cetera, shows the other side what it is, and then the other side has the opportunity to object to it. And so that's -- so you would see it before, certainly, the witness sees it or the jury sees it.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. We'll deal with these as they come then, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. The witness lists have been, I think, filed for a time -- I mean, the exhibit lists have been filed for a time here. This book was given to the Court because oftentimes, again, as I said, I don't receive the exhibits so if there's an argument about the exhibits, then I'll have it here and I can take a look at it so I'm up to speed on what we're arguing about.

But my thought being that since we are going to

10

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

be handing up our exhibits up through bailiffs and it looks like lots of photographs, et cetera, that my thought was it would be helpful to have this on the stand and have them turn to, say, for instance, People's Number 1 after both sides have had the opportunity to review it.

Mr. St. George, then you'll be able to go ahead and use -- and reference the exhibits that have been admitted in that way too, and then if you wanted to present -- have a book of your exhibits, you can do that also.

MR. ST. GEORGE: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And just a reminder, everybody have their cell phones off in the courtroom and all spectators have their cell phone offs. Attorneys or investigators can keep them on mute if they're calling a witness, et cetera.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

(The prospective jurors entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: And then everyone else if you'd sit in the rows behind and I need you to slide over pretty closely. We're going to get to know our neighbors pretty well.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: All right. Everybody be seated,

please.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I want to welcome you to Division 1. We're in district court. My name is Lily Oeffler and I'm the Judge here.

Before we begin this trial, I'd like to tell you about what will be happening. I want you to understand the purpose of the trial. First, does anyone have difficulty hearing me? We have some headsets. They are tied into the sound system. So as long as people stay fairly close to the microphones, they are a great help to some people. So if you're having trouble hearing me, let me know and we'll try one of these headsets to see if it helps you in any way.

If you have trouble seeing, we can always adjust where you are in the courtroom, move you forward. So please just give me a hand and let me know and we can make accommodations.

So the case we are about to try today is a criminal case. In a criminal case the prosecution is brought in the name of the People of the State of Colorado. Today, the prosecution in this trial is represented by Mike Freeman and Katharine Decker. They are lawyers from the district attorney's office. I'll sometimes refer to the district attorney as the prosecution or the People.

The defendant in this case is Eric James

St. George. Mr. St. George has decided to represent
himself in this case. The individual seated next to him
is advisory counsel, Peter Menges. The defendant may
consult with Mr. Menges during the course of these
proceedings if he so wishes. Please note that

Mr. St. George's decisions regarding representation by
counsel have no bearing on whether he is guilty or not
guilty and it should not have any effect on your
consideration of this case.

The charges against the defendant are contained in what is called an information. An information, ladies and gentlemen, simply describes the charges made by the prosecution against the defendant. The charges are merely a vehicle to get into this courtroom. Remember, the defendant is presumed innocent. The fact that charges have been filed do not affect the presumption of innocence in any way. The information is not evidence of anything.

The information in this case reads as follows:

Count 1, criminal attempt murder in the first-degree. On

July 31, 2016, Eric James St. George, by engaging in

conduct constituting a substantial step toward the

commission of murder in the first-degree, Eric James

St. George, unlawfully, feloniously after deliberation and

with the intent to cause the death of a person other than

himself, attempted to cause the death of Agent Devon

Trimmer. Further, the victim was a peace officer engaged

in the performance of her duties in violation of statute.

Count 2, criminal attempt, murder in the first-degree. On July 31, 2016, Eric James St. George by engaging in conduct constituting a substantial step towards the commission of murder in the first-degree, Eric James St. George unlawfully, feloniously, after deliberation and with the intent to cause the death of a person other than himself, attempted to cause the death of Sergeant Jason Maines. Further, the victim was a peace officer engaged in the performance of his duties in violation of statute.

Count 3, criminal attempt, murder in the second-degree. On July 31, 2016, Eric James St. George, by engaging in conduct constituting a substantial step towards the commission of murder in the second-degree, Eric James St. George unlawfully, feloniously and knowingly attempted to cause the death of Emily Elliott in violation of statute.

Count 4, assault in the first-degree. On July 31, 2016, Eric James St. George, with the intent to cause serious bodily injury upon the person of Agent Devon Trimmer, a peace officer, unlawfully and feloniously threatened the peace officer with a deadly weapon, namely,

a gun, while Agent Devon Trimmer was engaged in the performance of her duties and the defendant knew or reasonably should have known that Agent Devon Trimmer was a peace officer acting in the performance of her duties in violation of statute.

Count 5, assault in the first-degree. On July 31, 2016, Eric James St. George, with the intent to sauce serious bodily injury upon the person of Sergeant Jason Maines, a peace officer, unlawfully and feloniously threatened the peace officer with a deadly weapon, namely a gun, while Sergeant Jason Maines was engaged in the performance of his duty and the defendant knew or reasonably should have know that Sergeant Jason Maines was a peace officer acting in the performance of his duties in violation of statute.

Count 6, menacing with a deadly weapon. On July 31, 2016, Eric James St. George by any threat or physical action unlawfully, feloniously and knowingly placed or attempted to place Agent Devon Trimmer in fear of imminent serious bodily injury by use of a deadly weapon or any article used or fashioned in a manner to cause a person to reasonably believe the article was a deadly weapon, namely, a gun, in violation of statute.

Count 7, menacing with a deadly weapon. On July 31, 2016, Eric James St. George, by any threat or

physical action unlawfully, feloniously and knowingly placed or attempted to place Sergeant Jason Maines in fear of imminent serious bodily injury by use of a deadly weapon or any article used or fashioned in a manner to cause a person to reasonably believe that the article was a deadly weapon, namely, a gun, in violation of statute.

Count 8, menacing with a deadly weapon. On July 31, 2016, Eric James St. George, by any threat or physical action unlawfully, feloniously and knowingly placed or attempted to place Emily Elliott in fear of imminent serious bodily injury by use of a deadly weapon or any article used or fashioned in a manner to cause a person to reasonably believe the article was a deadly weapon, namely, a gun, in violation of statute.

Count 9, illegal discharge of a firearm. On July, 31, 2016, Eric James St. George, unlawfully, feloniously, knowingly, or recklessly discharged a firearm into a dwelling, other building, or occupied structure in violation of statute.

Count 10, unlawful sexual contact. On July 31, 2016, Eric James St. George, unlawfully and knowingly subjected Emily Elliott to sexual contact and the defendant knew the victim did not consent in violation of statute.

Ladies and gentlemen, the charges against the

defendant are not evidence. The charges against the defendant are merely an accusation. The fact that the defendant has been accused is not evidence that the defendant committed any crime. No juror should assume that the defendant committed any crime simply because there are charges.

By pleading not guilty to the information,

Mr. St. George has told you he did not commit the crime.

He is presumed to be innocent and, therefore, the

prosecution has the burden of proving the charges beyond a

reasonable doubt.

Reasonable doubt means a doubt based upon reason and commonsense which arises from a fair and rational consideration of all the evidence or lack of evidence in the case. It is a doubt which is not a vague, speculative, or imaginary doubt, but such a doubt as would cause reasonable people to hesitate to act in matters of importance to themselves. The jury decides whether the prosecution has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant has done the things that are contained in the information.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the outside world, we oftentimes say, we want to hear from both sides. In a courtroom, things are very different. In a courtroom the prosecution has the burden to prove each and every element

of a crime beyond a reasonable doubt. And as such, it is the burden of the prosecution to bring forth witnesses and evidence.

The defendant need not bring forth any evidence, need not testify, need not bring anything to you. It is up to the prosecution to bring all of that evidence to you. If they fail to bring that evidence to you, if they fail to prove each and every element of every charge beyond a reasonable doubt, the verdict is not guilty.

At this point in time, ladies and gentlemen, the verdict is not guilty. The defendant is presumed to be innocent. The charges mean nothing. As I've indicated to you, they're merely a vehicle to bring us into this courtroom.

So in this case we are selecting 12 jurors and 1 alternate, okay. They will consider all of the evidence produced during the trial and it will be the soul responsibility of jurors chosen to try this case to determine the facts from all of the evidence received during the trial. This will require your close attention, absolute honesty, impartiality, and sound judgment.

It will not be necessary to keep jurors together at noon or at night during the trial. If you're selected as a juror, you'll be permitted to go home at night and leave the courthouse during the noon recess, you just have

2 3

4

6

5

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

to promise to come back to us.

Okav. So when I get to this part of my discussions with you as potential jurors, it used to be the easiest part of my discussion. I used to say if you're selected as a juror, don't talk about the case and don't do any research about the case. I used to tell people to not look up things in dictionaries, to not look in encyclopedias. I think half of this jury has never looked in a dictionary or an encyclopedia, so I've had to change.

So when I say to you, you're not allowed to talk about the case, this is what I mean. You're not allowed to go on Facebook and say, Guess, what I'm on a jury, let me tell you all about. Don't Snapchat from the courtroom. Don't do any vehicle I don't understand. Just don't do it. You're not allowed to talk about the case while the case is ongoing. At the conclusion of the case, you can talk about it as much or as little as you'd like. But during the course of the case, you are not allowed to talk about the case.

Is everybody with me?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So you're not allowed to talk about the case, and that is old school, physically talking about it, writing about it or

electronically writing about it. You're not allowed to do any research about the case. So you're not allowed to look up any words no matter how you do it.

You're not allowed to Google anything about the case. You're not allowed to drive by any potential scenes. It is something that I think we do almost instinctively now. Someone says an address and you tend to put it in -- everybody with me on the jury? Why don't we stand up for a minute. Everybody stand up in the courtroom quickly, stretch, it's is been a long morning already.

(The prospective jurors complied.)

THE COURT: Okay. Be seated. All right. So don't put an address in your phone to say, let me look at the satellite images of it. You can't do it. You can't do any research on the Internet about this case either. You can't look up any words, you can't research anything about the case, you can't Google anything about the case.

Why is that? Because, first thing, every juror has to receive the same evidence and the only way I can do that is to make sure all the evidence comes before all the jurors at the same time in the courthouse and in this courtroom.

Also, the only way I can ensure the integrity of what you consider to reach a decision in this case is to

have it come through this courtroom. So agree that if you're selected as a juror and while we are selecting the jury, please don't talk about the case in any way you can possibly image, and don't do any research on the case, okay?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: All right. Everybody's with me.

Okay. I want to explain briefly to you the method we'll be using in selecting a jury in this case. We have 25 already that have been randomly selected in the jury box. We are now going to, in a few minutes, ask you all to take an oath, -- those up here and those back here -- that you each will answer your questions fully and carefully as to your ability to serve as a juror in this case.

Now, I'm going to ask you, as we question, my questioning will start with the jurors up here. But I'm going to ask you if you're seated back here to listen carefully, because it is quite likely during the course of this proceeding that you'll be called up here too to answer questions. So if you listen carefully, then I can catch you up on the questions a little sooner and quicker and we can do this a little more efficiently.

So after the oath is administered, the Court and each attorney are going to ask questions and the defendant

are going to ask questions concerning your ability to be fair and impartial. Please answer fully all questions asked by any one of the participants in the trial and myself. Even though you may not be called forward initially as I said, please listen closely to all that is said because it is likely that you'll be called forward.

Okay. So I'm going to have everybody raise their right hands, please.

(The prospective jurors were duly sworn.)

THE COURT: Okay. So right now I'm going to turn my attention to those jurors that are up here in the jury box. But as I said, if you could listen carefully, when you're called forward, I'm going to individually take you through these questions. So if you've listened to them already it makes it a little easier, okay?

So I'm going to start by reading some lists of grounds that may disqualify you as a juror. Please raise your hand if any of these apply to you.

Okay. Look at the people seated here at the tables. Does anybody know any of these people?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Nobody knows any of the people seated at any of the two tables here?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Right. I'm assuming -- no one is

telling me they are, okay.

So is anyone here a compensated employee of a public law enforcement agency?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Okay. So Colorado law does set forth certain qualifications for jury service and I'm going to read to you the part of the law that deals with jury qualifications. Please raise your hand if any of these apply to you. Is anyone here not a citizen of the United States, 18 years old, and a resident of the county?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Is anyone unable to read, speak or understand the English language?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Is anyone incapable by reason of his or her physical or mental disability of rendering satisfactory jury service?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Has anyone served as a trial or grand juror within the preceding 12 months?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Okay. So by law a jury consists of 12 persons. So we're selecting in this case 13 people because we have 12 persons plus an alternate. Each side may excuse up to 6 of you without stating a reason.

You should not be embarrassed or consider it a reflection upon you if you're not one of those excused -- if you are one of those excused. By using this method of selecting a jury, both sides can participate more freely in the jury selection of process.

Okay. At this time, I'm going to ask you some questions to determine your qualifications to sit as impartial jurors and then the other participants will be allowed to ask you additional questions. If a particular question applies to you, please raise your hand.

Ladies and gentlemen, we estimate how long we think trials may take. At this point, we are estimating that this trial will go through February 9th. Of course, we don't work weekends. Is there anyone who feels that they would suffer an extreme hardship if selected to serve for this period of time?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Okay. So we have a couple of people with their hands raised. So let me call them. And who in the back row, was it Juror Number 2. I'm going to ask Juror Number 2. What is it that is the problem with serving?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 2: I'm self-employed and if I'm -- I am the only one that works for my company, and if I'm not there, my company is shut down and I have a lot of

things that need to be attended to within the next couple of weeks.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is a situation I've got to talk to you a little more about this. I'm not allowed to excuse jurors simply because they're self-employed because I would get rid of a whole category of people that serve, and we do have the constitutional right to trial by jury. So in regards to this, there's no one else that can work with you or work for you during this period of time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 2: I run my own company and I'm the only one that works there.

I could do regarding that is to have you go down and reset your jury service so you would have a heads-up as to when it was. As I said, I can't excuse you from jury service for that particular reason. There are certain payments that can be requested for funds, certainly. Generally, they don't replace income that would be earned, but there are certain stipends and monies that can be applied for if you're self-employed immediately, and three days thereafter for others, and we would have you fill out that form. But that's the best I could do.

So the best I could do is have you go downstairs and reset and then you'd have to come back for your jury

service, but you'd simply be able to plan in advance. I can't excuse you from jury service because of being self-employed. So at this point in time, do you want to take the option of resetting this because you're self-employed or do you want to just do the service now?

THE COURT: You'd go downstairs and talk to the jury clerk's downstairs and they would give you another date to come in to start your jury service.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 2: I'll go downstairs.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 2: What does resetting mean?

THE COURT: Okay. We'll let them know that you're coming downstairs to reset your jury service so I can't excuse you from jury service. You're simply resetting but you can go ahead and do that right now.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 2: Thank you.

THE BAILIFF: Number 26. Juror Number 26 come forward. I'll have you take his seat, please.

THE COURT: Good morning to our new juror and I just wanted to take you through quickly the questions I already asked. Did you know anybody at these tables?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: No. Are you a compensated employee of a public law enforcement agency?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: No, okay. Do you have the

qualifications to sit as juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. And so we are at that extreme hardship question. Did you have a response for the Court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: No, I have no extreme hardship.

THE COURT: Okay. So I think then I was on row 2, and I had some people. Did I have anyone raise their -- okay. So it was Juror Number 6, did you have your hand raised? What are we talking about here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 6: Well, I take care of my mom and I thought this was going to be, like, for one day.

THE COURT: Okay. And what's the situation with your mom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 6: She's 90 -- going to be 91 years old. She can barely walk. She needs assistance. She wears a gait belt. If she has to go to the bathroom, somebody has to be watching her pretty much every time. My sister and my wife help, but my wife's at work now. My sister is taking care of her now. But if it goes more than a day, I don't think I will be able to make it.

THE COURT: Okay. And she needs constant care?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 6: Constant care.

THE COURT: So I'm going to do the same thing for you. I'm going to have you go down and reset your

jury service so you can make plans to have somebody come 1 2 in and watch your mom during the jury service, okay? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 6: Okay. 4 THE COURT: So we'll tell them you're coming 5 down to reset your jury service. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 6: Okay. 7 THE BAILIFF: Number 27. 8 THE COURT: All right. So to our new juror, 9 good morning. Did you take a look at the people at the 10 table here, did you know any of these people? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: No. 12 THE COURT: Are you a compensated employee of a 13 public law enforcement agency? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: No. 15 THE COURT: Do you have the qualifications to 16 sit as a juror in this case? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: Yes. 18 THE COURT: And do you have anything to tell me 19 about extreme hardship? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: No. 21 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I think we're on 22 the next row where I had a hand, okay. I think then I had 23 Juror Number 11? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: Um-hum. 25 THE COURT: What --

Thursday?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: I just had a question.

So I have college classes on every Wednesday and Thursday.

Would that affect it, from 12:00 to 2:45?

THE COURT: Well, then you -- every Tuesday and

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: Every Tuesday and Thursday.

THE COURT: Okay. So that would require missing class on Tuesday and Thursday. What happens -- what do you do if you have to miss a class, if you're sick or something like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: It is a hands-on class and I am required not to miss a class because of a -- because we're there for three hours and we get all of our work done within those three hours.

THE COURT: So what happens if you're ill?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: If I'm -- if I'm ill, I

mean, I'd still have to come. I mean, like, I can't miss,

like, a class of it because then I'd be very far behind

from the next class and it would be hard to catch back up.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, it is the same situation. I can't excuse you from jury service because everybody here has -- they all have jobs and kids and all kinds of commitments that they have to serve in this case. I could have you reset your jury service but you would

1 have to be here. It could be -- I can't tell you how long 2 the trial's going to be either. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: Okay, yeah, no, I'll just 4 stay here. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: I'll figure it out. 7 THE COURT: Then, okay. So then I was on Juror 8 Number 16? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 16: Yes, I have a trip out of 10 the country on February 9th, so I don't know if I could be 11 reset. I'm happy to serve. 12 THE COURT: And February 9th is kind of up in the air for us and this is a trip that you planned for a 13 14 while. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 16: Yeah, I've had it planned 16 for a long time and it is out of the country. 17 THE COURT: Airfare? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 16: Yes. 19 THE COURT: So with that, yes, I'm going to have 20 you go downstairs and reset. Those are generally the 21 one-time things that we try to accommodate, but they'll 22 expect you downstairs. PROSPECTIVE JUROR 16: Okay. Thank you. 23 24 THE BAILIFF: Number 28, please come forward. 25 THE COURT: Good morning.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 28: Good morning.

THE COURT: Did you take a look at everybody at these tables to make sure you don't know anybody.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 28: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Are you a compensated employee of a public law enforcement agency?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 28: No.

THE COURT: Do you have the requirements to sit as a juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 28: I believe so. I have just a question on hardship. Single-income family, being out of income for possibly a week, just questions on that.

THE COURT: Again, it is the same thing that I've had to tell others. We have forms that you can fill out after a couple of days that will provide \$50 a day. There are forms that you can fill out for the first days if you're -- if you're self-employed, so we'll give you all of those. So that's all I can do as far as funds.

I can't excuse you because of that, but I can certainly have you reset and plan it in some way if you want to do that. Otherwise, those are my parameters on how I can work with that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 28: I think it would be best that I reset, please.

THE COURT: Okay. So we will then have you go

1 downstairs and reset your service. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 28: Yes, ma'am, thank you. 3 THE COURT: Surely. 4 THE BAILIFF: Number 29. 5 THE COURT: Just that second chair there, sir. PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: Right here? 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Did you take a look at 8 the people sitting at the tables, did you know any of those people? 9 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: No, I don't. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have the 12 qualifications to sit as a juror in this case? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Are you a compensated employee of a 15 public law enforcement agency. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: No, but my son is a cadet 17 at the Adams County Sheriff's Department. 18 THE COURT: Okay. And a lot of us, I think, 19 have friends, family, neighbors and whatever in law 20 enforcement. We're going to talk about that. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: Okay. 22 THE COURT: But at this point, you're 23 not -- you're not being paid by law enforcement? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: No, ma'am. 25 THE COURT: Okay. And do you have anything

about the hardship question that we're on right now?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: It is debatable without belaboring it. My wife has metastatic breast cancer. I'm pretty much the primary caregiver. However, I think we can make arrangements to cover her during the day. I had raised my hand, but in thinking about it, I'm withdrawing that concern.

THE COURT: All right. All right. Anybody else in this front row? So I have Juror Number 17.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 17: I also have a small automotive business and I have clients' vehicles that are already in the shop now that have -- I can't just put people -- other people off. I can do it myself, but not when I have other clients already at the shop.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're asking to reset this jury service?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 17: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I'll go ahead and have you go downstairs and we'll replace Juror Number 17's spot.

THE BAILIFF: Number 30, please come forward.

THE COURT: Good morning. Did you take a look at the tables to see if you knew anyone?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: No I don't.

THE COURT: Do you have the qualifications to

1 sit as a juror in this case? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Are you a compensate -- are you a 4 compensated employee of a public law enforcement agency? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: No. 6 THE COURT: We are at the hardship question, is 7 there an issue? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: 9 THE COURT: Okay. Where there others? We were 10 finishing out this very front row. Is there anyone else 11 who wanted to bring this to my attention? So 20, Juror 12 20, what did you want to tell me? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 20: I have a wedding, I'm 14 leaving on the 8th, so just a conflict. 15 THE COURT: I guess they're just not going to 16 reschedule that for you? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 20: I was expecting a shorter 18 trial, so it would have been if it was just a day or two, 19 but prolonging it out to be a week kind of conflicts. 20 THE COURT: I'm going to have you go downstairs 21 to see if you can reset. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 20: Okay. That's fine. 23 THE COURT: And you have to give your name tag 24 up here. 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 20: Right.

THE BAILIFF: Number 31? 1 2 THE COURT: Good morning, sir. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: Good morning. 4 THE COURT: Did you take a look at the People 5 seated at these tables. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: Yep. 7 THE COURT: Do you know any of them? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: Nope. 9 THE COURT: Do you have the qualifications to 10 sit as a juror in this case? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: Yep. 12 THE COURT: Are you a compensated employee of a 13 public law enforcement agency? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: No. 15 THE COURT: We are at the hardship question. there anything you need to bring to my attention? 16 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: No. 18 THE COURT: Did I miss anyone down the line 19 here? 20 (No verbal response.) 21 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So as I said, all 22 participants in the trial may be asking some questions of 23 you. You may think some of them are a personal nature 24 about you and your background and about various matters 25 involved in the case. If any of you, first, would like to

discuss something outside the presence of the rest of the jury and the jury panel, if you'd raise your hand and let me know, we can do that when we take a break and excuse everyone.

Also, I'm going to tell you that if any of you has a response that might prejudice our taint any other member of the jury panel, you're going to let me know and we'll hear that outside the presence of everyone else.

For instance, in a minute I'm going read you a list of possible witnesses in this case. Say the second witness is your next-door neighbor. You hate your next-door neighbor. You have hated your next-door neighbor for 25 years. You fight about the dog, the kids, the driveway, the fence, everything. You're next-door neighbor, you believe, is a total liar.

So if I say you're next-door neighbor's name, please don't shout out, I hate that guy, he's a liar. That may prejudice or taint the other members of the jury. That would be something that you would tell me when we took a break without the other members of the jury there.

Okay. So I already asked, nobody knows anybody at these tables? I'm not going to belabor it, but one time I had somebody a day or two into the trial say, hey, I know that guy. So nobody knows any of that?

(No verbal response.)

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So I am now going to read you the list of possible witnesses. Doesn't mean everyone's going to be called, but we like to run all the names by you in case you do. Dawn Carlstrom, Betty Clark, Daniel Dunnebecke, Brian Fox, Timothy Gideon, Dale Higashi, Victoria Parker, Julia Rossi, Christopher Zaw-Mon, Jeffrey Adams, Christopher Alfano, Eric Brennan, Todd Fahlsing, Bryan Feik, Dawn Fink, Jason Frink, Kim Gallerani, Monique Gilstrap, Gene Gray, Stephen Grisham, Joseph Lane, Jeffrey Larson, Gordon Lawcock, Matthew Lebsack, Patrick Lone, Jay Lopez, Jason Maines, Darren Maurer, Josephine McCormack, Ryan McKalip, Nathan Muller, Michael Roemer, Jeromy Rohling, David See, Sheri Shimamoto, Daniel Shube, Alan Stevens, Devon Trimmer, David Waller, Brad With, Janet Bal, Michael Berumen, Daundrea Bryant, Adam Carr, Jeffrey Delgadillo, Lareina Jimenez, Elizabeth Jordan, Debbie Malmsberry, Kelsie O'Shea, Keri Pokorny, Sharon Pokorny, William Sanders, Cedric Williams, Eric Yingling, Rebecca Gibson, Steven Kuntz. Does anybody know any of those people?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: And, ladies and gentlemen, I neglected to add Emily Elliott, okay.

Nobody knew any of those people?
(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Who here has had previous jury service? Has anyone had previous jury service?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to start out in the back and work my way up. Juror Number 4, you've had previous jury service, where was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: That was in the city of Westminster.

THE COURT: Okay. And about how long as was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: That was five or six years ago.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you remember if it was a criminal case or a civil case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: It was a shoplifting case.

THE COURT: So a criminal case. All right. Was there anything about your jury service in Westminster that would keep you from being fair and impartial with us today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: No.

THE COURT: And what I want to be certain is, first, I want to thank everybody for prior jury service.

And, second, I want to make certain that there wasn't anything so extraordinary or unusual that it would impact jury service today. Certainly, every case rises and falls

on the facts as they're presented into the courtroom and the evidence that's presented into the courtroom along with the Judge's instruction. And I just want to make sure that everybody can separate those things. So thank you.

Anybody else, I saw a couple more hands go up for prior jury service?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: So did I see Juror Number 15? Did you raise your hand, sir?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 29, what kind of service did you have? Where was it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: Well, there have been multiples where I've been called and I was in this position, but was dismissed for, you know, at the pleasure of the prosecution or the defense. I did sit, ironically, on a shoplifting case in the city of Concord, California. I was at least 22 or 23 at the time.

THE COURT: So my guess is you remember every word of that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: To the letter, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's what I thought. Okay. So is there -- was there anything about that case that would

1 keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: No, ma'am. Not at all. 2 3 THE COURT: So I saw some other hands here, Juror Number 19? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 19: Yes. Twenty-eight years 6 ago, Los Angeles, criminal, indecent exposure. 7 THE COURT: Anything about that case that would 8 keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 19: 10 THE COURT: And did I miss anybody? 11 (No verbal response.) 12 THE COURT: Okay. So I have Juror Number 21? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: Yes, it was here and it 13 14 was a civil case and I don't remember exactly what it had 15 to do with, vehicular --16 THE COURT: Sometimes civil cases blur together, 17 don't they? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: But I was selected for 19 the jury, but then the defendant did a plea bargain and so 20 then --21 THE COURT: They settled the case? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: Before questions got in. 23 THE COURT: All right. All right. So before 24 you got -- you went and started the trial, really they

went ahead and settled the case so you didn't have to sit?

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: Exactly.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that case that would keep you from being fair and impartial, the little bit you heard?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. With regard to civil cases, it is kind of interesting because civil cases are different than criminal cases in that there's a whole different burden of proof.

In civil cases we talk about preponderance of the evidence, so that when we look at it, we start out one side weighs a little heavier than the other. And that's the burden of proof. In a criminal case, the burden of proof is much higher. It is beyond a reasonable doubt. So just as little difference in between a civil case and a criminal case.

Was there anyone else here that I missed here?
(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Juror Number 22?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: It was dismissed from that last round of jury selection for sexual rape case in Denver.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. But you didn't actually sit and hear the evidence in that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: Correct.

THE COURT: Anything about the process that would keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: I had a strong personal reaction to that sexual assault portion they discussed, but that's about as far as we've got.

THE COURT: Just as an aside, sometimes I will have jurors say, well, I don't agree with stealing or I have a big reaction to burglary and I think a lot of people do. And what we're doing in this courtroom is not wanting people to condone a charge, but to find whether or not the elements of the offense have been met.

So, certainly, I think your reaction would be the reaction of most people. What the defendant in this case has said, is he is not guilty, he did not commit the crime and, thus, that's what we're doing here today.

Okay. All right. So then how about Juror Number 23?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: Denver District, I believe. It was 50 years ago. I was 21 and just pregnant throwing up and they would not excuse me, and it went on for a month and we had several different -- mostly illegal things, we had interpreters.

THE COURT: So it was a complex case and it went for a month?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: Oh, no, no. Different 1 2 cases. 3 THE COURT: It was different cases? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: We had to report for a 5 month. 6 THE COURT: Okay. So maybe it was grand jury. 7 Maybe it was grand jury that you sat on? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: 50 years ago, \$40 a day 9 whether we served or not and that was big. 10 THE COURT: Anything about that experience other 11 than being sick the whole time part, that would keep you 12 from being fair and impartial with us here today? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: No. 14 THE COURT: How about my last two jurors here. 15 Juror Number 24? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: Two criminal, one civil. 16 17 THE COURT: Wow. Thank you, three juries. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: One 40 years ago, and two 19 in the '90s. 20 THE COURT: And were they in Colorado? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: Yeah, here in Jefferson 22 County. 23 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So three juries, 24 thank you so much. Anything about any of those that would 25 keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody I missed?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Juror Number 25?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 25: Yes. It was about 30 years ago in Arvada, and it was an assault case.

THE COURT: Anything about that case that would keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 25: No.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So as I was saying to, I think it was Juror Number 29, I'm going to ask now about friends, family, close acquaintances, whatever, who -- or yourself, who have ever been a law enforcement officer.

And the reason I ask this question is this: Law enforcement officers oftentimes testify in cases, and I want to make certain that everybody can judge the credibility of a law enforcement officer just as you would any other person. Because they're people and your obligation as jurors is to have the person take the stand and judge their credibility as to what they're saying to you and assess their credibility. And that's your obligation with every single witness no matter what role they play in the case.

So I want to be certain that everyone can judge

the credibility of a law enforcement officer just as you would any other person, that would be the Court's instruction, neither giving them a leg up or downward feeling because they're law enforcement.

And so that being in mind, I want to talk to you about who here -- a lot of us have friends, family, acquaintances, neighbors, or whatever who have been or were law enforcement officers, and that's what I want to talk to you about. And I'll start in the back row first.

Anybody in the back row who has friends, family, acquaintances in law enforcement?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Okay. So Juror Number 4?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: When I first moved into my current residence, my neighbor, he was an Adams County Sheriff, and his wife worked in the Westminster City court system.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. And do they still live there now?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: They have moved away.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you drive them away, is this one of those neighbor situations?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: That's up to them, not me.

THE COURT: All right. So did you know them closely or were they just neighbors, whatever?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: Lived with them closely and watched their little girls grow up.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about the fact that they were your neighbors that would keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: No.

THE COURT: Can you judge the credibility of a law enforcement officer just as you would any other person, neither giving them a plus or a minus because they were law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: I believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anybody else in that back row?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: How about the next row?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Juror Number 8?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: I guess a couple things to disclose. I have a couple good friends in law enforcement both here in Jefferson County as well as Adams County. I also know a number of the Colorado Attorney General -- Attorneys General. I was the state's expert witness forensic accountant on a matter that went to trial in Denver last January, so I know quite a few people there.

All that said, I don't believe it would keep me

1 from being a fair and impartial. 2 THE COURT: Okay. So let's look at this 3 carefully, so you're a CPA? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Yes, ma'am. 5 THE COURT: And so you were hired by the 6 prosecution to do a forensic analysis and testify? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Yes, I was retained by --8 my firm and I were retained by the Attorney General, and I 9 did testify in the case. 10 THE COURT: Okay. All right. And so then you 11 testified it was a criminal case or civil case? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: It was civil. 13 THE COURT: Civil case? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Yes, ma'am. 15 THE COURT: Okay. And are you getting ready for 16 tax season right now? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Thankfully. I only do 18 forensic work, so I don't do --19 THE COURT: So you can take a breath there and 20 you're not quickly looking over this new legislation? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Well, I have done that to 22 maintain my education. 23 THE COURT: So because of this and because of 24 your personal life, you're friends with people at the 25 attorney's general office, and you're also friends with

some deputies here and you said deputies in Denver?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: One of my friends is a cadet in Adams County, training to be a police officer and one of the deputies that works in Jefferson County actually works in this building was my stepson's baseball coach, and I've known him for a number of years.

THE COURT: Okay. So tell me if anything about that keeps you from being fair and impartial with us here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: I don't believe so, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So you wouldn't say from your experience that I would automatically believe everything a law enforcement officer said or I would automatically disbelieve everything a law enforcement officer said?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: No, ma'am. I would -- our firm in particular represents both plaintiffs and defendants, so I understand both sides.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Works for us is the right word, not represent.

THE COURT: Right. Right. And Juror Number 9, did you have something, did you have law enforcement? Did you raise your hand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: I didn't.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then we had the next row. Anybody in the next row with friends and family in law enforcement?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: So I'm looking at Juror Number 12 first.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: Yes, just as a matter of disclosure, I have a nephew who is in law enforcement in another state.

THE COURT: Anything about that relationship that would keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: No.

THE COURT: Okay. And Juror Number 13, did you raise your hand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Yeah, my brother-in-law is a police officer in New Jersey.

THE COURT: Okay. And anything about that relationship that would keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: No, I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. So now we're on the front row and I had some hands in the front row, I think, 31, you raised your hand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: Yeah. My son was a

1 deputy here in Jefferson County for, I think, four or five 2 years, and then he's now a scientist at a lab. 3 THE COURT: Okay. And the fact that your son 4 was a deputy, does that keep you from being fair and 5 impartial with us here today? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: No. 6 7 THE COURT: Can you judge the credibility of a 8 law enforcement officer just as you would any other 9 person? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Okay. And I think was it, 18, who 12 had -- you had your hand raised? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: Yes. 14 THE COURT: And --15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: My -- my sister's son is 16 going to be a law enforcement agent. 17 THE COURT: Okay. And he's in training right 18 now? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: Yes, he is. 20 THE COURT: Is he at the academy. PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: He's at the academy. 21 22 THE COURT: And how about that, anything about 23 the fact that your nephew is in training to be a law 24 enforcement officer that would keep you from being fair

and impartial with us here today?

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: No.

THE COURT: Okay. And, certainly, I know Juror Number 29, you told me about your son is a cadet.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: Yes.

THE COURT: Anything about that that would keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: I will be perfectly honest, Your Honor. You know, police officers, sheriff's swear to uphold the law of the country and the state and the county, and I would listen to them before I would listen to someone else. I really feel that --

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to say this then, it is the Court's instruction that you evaluate a law enforcement officer as you would any other person. If you feel you can't do that, then I'm going to have you go downstairs and reset on a civil case where the situation isn't the same. So if you feel that you can't judge the credibility of a law enforcement officer just as you would any other person, then I'll have you go downstairs and reset.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 29: Very good. I will take that option, please.

THE COURT: Then we'll have you go downstairs to sit, because everybody swears to tell the truth in the courtroom.

THE BAILIFF: Number 32, hello. 1 2 THE COURT: Good morning. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: Good morning. 4 THE COURT: Can you take a look at the people 5 seated at these tables? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: I do not know any of 7 them. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Are you a compensated 9 employee of a public law enforcement agency? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: No, I'm not. 11 THE COURT: Do you have the qualifications to 12 sit as a juror. PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: Yes, I do. 13 14 THE COURT: How about the issue of hardship? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: No. 16 THE COURT: Now, I read a long list of 17 witnesses, did you know or recognize any of those names? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: I did not. 19 THE COURT: Have you had prior jury service? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: No, ma'am. 21 THE COURT: And we're at the police officer 22 question, do you have friends, family, acquaintances, 23 neighbors, et cetera, who are in law enforcement? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: No. 25 THE COURT: Okay. Did I miss anybody here who

had their hand raised?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: So I have Juror Number 24?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: I have a cousin that's a retired Pueblo police officer and Department of Corrections officer.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that relationship which would keep you from being fair and impartial with us here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: No.

THE COURT: You could judge the credibility of law enforcement just as you would any other witness?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, and, again, ladies and gentlemen, I ask that question because every person who takes the stand has to be listened to. And as jurors, you are the judges of the facts. I don't judge anything about the facts. I just take care of the law in the case.

But jurors, when they're sworn to sit on a jury, are the judges of the facts and part of determining the facts in the case, is assessing the credibility of each witness as they come to the stand, okay?

All right. So everybody good? Can everybody hear and see what's going on so far?

1 (No verbal response.) 2 THE COURT: Anybody have any issues with that? 3 (No verbal response.) 4 THE COURT: Because we can move you around, we 5 can try the headsets. 6 (No verbal response.) 7 THE COURT: Okay. Could you take a look around 8 and tell me if any panel members know each other. You 9 know, the other day we had cousins sitting in our jury, 10 and what was surprising, is they did not notice it until 11 the second day. So anybody have a cousins here, a 12 neighbor, do you see people? 13 (No verbal response.) 14 THE COURT: Okay Juror Number 9, who do you 15 know? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: I know Number 3. 17 THE COURT: Okay. How do you guys know each 18 other? Do you work together? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: We went to school 20 together. 21 THE COURT: You went to school together. Okay. 22 And were your close friends or did you just see each other 23 in school? How was that? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: We, like, were in the same 25 classroom senior year most of the time.

1 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So tell me this, 2 what I need to know is would either of you be 3 uncomfortable in any way sitting as jurors together in this case? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: (The prospective shook her 6 head.) 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: (The prospective shook his 8 head.) 9 THE COURT: Both of your shaking your head "no"? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: Yeah, I'm good. 11 THE COURT: Okay. So here's the scenario that 12 I'm going to give you. So say you both get selected as 13 jurors in this case, because we're just starting this 14 selection. Say you both get selected and you're back in 15 the jury room and you're making decisions in the case so 16 you have to go down through elements of the crime and make 17 decisions on all of these. 18 Say Juror Number 3 says guilty, Juror Number 9 19 says not guilty. Would both of you feel free in 20 expressing your views and opinions about the case with the 21 other person there? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: Yeah. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Both of you are shaking your head 25 So no reservations that you went to school

together, you didn't hate each other?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: (The prospective shook her head.)

THE COURT: No, okay. All right. Has it been a while since you've been in high school?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: We graduated in 2017.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: Last year.

THE COURT: Last year, oh my goodness. All right. Anybody else know each other?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: No, okay. If you were selected as a juror in this case, would you be able and willing to render a verdict solely on the evidence presented at trial and the law as I give it to you in my instructions disregarding any other ideas, notions or beliefs about the law you may have encountered? Can all of you do that?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Is there a reason, whether I've asked the question or not, why, if you were selected as a juror, you could not or would not be fair and impartial in deciding the this case?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: What I need to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, is that everybody comes into a courtroom with life experiences. We want you to come into the courtroom

with life experiences. Of course, you're live human beings, each one of you have had different life experiences. We do not want you to put those life experiences aside. We want you to use your commonsense, your practical knowledge, the experiences you've had in life.

What we don't want to happen is that your life experiences keep you from being fair and impartial. We want you to apply them, to use them, to use your commonsense, and then go in and be fair and impartial to both sides and look at the issue and reach a conclusion.

Okay. So now we're going to take a look at the screen up here and can everyone see that?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Tell me if you can't because I'll just go through the question with you. But I'm going to have you simply give me some information about yourself so it is kind of an intro to having the district attorney and Mr. St. George talk to you in what's called the voir dire part of the selection.

So if you'd just go down the list and just give me some responses to the questions, we'll get a little information. And we're going to start out with Juror Number 1.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: Do you want me to go

1 ahead? 2 THE COURT: Please. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: Hi, so my number is one. 4 I'm not married. I do have one child. I have a daughter. 5 She's three. Interests, I like to do a lot of outdoorsy 6 things when it is nice out. So I like the warm weather. 7 Don't really like the cold weather. I love country music 8 and I love, like, dramas on TV. 9 THE COURT: And what sort of business are you 10 in. 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: I just got a new job so I 12 work at a bank. 13 THE COURT: Okay. So you're in the banking 14 business. And how about your parent's, were they in a 15 similar business there? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: My mom is a manager for a 17 retail place, and my dad is a boss for a distribution 18 center. 19 THE COURT: Okay. And how far did you get in 20 school? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: I graduated and then I've 22 got -- I went a little for dental assisting so... 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: So I got that certificate 25 and everything.

THE COURT: All right. So Juror Number 26?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: I'm 26. I have lived
here almost my entire life. I am a legal administrative

THE COURT: What kind of law?

assistant for a sole practitioner attorney.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: He does mostly land use and he also represents special districts.

THE COURT: Okay. We're not going to be doing that here.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: No. He does no criminal work. I have a college degree in music. I am married. I have two sons, they are both in their 30s. One is a forester and one works for the government in DC. My parents, my dad was an airline pilot, my mother was a homemaker. My husband is an aerospace engineer. I like to go camping, fishing, scrapbooking. I do listen to music, mostly contemporary music and some classical. And I like to watch things like Chicago Fire on TV.

THE COURT: My next juror.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: I'm Juror Number 3. I've lived in Colorado and in the U.S. for my entire life, all 18 years. Finished high school.

THE COURT: You have to keep saying that to me.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: Finished high school last
year. Not married, no kids. My parents, my dad works for

the City of Westminster, and my mom is a vet tech. I've swam since I was, like, five and I enjoy doing that a lot, especially in the summer. Don't necessarily like the cold weather all too much. But I read whatever, listen to whatever, watch whatever, it doesn't really matter.

THE COURT: So what's your favorite show on TV right now on Netflix or whatever?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: I couldn't tell you. I don't really watch TV too much. I sold a lot of my stuff because I don't like watching TV. I like getting out and doing things rather than actually sitting at home and just not doing anything at all.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 4?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: Juror Number 4. I was born in Boulder, Colorado, if you consider that part of Colorado. Moved to Jefferson County in '98 and I am currently an unemployed accountant. Most recently I am a home builder. I have a bachelor's and master's in accounting from the University of Denver. Single. No kids. My father was a mechanical engineer for the civil service for the U.S. Army. And my mom was an elementary school librarian.

I am an avid golfer, volunteered for a local club. Also, like to get out and hike if I'm not golfing. Have a black belt in Taekwondo. I like to read mystery

novels, listen to sport's radio, watch sports, watch documentaries, nature shows.

THE COURT: And Juror Number 5?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 5: I've been in Colorado for 35 years. I have a degree in interior design and that's what my business is. I'm self-provided also. I'm married. I've got two boys, one is 27, one is 24. They both live in Colorado or in the metro area too. Both my husband's parents and my parents were farmers. I like to read, I read a lot of history, historical novels, watch sports. We don't really watch any other television. Bike and hike and don't ski much, it is too expensive. But camping, and we're kind of foodies. That's why we can't afford to ski because we go to restaurants.

THE COURT: All right. Juror Number 27?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: I've lived in Jefferson

County most of my life. I am a stay-at-home mom and I

have an associate's degree in early childhood education.

I'm married. I have two kiddos. One is four and one is

nine. My dad was an engineer and my mom was a homemaker.

Spouse's industry, he is -- he works for Orical, I'm not

really sure what he does. He does something with

technology, I have no idea.

And my interests are I love DIY projects, crafts, play with the kids. I like to read classical

novels and historical novels and I love documentaries.

THE COURT: Juror Number 7.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: I'm Number 7. Colorado native. Been delivery driving, janitorial, Warehousing, forklift. Graduated in '96. No degree. Single. Have twin boys that are nine. My dad passed away when I was 20. My mom's a cook at it a daycare center. I like tattooing, oil painting, drawing, pretty much read whatever. I don't watch TV. It is usually just sport's radio and sport's on TV, really that's about it. If I do watch TV but, yeah.

THE COURT: Do you have a favorite for Sunday?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Man, I don't like both

teams but it is good to see Brady do his thing. You know,

it is kind of like watching Michael Jordan back in the

day, I'm just kind of taking a lot in. A lot of Bronco

fans might be mad at me right now.

THE COURT: At the Nuggets game they put up the picture of Tom Brady if they want people to boo.

Number 8?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: I'm number eight,

Born and raised in Jeffco. Went to Columbine. As I said earlier, I am a forensic accountant. I'm a CPA. Been doing that for 17 years. I have a bachelor's in economics, a master's in accounting from metro. I also

teach at metro as an affiliate in the graduate accounting program there. Married. I have a 20-year-old stepson and a seven-year-old and almost five-year-old. Five-year-old is in charge of the house if there's any question.

My father is a geophysicist. My mother is a teacher. I probably should have said earlier that my mother-in-law was an Arapahoe County officer. Same answer to the question we had earlier. Interests and clubs, I'm active in the sailing club, treasurer of that. And love sailing in the summer. I enjoy gardening, and I also started a lego club at my son's school, I enjoy doing that. I watch almost no television. Occasionally sports, but even that infrequently at this point. I enjoy reading both history and crime novels and listen to NPR.

THE COURT: Number 9.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: I've lived in Colorado most of my life. I'm Number 9. I've never been out-of-state. I graduated in 2017. I'm not married and I don't have kids. I don't really talk to either of my parents and I don't really watch very much television. I like to read Ellen Hopkins, and yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 10?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: Number 10. I've been in Colorado for about five years. I work as a warehouse manager for an interior design company. I have a high

school diploma. Single, no kids. My mom is a bartender. I like to snowboard, play basketball and fish. And I like to read news articles here and there and I watch a lot of stand-up comedy.

THE COURT: Juror Number 11?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: I've lived in Colorado my whole entire life. Grew up in Glenwood, came here about five years ago. And I work at King Soopers and graduated from high school last year and single. Have no children. My dad is a merchandiser and my mom works at a bank. And what I look doing, reading, drawing, and, yeah, hanging out with people. And then what I like to read, nonfiction and then watch it on TV. What have I been watching? That '70s Show.

THE COURT: Ancient times.

Number 12?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: I'm Juror Number 12.

I've lived in Colorado and in Jefferson County both for almost 37 years. I'm in the banking industry. I have a master's degree, an undergraduate degree in business. I'm married. We have three children. The oldest is a medical doctor. The second is a certified Rolfer, and the third is in the fashion industry in San Francisco.

My wife is retired but spent at career in public education as a school psychologist. And my interest is

avid road biker, very active in the community at various levels and positions in various organizations in the community. And I read mostly things involving American history. I do read things involving, I suppose, business-related things like economics and finance on a have-to basis. But my fun thing is American history, military history, that kind of thing. And I don't watch much television. When I do, I watch American Pickers, so...

THE COURT: All right. Number 13?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: I'm Number 13. I've lived in Jefferson County for three years. I'm retired or unemployed or stay-at-home mom, whatever you want to call it from the Apple development industry. I have a BS in communications. I'm married. I have one son who is seven months old. And my father's a retired engineer for the Navy. My mother is a retired counselor. My husband is a software engineer. And we have lots of interests, but I'll save you. We like to ski, I guess that's a big one, and very involved in the Japanese-American community downtown at the Denver Buddhist Temple. I like to read a lot of self-development books, like, I'm reading The Speed of Trust by Stephen Covey right now. I don't listen to the radio and I watch whatever my husband watches which is soccer, football, Gotham, Game of Thrones, Walking Dead,

whatever it may be.

THE COURT: Gotcha. Number 14?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 14: I'm number 14. I'm a Colorado native. I've worked in Arvada my entire life. I work for Bed Bath & Beyond. And I got my education at CSU in psychology and in dietetics. I'm not married but I am engaged. No children. My dad is retired and he was an Air Force mechanic. And my mom was a bank accountant. I like to swim, go hiking, garden, and I love all types of music.

THE COURT: All right. So then I have Juror Number 15?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: Number 15. I've lived in Colorado most of my life. I manage a hockey bar and grill. I went to culinary school. Didn't graduate, I felt it cost too much money for what you get for entry level afterwards. Single. I have three boys, 8, 12 and 14. I'm not sure what my mom does. I don't know my dad. I mostly hang out with my youngest, I have him full-time and we just play, and play video games. And I watch and read mostly sci-fi fantasy-type stuff.

THE COURT: Okay. 32?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: I'm Juror 32. I came to Colorado in 2007 and left for three years with -- my wife was in grad school and came back in 2015. I've been in

Jefferson County for one year. I'm a registered nurse in a hospital in downtown Denver. And I have a bachelor of science in nursing. Like I said, I'm married. I have one child, 17-month old little boy and he's not working yet. My parents, my dad was in the car business and management for his entire career. My mom was a homemaker. My interests include skiing, camping, hiking, high fi audio. I read *The Denver Post* weekly and I listen to NPR and some regular FM radio stations sometimes. And my favorite shows are stranger things and my wife and I like to watch This is Us on TV.

THE COURT: Juror 30?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: I've lively in Colorado since 1973. I retired, I was a case manager with Jefferson County Human Services. I have a bachelor's degree in psychology. I'm divorced and have no children. My parents are both deceased. My interests are, I enjoy hiking, riding my bike and playing pickleball. I like to read nonfiction and watch football and reality shows.

THE COURT: Number 18?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: I'm Number 18. Colorado native. Work for the Federal government, also former Navy. I have a bachelor's in computer security. Single, no children. My dad was an upholsterer, my mom was a homemaker. Interests are hiking, skiing, golfing,

snowshoeing, cycling. Love to read science fiction, fantasy novels. I think the Blacklist is what I watch.

THE COURT: Number 19?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 19: Okay. 19. In Colorado and Jeffco since 1996. I am in human resources for a small software company. Bachelor's degree in business. Married. One stepdaughter, 31, stay-at-home mom. And parent's were teachers. My spouse is a retired journeyman in HVAC. Interests, I volunteer mentoring at an inner-city school. I also hike. My husband and I ride on road/off road motorcycles. And I'm a history buff, reading; television, documentaries. Pretty much it.

THE COURT: Number 31?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: I'm 31. I was born in St. Joseph's and lived here all my life. I've been in Jefferson County since 1980. I was a drywall contractor. My dad was a plaster and dry wall contractor. Mom was a homemaker. I have two kids. I'm married and I got two kids, 41 and 36. And they -- one's a scientist and the other one works at a house cleaning service. And interests are golf. I have a black belt in kung fu. Tried a couple schools, nobody wants to pay. They all want to learn. And do a little reading of fiction. And stuff on TV, it is mostly sports and I record Price is Right and the game shows and watch some of that, but

that's about it.

and football.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

well. I have bachelor's degree in English. My wife is in her eighth month of pregnancy, and so that takes care of two in one, I think. My dad was in the Navy for 30 years.

My mom was a secretary. We were pretty active outdoors

since '07. Been in Jeffco since '16. I work in marketing

and I have a side consulting business in marketing as

people, snowboard. Member of my HOA. Rebuild motorcycles

on the side just for the heck of it. And we watch the same kind of stuff everybody else does, Walking Dead, Game

of Thrones, all of that predictable stuff.

THE COURT: 23?

THE COURT: All right. Number 21?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: I'm a semi-native. I've been here since I was two years old and that's a long time so I like to say I'm a native. I am retired. I have an associate's degree in management information systems, and I used to work in that industry. I'm married. I have two children, three stepchildren, five grandchildren. My spouse is a retired civil engineer. Our interests are ballroom dancing and my exercise class and eating out. And I like to watch -- read mysteries and I watch dramas

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: 22, I've been in Colorado

THE COURT: 22?

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: I'm a native. Been in Jefferson County since second grade. Stay-at-home mom. My dad was an electrician though he was self-employed. was a stay-at-home mom until I was 28. While I stayed at home I was a foster parent for four years. Went into nursing. Got my license practical nursing.

Went through a divorce so I had to get into something other than -- I worked for a private practice thoracic surgeon and he was new to practice and didn't have insurance and I had three children. So went to work for Mountain Bell and stayed there until -- well, I remarried in '80 and he worked for Mountain Bell, and he took early retirement, I helped him in his business.

We formed our own business so self-employed but we're both retired now. We do some traveling, just camping and fishing and have a place up in Wyoming pretty frequently. Reading puts me to sleep so I don't. I, like, watch the news to a point then it is off. But as far as favorite channels, watch what he watches which is no commercials so we're watching two or three shows, you know, as the commercials come up. But it is usually the NCIS and CSI and Blacklist.

THE COURT: Now, you know we're not quite as good as NCIS and all of those shows? I think they get done from maybe crime to the end in 48 minutes with the

commercials. So we try to be that efficient and, also, you know, TV is TV. Really different and you never see jury selection on those shows, do you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: I have seven grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

THE COURT: All right. 24?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: Born and raised in Golden. I've lived here all my life, obviously. And I own a small construction company. High school diploma. Married. Got three sons. They're all in construction, 32, 29 and 27. Mom was a lab technician at Denver General. Dad was mostly a rancher. My wife works as an optic assistant at Sam's Club. And don't have a lot of time for hobbies, but we have horses and some rescue pit bulls we take care of. And do a lot of reading of trade industry stuff.

THE COURT: All right. Juror Number 25?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 25: I'm 25 and I'm a Colorado native. Lived here all my life and I work for United

States airlines as a mechanic. And I'm about to retire any time now. And I have an associate's degree. I'm married. My wife is retired now but she was a hairstylist for 45 years. And I have one daughter who's a lawyer in Dallas and two stepkids, one is an auto mechanic and the other is a hairstylist following in her mom's footsteps.

And let's see, clubs and interests, I like to garden, and on TV I like Big Bang Theory, comedies.

THE COURT: Okay. So, ladies and gentlemen, from the responses of the other jurors, does anything come to mind that you would like to share with us or that you just forgot to share with us during the individual questioning?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Will each of you follow the Court's instructions as to the law.

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Can everybody be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. This is the time when we allow both sides to inquire, but before we do that, we're going to take a break. It is going to be about 15 minutes so we will return at 11:15.

I need everybody out of the courtroom. I've got to do a couple of things while you are out on another matter so please wait to have somebody bring you back into the courtroom.

(The prospective jurors left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: I'm going to tell you don't talk about the case, keep an open mind.

(The jury left the courtroom.)

MR. FREEMAN: Judge, I just want to mention something on the record. There was a name that I recognized on here, Juror Number 69. I wasn't sure if it was her until I turned around just now and saw her. She's not in the presumptive 25 so it is not a big issue yet, but I know her pretty well.

Our kids have played baseball together for the last seven or eight years. Her husband has been my son's coach for the last seven or eight years. If she makes it up here, that may come up.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So I'm making a note of that. We're going to take a break and we're going to have the individual voir dire.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. We need to collect the lists now.

MR. MENGES: Judge, one thing. I don't think it is an issue. One of the jurors asked Mr. Burnett when she was walking out the courtroom. Where's the defendant and Mr. Burnett just said, I can't talk to you.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BURNETT: I assume everybody thinks it's me.

THE COURT: Okay. So 15 minutes. So I said

11:15, I think.

MR. MENGES: And then the DA is going to go and

1 then we are going to have a lunch break. I have a 2 scheduled phone call that has to be made over the lunch 3 hour. 4 THE COURT: Well, it all depends on what we do. 5 It was 45 minutes, so my thought is we're probably going 6 to have to break because -- you know, if it goes 7 seamlessly and there's no issues or whatever, we're still 8 going to end up right at noon and the cafeteria closes. 9 MR. MENGES: They've been here since eight 10 o'clock. So just for scheduling. That's what I told him. 11 THE COURT: That's my thought is that we're 12 going to break in between. MR. MENGES: After Mr. -- or the district 13 14 attorney's voir dire? 15 THE COURT: Yeah. 16 MR. MENGES: Okay. Thank you. 17 THE BAILIFF: Judge, do you want me to collect 18 the list? 19 THE COURT: Yeah. 20 (A recess was taken.) 21 THE COURT: So, Mr. St. George, my understanding 22 is your parents are here? 23 MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. 24 THE COURT: And you want to have somebody from 25 your team advise them they're not allowed to talk to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

jurors.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Fair enough.

MR. MENGES: That's fine.

MR. FREEMAN: Judge, can we go on the record.

THE COURT: We can go on the record.

It came to our attention when you MR. FREEMAN: were reading the information that we need to file a motion to amend the dates. While some of the offenses occurred on July 31st, some of the offenses, I think, occurred on August 1st in the early morning hours.

Certainly, we think that's an amendment of form, and not substance, Rule 7E allows us to at least make a motion to amend all the way up until to verdict. I don't know if defendant was going to latch onto that and argue that we didn't prove that everything happened on July 31st, but out of an abundance of caution, we are going to file a motion to amend.

And that doesn't apply to all the counts. The counts relating to Ms. Elliott occurred on the 31st. amendment would apply to Counts 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9.

THE COURT: Okay. So the allegation or the theory by the prosecution is that these allegations began on July 31st and ran through the early morning hours of August 1st?

MR. FREEMAN: Correct. And so I think it should

24

25

properly read on and between July 31st and August 1st of 2016.

THE COURT: Response?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, my knee-jerk reaction is, of course, to object. These are not the dates that I was bound over to in preliminary hearing. I also understand that before the Court, this is probably going to be something of a Sisyphean adventure here that you're going to go ahead and overrule and allow them to amend, so if that's the case, then I object.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So the Court looks at these amendments and the Court looks particularly at whether or not there's a disadvantage or whether or not there is an issue with regard to preparation, et cetera, regarding the case.

I have heard motions in this case and been able to read some of the information, read through the affidavit. I just confirmed with the district attorney, so it is the Court's impression, from what I have heard and read that the allegations arise sometime during the evening night hours of July 31st of 2016 and then continued on through the early morning hours of August 1st of 2016.

That is my understanding of the discovery and my understanding of what has been presented to the Court.

And it is not my understanding that discovery would provide any different dates for these occurring. Since that has been the continuous course of conduct that's been outlined in all the materials, I'm going to go ahead and grant the amendment.

MR. FREEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So it would be as amended right now.

If you could file the charges formally with that

amendment, then we would have that on -- in the electronic

file.

MR. FREEMAN: We will do that.

THE COURT: Okay. So are we ready? Everybody ready?

MR. FREEMAN: The People are ready.

THE COURT: So 45 minutes I'll give you a heads-up.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

(The prospective jurors entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. Everybody be seated, please.

We are back, ladies and gentlemen, and we we're ready for voir dire from both sides. This is the opportunity for both sides to ask you some questions to hone in on who they think would be the best jurors for their particular side. So we're going to start on that.

One thing I did neglect to give you a heads-up

on, if you see people that are sitting at this table -- these tables, walking around the courthouse, they will run from you, and that is because I told them not to have contact with any of the jurors, and they may not have contact with any of the jurors.

Also, jurors can't have contact with spectators or also witnesses in the case. So that's why. They're not being rude, they're just following my instructions.

We'll start with voir dire.

MR. FREEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

VOIR DIRE

BY MR. FREEMAN:

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. As the

Judge introduced me earlier, my name is Mike Freeman. I'm

a prosecutor with the Jefferson County District Attorney's

Office. My co-counsel is Katharine Decker. Together we

represent the state of Colorado in a case against

Mr. St. George. Also, with us at our table is Lakewood

police detective, Jeff Larson, and our paralegal, Kirsten

Lewis.

A few of you mentioned that you watch some of the crime shows on TV, CSI shows, things like that. You probably have figured out by now why jury selection is not featured in those shows. It's a little dry, a little boring, but it is a very important part of the trial

because we're trying to find out if you can be fair and impartial.

You're probably all sitting there thinking, of course I can be fair and impartial, I'm a reasonable person. But like the Judge mentioned, all of you come into the court with a set of life experiences, a set of opinions about things and sometimes those things make it hard for you to be fair and impartial.

For example. One of the charges in this case is a charge of unlawful sexual contact. Maybe somebody has been subjected to that in their life or someone close to them has been subjected to that in their life and just those charges and the idea about hearing evidence that might support those charges, might cause an emotional reaction that might make it difficult for you to be fair.

If that's the kind of thing you're thinking about now, let us know. And those are the kind of things we're trying to get at in jury selection. We're not trying to embarrass anybody.

In a little bit I'm going to call on you just by numbers, I'm not going to call your names out. But I'm going to ask you how you feel about police or some of the charges or certain principles of law that may come up. If I call on you, please don't feel like I'm picking on you. Please don't feel like you're being put on the spot. I

know it's not fun to speak in public. We really just want to hear your candid, honest opinions about things.

There are no right or wrong answers. Nobody's going to criticize you if you have certain strong opinions one way or another about the questions you're being asked so please don't hesitate to be candid with us. We just kind of want to hear from you and hear you feel about some of the principles that may come up.

So I'm going to ask a few questions about some of those principles, but before I do that, I just want to cover a couple of things that folks mentioned earlier.

Juror Number 11, you said you're studying in college. What are you studying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: Graphic design.

MR. FREEMAN: Graphic design, okay. And you mentioned that you might miss a couple classes that might cause you some hardship. Are you going to be able to set that aside, do you think, and focus on the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: To be honest, not really. It is pretty important to me.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. As you're sitting here now, are you kind of stressed out about it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: Yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. All right. Thank you, fair enough.

Let me ask the whole group if anyone -- is there anyone of you that has never heard the term "justice is blind"? Has anyone never heard that phrase, "justice is blind"?

Juror Number 9, you've never heard that term? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: No.

MR. FREEMAN: Have you ever seen in a lot of the courthouses or a lot of legal documents there's a symbol, and it's a lady wearing robe and she's got a blindfold and she's holding these scales of justice and that sort of represents.

Anybody seen that, that statute or that symbol? (No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Some folks are nodding their heads. Let me just call on somebody.

Juror Number 8, have you ever heard the term "justice is blind"?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Yes, sir.

MR. FREEMAN: Are you familiar with that sort of statue, the lady with the blindfold?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Yes, sir.

MR. FREEMAN: What do you think that means?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Essentially you're supposed to listen and understand the facts of the case and apply the law as it's written, and you're not supposed

5

to look and form any kind of prejudgment as to what you think, but weigh the scales based on the evidence presented.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Sort of look blindly at the evidence without any sort of preconceived notions, things like that? Would you agree with me if I said, it's an ideal that we should strive for in the criminal justice system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Yes, sir.

MR. FREEMAN: Would you agree if I said that we should try to be blind to things like race, color, religion, socioeconomic status, political status, things like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: That we should be blind to those things? Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: That we should be blind to those things.

Would you, as a juror, be offended if in my job

I looked at a file and in deciding how to prosecute a case
or what charges to file, I said, Oh, this person's black,
I should treat them differently than somebody who's white.
Or this person is a homosexual, I should treat them
differently than a heterosexual.

Would you be offended if I made those kind of decisions as a public servant?

ideal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Do you feel like a juror you should try to avoid making decisions based on those kinds of things as well?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Does anybody disagree with that

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Everybody agree that as jurors we should at least strive to be blind to things like raise, color, religion, things like that?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Everybody's kind of nodding, nodding off to sleep maybe.

What about the idea that trial is not a popularity contest? You're going to probably get to know us a little bit as attorneys over the next week or so. You may get to know Mr. St. George as a defendant over the next week or so.

By the end of this trial, you may have some feelings about how you like or dislike -- you may already have an opinion about me -- about how you like or dislikes folks. Can everybody try their best to set those feelings aside and decide the evidence and not let how you feel about the attorneys or the parties try to get in the way?

1 (No verbal response.) 2 MR. FREEMAN: Juror Number 5, how do you feel 3 about that task? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 5: I think I'm up for it, 5 yes. 6 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Would you agree that a 7 trial should not be a popularity contest? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 5: Absolutely. 9 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Kind of along those lines, 10 one of the first things the Judge told you is that the 11 defendant, Mr. St. George, has chosen to represent 12 himself. 13 He has an absolute constitutional right to have 14 an attorney represent him at trial. But if he doesn't 15 want to take advantage of that right, he also has a 16 constitutional right to represent himself. 17 Juror Number 1, how do you feel about that? 18 do you feel about the idea of him representing himself? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: Totally up to him. 20 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: I don't really -- I just 22 believe that's up to him. 23 MR. FREEMAN: Oak. You may feel by the end of 24 this trial, you may form an opinion that his decision to

represent himself was a good idea or a bad idea. Do you

25

think that you can set that opinion aside, or at least as best you can, and try to decide the facts of the case in his guilt or innocence aside about whether you thought it was a good idea or bad idea for them to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: You may surmise by the end of trial that he hasn't been to law school and maybe he doesn't have a lot of experience trying a case in a courtroom. And hopefully, you will have surmised by that time that Ms. Decker and I have been to law school and we may know what we're doing a little bit.

Do you feel like if there's an imbalance in the experience and the ability to sort of put on a case between the two sides, do you think you might feel sorry for him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: No.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. If we treat him, because we're entitled to treat him a like an attorney, and if we treat him like an attorney and sort of do our best to hold him to the rules of evidence and object when we think we should, and if we, you know, if we win most of those objections, do you think you might get the sense we're sort of ganging up on him or beating up on him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: No.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Anyone feel that way?

Anyone concerned about that? Juror Number 26, how do you 1 2 feel about that? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: I will not have a 4 problem. I think I can be fair. 5 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. You're going to not feel 6 sympathy for him if you think he does a bad job at 7 representing himself? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: No, I don't think so. 9 MR. FREEMAN: He may do a great job, I don't 10 know. 11 But Juror Number 27, do you think if he does a 12 really bad job, do you think you're going to feel sorry 13 for him at the end of the trial? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: No, because you have to 15 prove he's guilty so... 16 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. And it was his choice, he 17 could have had an attorney. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: Yeah. 19 MR. FREEMAN: Anyone feel like they might feel 20 sorry for him? Again, he may do a great job, but he may 21 flounder. Anybody feel like they might feel sorry for 22 him? Anyone going to hold it -- Juror Number -- I'll get 23 it, 13? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Yes. 25 MR. FREEMAN: You raised your hand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Yeah, I do feel like I might feel sorry for him, but I don't think -- but is it okay to have that sympathy? I'd be able to set that aside and still make a clear decision based on the facts.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. And that's the question, do you think you'll be able to set that feeling aside and decide the case independent of that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Yeah, I think so. But I wanted to be honest.

MR. FREEMAN: I appreciate that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: I've never been in this setting and I could feel bad for him, who knows.

MR. FREEMAN: We don't ask you to come in like robots and not have human emotions. But at the end of the day, do you feel like you'll look at that -- if he does do poorly, you'll look at him and say, you know, he could have had an attorney and decided to represent himself, Maybe that was a bad idea, but I'm going to look at the evidence that was presented and decide the case on that?

Do you think you can do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Right. I think those are two separate things, that you have an opinion on something but then you're going to make a choice based on facts presented.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Anybody else share that

feeling that even if they might feel sympathy, they can still look at the evidence and sort of try to set that aside?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. I want to talk to you about the idea of penalty or punishment. One of the things that you won't be asked in this case if you're chosen as the 12 jurors, is should you convict, what should happen to the defendant. That is completely up to the Judge.

In fact, at the end of the case before you're given the case to deliberate, the Judge gives you a set of instructions that you will take an oath to apply. And the very first one of those instructions, part of it says, "You are not to consider penalty or punishment."

And what that means is not internally think about it like, oh, gosh, if we convict this guy, something's bad is going to happen to him, but also not discuss it openly when you're discussing guilt or innocence. Is everybody okay with that limitation on your jury service?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Sir, Juror Number 12, how do you feel about that limitation on your jury service?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: It was what I expected.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Do you think you can set

aside any thoughts about what might happen to him should you convict from your deliberations?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Anybody feel like they might have a hard time doing that?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: You've heard some -- obviously, some very serious charges. You may surmise that if the defendant is convicted of one or more of those, there may be some significant consequences to his life.

There are sometimes I've had jurors over the years that just said, I don't want to be a part of a process that leads to that kind of consequence to somebody else. And that's fine if you're feeling that way, we just like to know about I.

Anybody sitting here now feeling like that? Let me ask, Juror Number 9, you raised your hand. How do you feel about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: I just feel like it's too much of a, like, a decision that could be in my hands.

MR. FREEMAN: Too much responsibility?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: Yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Anybody else feel that way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: I could probably agree. I
have friends that are incarcerated, you know, the whole

thing.

MR. FREEMAN: And for the record you're Juror Number 7?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Yes, sir.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. So let me ask the two of you. If I've proven the case to you, and I know you haven't heard any evidence, just assume you're convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that he's guilty. Do either of you think you would hesitate to vote for guilt knowing that that may lead to some significant negative consequences for Mr. St. George? Would you hesitate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Probably not.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Juror Number 9, I think is saying yes. And, sir, Juror Number 7, you're saying probably not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: No, no.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody feel like they would hesitate to convict knowing that that might lead to some significant negative consequences for the defendant other than Juror Number 9?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: And, ladies and gentlemen, just quickly to interject. I will give you an instruction on there talking about should there be the need for

sentencing, that would be my job.

MR. FREEMAN: The reason we ask you not to consider penalty or punishment is you would be guessing. You would be speculating as to what might happen to the defendant should you convict. And if you were to find out after your verdicts were entered that you were wrong, we can't go back and change the verdicts.

So does everybody understand why we don't want you to guess or speculate as to what might happen?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Everybody think they can do that? (No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: All right. Thank you. I want to talk about credibility of witnesses. The Judge mentioned this earlier, if you're chosen as jurors in this case, one of your jobs, and really one of your most important jobs, is to determine the credibility of witnesses, and there will be instructions on that that will give you some guidance and give you some factors to consider.

And part of that instruction says you can believe all of a witness's testimony, some of it, or none of it. That's your decision, it's up to you.

Let me ask, Juror Number 30, how do you feel about your ability to judge the credibility of a witness that's testifying in trial to decide if you believe them

or not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: I would think that would be difficult to do not knowing a person or knowing whether to believe them or not. I think it would be difficult.

MR. FREEMAN: Let me give you some factors that the Judge is going to include in that instruction. Some of the factors are whether the witness has a motive or bias or interest in the outcome. Is that something that you want to know?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: What about if the testimony on the witness stand is consistent with or inconsistent with prior statements they may have made, is that important?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: What about whether their testimony on the stand is consistent or inconsistent with the testimony of other witnesses.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: How about whether their testimony on the stand is consistent or inconsistent with physical evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Let me give you an example. Say a witness testifies that they never touched a gun. There's this gun that was used in the crime and the issue is

whether they've ever touched it or not. The witness says under oath, "I've never touched that gun."

But then another witness comes up and says,

"Yes, we processed that gun for fingerprints and found a

latent print on it and it matches the defendant." Now

you've got the defendant's print on the gun.

Which would you feel is more reliable or more -- would carry more weight?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: I would think the physical finding of fingerprints.

MR. FREEMAN: And knowing that the defendant may have a motive to distance themselves from that gun, would you factor that in as well?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. So in light of some of those factors, do you feel like you could apply some of those factors and determine credibility of witnesses?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: I still think it would be difficult.

MR. FREEMAN: Yeah, sort of in a vacuum because you haven't heard anything yet. Okay.

Let me ask somebody else. Who have I not called on yet. Juror Number 15, how to you feel about that task? How do you feel about your ability to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: I just would like to have

as much information as possible so I can figure this it

MR. FREEMAN: So there's the witness stand right in front of you. You're going to watch people, at least sort of from the shoulders up, and you're going to watch them and listen to them testify. Is that important?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: Uh-hum.

MR. FREEMAN: Why is that important?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: Body language, maybe, you

MR. FREEMAN: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: How the answer questions.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. How do you interpret a witness who appears to be nervous? Do you automatically think they're being dishonest or --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: I'm nerve so...

MR. FREEMAN: You're nervous? I'm nervous too and I've been doing this for a long time.

How do you deal with somebody who, maybe, clearly is nervous just speaking in public? How do you interpret that nervousness, being dishonest, nervousness and I'm not comfortable up here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: I'm not sure how I'd be able to differentiate that.

MR. FREEMAN: Is it kind of a gut feeling?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: It's more -- yeah, it's more the information then like just the evidence kind of thing. I don't know.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. What about the factors that I discussed with Juror Number 30, that consistent or inconsistent with their prior statements, other witnesses, physical evidence, things like that, is that important?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: Yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. I don't have a lot of time, I know it seems like I have a lot of time, but it's going to go quick. Let me talk about the use of alcohol by a defendant. This should not come as a shock to you but oftentimes when crimes are committed there's an allegation that somebody was using alcohol, may have been under the influence of alcohol.

Let me ask, who have I not called on? Juror Number 4, sir, have I called on you yet? I don't think so.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: Not yet, no.

MR. FREEMAN: How do you feel about the use of alcohol by a defendant, how does that affect their responsibility for a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: It's, you know, there's a question in my mind of, you know, a little bit versus too much. Where's that line? You know, I've got friends that

are in the business of selling alcohol, making it, so their livelihood depends on people do this, you know, consume it at times in their life. You know, but at the same time, a person is who they are.

MR. FREEMAN: Let me ask you this: Do you think sometimes people that have been drinking too much make bad decisions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: Yes, I think that's true.

MR. FREEMAN: Do you think they're still accountable for those bad decisions even though part of it was due to alcohol?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: I think it creates a chain of decisions that your responsible for links of the chain.

MR. FREEMAN: So let me ask you this: If somebody is alleged to have committed a crime and they, while under the influence of alcohol, in your mind, is that -- is that an aggravating factor, is it a mitigating factor, or does that simply sort of explain their conduct better? What do you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: Being a numbers guy, it's kind of hard for me. I mean, everybody's going to react differently, every individual is unique. So some people alcohol turns them into a more outspoken person and sometimes less outspoken. There are all kinds of different reactions.

MR. FREEMAN: Let me ask you something, a bank robbery, something totally unrelated to this case. If somebody's alleged to have committed a bank robbery and it turns out they're under the influence of alcohol. In your mind, does that aggravate their conduct? Does it mitigate -- do you know what I mean by aggravate? Does it make it worse? Does it make it sort of like are you less outraged by their conduct or does it simply explain why they would do something that stupid?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: Yeah, that's hard for me to answer.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Let me ask somebody else. Who can I not see. Sir, Number 10, how do you feel about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: Sorry what was the question again?

MR. FREEMAN: Alcohol, and how do you view it in relation to somebody comitting a crime. Are they -- is somebody who commits a crime under the influence of alcohol, are they more responsible, are they less responsible, how do you feel about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: I think they are equally as responsible. You know, they knew that they were drinking before and they commit this sort of crime and they should take full responsibility.

1 MR. FREEMAN: So do you think that somebody who 2 commits a crime under the influence of alcohol in your 3 mind are they more responsible for their conduct or less 4 responsible? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: I'd say more. 6 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Does anybody disagree with 7 Juror Number 10? Anybody feel like they're less 8 accountable, less responsible? 9 (No verbal response.) 10 MR. FREEMAN: Juror Number 14, how do you feel 11 about that? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 14: I think that they're 13 responsible for their own behavior. 14 MR. FREEMAN: Let me ask, are you more likely to 15 excuse someone's bad decisions, bad conduct if they were 16 drunk --17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 14: No. 18 MR. FREEMAN: -- versus if they were sober? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 14: 20 MR. FREEMAN: Anybody feel like they would be 21 more likely to excuse somebody's bad decision if they were 22 drunk? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Yes. 24 MR. FREEMAN: Juror Number 7? 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Yes, sir. Yeah, I mean,

it explains, you know, if I had a friend that threw a rock and broke a window just because he was drunk, do you know what I mean?

MR. FREEMAN: Got in a bar fight?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Yeah, something, you know. It explains he was faded, he was drunk, probably the main reason why he did that.

MR. FREEMAN: Do you view that as maybe something they wouldn't have done if they were sober?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: If during that drunkenness if they commit a crime, do you feel like they are just as accountable for that crime if they were sober or do you feel like it excuses them a little bit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: It's kind of like that borderline, kind of depends really, you know. It's kind of hard to say. You know, at the same time, you know, you're at that level, you're at that point but some people forget, they black out. Some people you got to excuse.

MR. FREEMAN: And you know they're not thinking correctly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Exactly, it's hard to say.

But once you find someone drinking or under the influence,

it kind of explains the act of what they're doing.

MR. FREEMAN: Explains their conduct a little

bit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: I want to talk about this concept of attempt, attempt to commit a crime. The Judge read the counts against the defendant. The first three involve an attempt, meanly that the allegation is that he tried to do something but he wasn't successful. So let's talk about that.

The law criminalizes attempts to commit crimes regardless of whether the person was successful or not. If they were successful, it would be a different crime, right? If someone tries to kill someone else and they're successful, we call that murder. We don't call it attempted murder.

Does anybody people like the law should not criminalize attempts to commit a crime?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Juror Number 31, how do you feel about that? An unsuccessful attempt to commit a crime.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: That's a good one.

Because it depends on what it was and how long he thought about doing it, okay? If there was a premeditated then he's, I'd say guilty, yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Let me give you an example. Say I decide I want to kill Fred. I don't like Fred, I've

had it with Fred, I'm going to kill Fred. And I decide I'm going use a baseball bat. So I get a baseball bat and I go looking for Fred. And when I see Fred, I sneak up behind Fred and I swing that bat as hard as I can at his head. But at the last second, Fred is very crafty and sees me out of the corner of his eye and ducks and I miss. People grab me and I'm arrested. What crime do you think I'm guilty of, if any?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: Attempted murder.

MR. FREEMAN: Why, Fred wasn't even hurt?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: You attempted to swing the bat at his head. He just -- Fred got lucky and didn't get hit.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Anybody disagree? Anybody feel like I'm not guilty of attempted murder?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Fred wasn't hurt.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: I'd say attempted assault.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. But I'm guilty of

something?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Yeah, guilty of something for sure. But, you know, you didn't hit him so if you did hit him, you're not sure whether's going to die or something. Do you know what I mean?

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. But under my hypo I just

gave, I said I want to kill Fred, so there's my intent to kill.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: I see what you're saying.

MR. FREEMAN: Now do you think I'm guilty of attempted murder? Still struggling?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Still kind of struggling because there is really no --

MR. FREEMAN: Fred's not hurt.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Exactly. He's not hurt. Not injured. I mean, I think if he was injured -- but I think, you know, with the intent and then not completing it and the guy, you know, ducked or whatever, I'd still say probably not really attempted murder.

MR. FREEMAN: So let me change the facts a little bit. Exact same scenario, I want to kill Fred, I'm sick of Fred. I get in the back, I go looking for Fred. I sneak up behind him. This time poor Fred doesn't see me coming, I whack him good in the head. Fred goes down. Fred is severely injured but Fred doesn't die. And in fact, eventually, Fred makes a full recovery. What crime do you think I'm guilty of?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Oh, man, I'd say assault, attempted murder if you were intending to kill him. It would be total assault and attempted murder on top of that, that's what you were going for but unsuccessful.

me.

MR. FREEMAN: Right, I whacked him.

Anybody think again, not going to disagree with you, nobody's going to criticize you, but does anybody think in this second scenario where I gave Fred a good whack, I'm not guilty of attempted murder? Anybody hesitate to convict me? You guys all probably look forward to it, right? I'm a rotten guy, I whacked Fred. Anybody feel like I'm not a guilty of attempted murder?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Juror number 27 you're scowling at

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: I just had Botox, that's normal. I'm just kidding.

MR. FREEMAN: What do you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: I think if the intent is there, the intent is there.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Okay. Under both scenarios where I swing and miss, where I swing and whack Fred, am I guilty under both in your mind?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: I think so. I mean, if you can prove the intent, yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: And, again, just for the sake of my hypo, I said I want to kill Fred. That's the proof that Mr. Freeman wanted to kill Fred. So that's what you got, my intent was to kill Fred.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: That you just said that? 1 2 MR. FREEMAN: Yep, so am I guilty? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: I've said that I wanted 4 to kill my husband. 5 MR. FREEMAN: Yeah, but did you ever act on it. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: No. 7 MR. FREEMAN: So I acted on it, and I, like I 8 said, I selected a weapon that could have done the job and 9 I went looking for the guy and then I did what I did. 10 Under either scenario, where I swing and I miss or I swing 11 and I hit Fred, do you think you would struggle to convict 12 me? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: I don't believe so, no. 14 If the intent is there and it's a proven intent, I --15 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Okay. Anybody would 16 struggle under either scenario? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: My question is, you know, 18 say you like you're intending to hurt him, do you know 19 what I mean, you're saying, I want to kill Fred. You 20 know, are you telling yourself that or are you letting 21 people know that you want to kill him, that's the 22 question. 23 MR. FREEMAN: I'm an idiot, I posted it on 24 Facebook. It's there in writing, okay. All right. 25 So let me ask -- let's see, who have I not

called on yet. Everybody's covering up their thing.

Juror Number 32, do you think the evidence, the strength of one of those cases is stronger than the other where I swing and I miss versus I swing and I hit Fred?

Is one case a better case than the other?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: It might be a better case that you actually went through with what you say you were going to do with the --

MR. FREEMAN: Where I actually hit Fred?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: Where you actually took
the action of striking the man with what could be called a
deadly weapon, a bat to the head. So I think that one is
little bit stronger.

MR. FREEMAN: But in both scenarios, I swung at the same part of his body, his head. I swung with equal strength. I swung with the same intent, and I made my best efforts to kill Fred. In one I was unsuccessful simply because Fred got out of the way. The other one I was unsuccessful just because Fred's got a rock head and didn't die.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: I think you have to look at all the factors, look at the history of you and Fred. Look at did you say you were going to kill him. Did you say like that's a joke, like, I'm going kill that dude if he comes near me again.

MR. FREEMAN: I put it on Facebook, I'm going to go kill Fred.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: I think that's a clear intent.

MR. FREEMAN: Are the cases equally strong in your mind or do you still think the one where I whack Fred is a stronger case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: I think that you went through with the act and actually did do harm to him is a stronger case because you prove that what you were saying is what you were going to do, what you were willing and you were able and did follow through with it.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. What if I said that the cases are equally strong, but you just might feel stronger about the second scenario where I whack Fred because your sense of outrage for me actually hurting Fred and your sense of sympathy for Fred is stronger than when Fred walks away unharmed?

Would you agree or disagree with that that they are equally strong but you just feel emotionally stronger about one because poor Fred got clobbered?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: Probably emotionally strong because I saw the result of what happened, your action, and your stated intent to do -- to do the harm. I would feel stronger about that.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Does anybody disagree that the cases are relatively equal in strength and that you just might feel stronger about one than the other?

Juror Number 19?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 19: Yeah, I just feel like they're equal. I don't think one is stronger than the other because the intent was there, the action was taken by you.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Okay. Juror Number 21, how do you feel about those two, equally strong or do you feel like one is stronger than the other?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: I feel like one is a little stronger because he was hurt but your intent was the same, so it's equal in that way.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Juror number 22, what do you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: They are both strong on that account, you did also assault him so, there's more --

MR. FREEMAN: Yeah. Sometimes one act can be sort of multiple crimes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: Right. If there was any doubt about it, you're probably more likely to go towards the way of any doubt about whether or not you were swinging and missing because maybe the last second or whatever, but if you didn't hit and connect, you're

obviously assaulting him on top of that.

MR. FREEMAN: Right. Right. Let me ask -- let me tweak this a little bit more and I'll get to you last folks. I don't want to ignore you.

Same scenario, but I don't post on Facebook that I want to kill Fred. I don't say anything about what I want to do to Fred, but my actions are exactly the same. I grab a baseball bat, I go looking for Fred. When I see Fred, I sneak up behind him and I whack him in the head. What crime -- juror 23, what crime do you think I committed?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: Well, would there be witnesses?

MR. FREEMAN: Yeah, let's just say this is the undisputed evidence, I'm on video. I'm a dummy, I'm on video. I'm in Starbucks or someplace where they got video everywhere.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: They found the weapon, they found --

MR. FREEMAN: No question on what I did. The only question is what was my intent? Did I intend to hurt Fred? Did I intend to kill Fred?

What I'm getting at is in a situation where me, as the defendant, doesn't state what their intentions are, can you determine, can you infer what my intentions are

from my actions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: I would say so.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. So do you think under this scenario where I select a baseball bat, say a nice 33-inch Louisville Slugger, you know, not a little toy bat, a real bat. I swing it hard. I swing as hard as I can. I swing at his head. I don't swing at his knees or his shoulder, I swing at hit his. Under that scenario can you infer the intent to kill?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: I would, yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: Would you be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 23: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Juror Number 24, how do you feel?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: I'd look at the evidence.

If that video, if you could tell you swung as hard as you could at his head --

MR. FREEMAN: Yeah, I really lined up.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: You know, that's evidence you have to go with that. If you didn't get a clear vision of how hard he was swinging, the intent is very hard to determine.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. What about the fact that I choose a baseball bat as a weapon as opposed to a ruler or an umbrella. Is that significant to my intent?

MR. FREEMAN: And the fact that I swung at his head?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 25: (The prospective juror nodded his head.)

MR. FREEMAN: Anybody here, the rest of you, any of you would struggle with finding an intent to kill on my part under those facts?

(No verbal response.)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: I think I would.

MR. FREEMAN: For the record, Juror Number 10?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: Yes. I don't know if you could infer an intent to kill, but definitely some type of assault or battery charge. Like if you swing the bat and kept going, definitely an intent to kill.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. So a stronger case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: Yeah, but if it's just one swing, you don't know if it's intent to kill or just hurt the guy. I don't know.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. It's great if defendants tell us what they had in mind when they commit assaults, but they don't always tell us. And even if they do, you, as jurors, can believe or not believe them.

So in a situation where we don't have the benefit of a defendant telling you what they had in mind or telling you what they intended, do you think you could

1 ever infer what somebody intended from their actions? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: From the actions, yes. 3 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. So let me make this 4 statement and let me ask you if you agree with it, do you 5 think most people intend the natural consequences of their 6 actions? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: I'm not sure. 8 MR. FREEMAN: That's kind of a tough one. Maybe 9 a little too philosophical. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: Yeah. 11 MR. FREEMAN: Do you think that -- do you think 12 the natural and probable consequences of hitting someone 13 in the head with a baseball bat would be death? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: Like I said, if it was --15 MR. FREEMAN: Could be death? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: Like I said, if it was a 16 17 repetitive swing and for sure trying to kill somebody. 18 MR. FREEMAN: So you'd want a little stronger 19 evidence? 20 21 22 23 sure. 24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: Yeah. Like I said, I think it would definitely be some sort of assault, battery, the highest degree, and attempt to kill, not MR. FREEMAN: Okay. And I understand that. I've got to move on because I don't have that much time

left. I want to talk a little about the law of self-defense.

THE COURT: I'm just going to give you a heads-up of ten minutes.

MR. FREEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

The law of self-defense is a law of justification. The person that is claiming self-defense basically admits the underlying assault but they seek to justify it and to avoid any criminal responsibility by saying it was self-defense.

Does everyone agree that it would be logically inconsistent for a person to say, I didn't assault that guy but if I did, it was self-defense? Everybody follow me, that's logically inconsistent? Where it's like saying I wasn't there but if I was, it was self-defense? it would Be kind of difficult for you to buy as jurors, everybody with me so far?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: So I want to talk to you. Before somebody can be -- their assault or attempted assault and someone else can be justified and they can be fully exonerated, certain things have to exist. The jury would have to find that the person used physical force in order to defend himself from what he reasonably believed to be the use or imminent use of physical -- unlawful physical

force by another person, and that he used a degree of force which he reasonably believed to be necessary for that purpose.

Both of those elements have the word "reasonable," and that means that not only, me, the actor or the defendant, have an actual belief and the need to defend and the actual belief that the degree of force that he used were necessary, but you as jurors viewing it from the outside think it was reasonable. Everybody with me so far?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Let's see, who can I -- who hasn't been called on? Have I skipped anybody?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Juror Number 18, I apologize. How do you feel about the law of self-defense?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: I think it all depends on intent. You say he chose a bat but was at it a random chance he picked up a bat on the way or was it aforethought?

MR. FREEMAN: Do you think that all people have a basic human right to defend themselves?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Everybody agree with that, that's a basic human right we all have?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Do you think that that use of force against another to defend yourself has to be objectively reasonable, objectively meaning viewed from the outside?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: Yeah. You go to basically the stopping of the violence or whatever. If you're defending yourself, you don't go beyond where the other person is down and, you know, you just basically stop the violence, basically is what it is.

MR. FREEMAN: Let me give you an example. Say years ago I got beat up by a bunch of bikers and now I'm terrified of bikers. I'm walking down the street one and I see a guy ride up on his Harley and he's all leathered out and he gets off and comes walking towards me.

Doesn't have anything in his hands. I don't recognize him as one of those guys, but shoot there's a bikers coming at me. So I pull out a gun and I shoot this guy, is that reasonable?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: No.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Even though I sincerely was terrified of this guy and sincerely believed that he was about to assault and maybe kill me?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: No, it's not reasonable.

MR. FREEMAN: Why not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: Because there's no -- I don't believe that that person could be, you know, subject to, you know, the other people who assaulted me or whatever. Yeah, there's no proof. There's no -- it doesn't matter what I would do, no, I wouldn't.

MR. FREEMAN: So you're saying that even though
I have a sincere belief and the need to defend myself, you
don't view that as reasonable?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: No, because I don't think there was the intent there.

MR. FREEMAN: I was being paranoid, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: Yeah, paranoid, it could be any biker.

MR. FREEMAN: Anybody disagree with that?

Everybody agree that my use of that force against this poor biker was unreasonable even though I had a sincere belief that he was going to attack me?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Juror Number -- can you hold your card up, ma'am?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: 13.

MR. FREEMAN: 13, what do you think about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: I think that there's

some -- it depends, right, if this person has a mental

health issue, then maybe it was reasonable, but you don't

know unless you have that other piece of information.

MR. FREEMAN: Well, and that's why there's sort of a subjective and objective element. The subjective means I have to actually believe it. I can't just make it up because I wanted to whack Fred, right? I can't say, Oh, I snuck up behind Fred because I was acting in self-defense.

So I have to have an actual belief, but it also has to be reasonable, objectively looking at it from the outside from the position of sort of a reasonable juror or reasonable person. So under the hypo that I gave, even if I might have had an actual fear of this person in leather, would you find or do you think you could find that my actions were objectively reasonable?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Right. If you would prove that that was your actual thinking, then yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Does anybody disagree with Juror Number 13 on that?

(No verbal response.)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: I just feel like they need to do something to you, self-defense, you know, for you to defend yourself. Do you know what I mean?

MR. FREEMAN: What do you mean?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Just because the guy is wearing leather and you're afraid, doesn't give you the

right to shoot the guy?

MR. FREEMAN: Not enough?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Not at all.

MR. FREEMAN: Unreasonable fear?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Even if it was mental health, come on, man.

MR. FREEMAN: The law also says that somebody who is the initial aggressor in this fight, in this confrontation, does not have the right of self-defense unless they do what is called withdrawing and communicate, and this is a goofy legal thing so let me give you an example.

We're at a bar, Mr. Freeman's drunk again,

Saturday night. I see Fred, I don't have a bat. But I go

up and I start assaulting Fred, and Fred fights back.

And, you know, it's on video, the police come. I get

charged with assault. I claim self-defense.

The law would say under that scenario, I don't have the right to claim self-defense because I was the initial aggressor. I started the fight with Fred.

Everybody agree with that? Anybody disagree with that?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Juror Number 4, how do you feel about that? Should I have the right of self-defense if I'm the initial aggressor?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: No. But I do have a disclosure. A friend of mine was -- a home invasion and ended up shooting somebody in his house.

MR. FREEMAN: Is that in Golden here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: In Boulder.

MR. FREEMAN: In Boulder, okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: So just a touchy -- I think about him when I hear this conversation.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. This idea of an aggressor not having a right to self-defense, do you agree with that? Do you think that's a fair limitation on the right of self-defense?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Somebody that goes looking for a fight shouldn't be able to claim self-defense?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: I think that's reasonable.

MR. FREEMAN: Anybody disagree with that? (No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: This idea of withdrawing and communicating would come up, if I start the bar fight with Fred and Fred starts kicking my butt and I withdraw. I say, Hey, Fred, I'm done, I'm not going to fight anymore, and, in fact, I'm going to leave. And then Fred keeps attacking me, at that point, my right of self-defense may kick back in because I've withdrawn and I've communicated.

And this almost never happens, but it's in the law.

That's what you have to do if you're an initial aggressor.

I kind of call it the bully rule. You can't be a bully and go pick a fight with somebody and then pummel them and then say, well, it's self-defense, otherwise I would have gotten beaten up a lot.

Does everybody agree that that's a fair limitation, that initial aggressors generally don't have this right of self-defense?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Really quickly, I've got about a minute left. You've heard from the allegations that a couple of the alleged victims are police officers. You heard one is an agent, Lakewood Agent Trimmer, the other is Sergeant Maines.

Just simply hearing that, does that cause anybody to have a strong emotional reaction that causes you to have any concerns about your ability to be fair, that officers may have had force, may have had violence directed at them.

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: A lot of stuff in the news lately.

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Is this causing anybody to have any concerns about your ability to be fair?

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Nope. Juror Number 22, you're kind of on the fence maybe?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: Well, I mean, it's pretty obvious to me if you're assaulting an officer of the law, that you kind of know what you're getting into. It's not like you can -- I don't know, you put the aggressor comment out there earlier, I mean, if you assault an officer of the law, you probably expecting to get a lot of force back and it seems like it's a pretty obvious and blatant thing in most cases.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: I mean, it doesn't seem -- it's seems more black and white as opposed to any other mitigating circumstances when you deal with Fred or whomever else.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. And I know it's hard because I can't talk to you about the facts of the case and what happened and what they were waring and lighting and things like that, those are things you'll hear at trial. But just hearing that the allegations are attempted murder of two police officers, does that cause you any concern about your ability to be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: I mean, I would do my

best.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. All right. Everybody else in the same boat? I know I can't tell you about the facts, so just hearing that, does that cause anybody concern like, do you know what, this is not the right case for me.

(No verbal response.)

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. So we're going to break for lunch right now. Ladies and gentlemen, everybody who is in the courtroom, I'm going to ask you and give you your first admonition. Everyone who is in the courtroom, whether you've been called forward or not, you may not talk about the case. You need to keep an open mind. You can't do any research remember about the case. Remember again, no contact for anyone that's participating at these tables or any spectators, et cetera.

I'm going to take care of some other matters over this lunch hour. So I'm going to ask that you gather in the hallway, don't come into the courtroom. We'll see you back here at 1:30.

If you could turn your jury badges over to -they say juror on the other side so people -- no, they
don't say juror on the other side. Well, surprise. Just
wear them like that. Thanks very much. We'll see you at

1:30.

dire --

(The prospective jurors left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right. So we've had voir

MR. FREEMAN: Judge, I do have a couple

challenges of cause.

THE COURT: And that's what I was going to say. We've had voir dire by the prosecution and I'll hear any challenges for cause at this point responses.

MR. FREEMAN: Judge, Juror Number 9, I think, has been sleeping on and off throughout the morning throughout voir dire, seems very disengaged. I would ask the Court to excuse her. It's very clear that she doesn't want to be here.

Juror Number 11 indicated in my questioning that he is very stressed about his school situation, can't focus and doesn't think that he can put that aside in listening to the case, so I'd ask that he be excused for cause.

Juror Number 4 indicated some strong feelings I think were brought up and he mentioned a friend or a close person that someone close to him that used self-defense in a home invasion scenario in Boulder. I think he indicated he was touchy on that. I don't have much time to follow-up on that. I'm not asking at this point to excuse

him for cause, but I would ask the Court to possibly inquire along those lines to see if he could be fair.

THE COURT: Response?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I have no objection to neither 9 nor 11.

THE COURT: Okay. Regarding Number 9, Number 9 is complex. Initially I had thought she was napping and it is why I asked the jury to stand up -- you can sit down -- why I asked the jury to stand up right away and stretch and then -- because she has a habit of putting her head in her hand and rest it on her elbow and then look down and close her eyes, open her eyes, whatever. However, then she responded appropriately to the Court's questioning and she also was quick to respond to Mr. Freeman's question regarding whether or not she felt a weight or she felt that this case was difficult for her, a decision that was difficult for her.

And so with the objection that she was sleeping and disengaged, I can't really say I don't -- I agree, I don't think she's tremendously engaged in the process, but I don't see that as a significant objection. I, too, was thinking that she was napping, sleeping, whatever, but when she was quick to respond to the prosecution's questioning, I --

(A conversation between the Court and the

Bailiff were had off the record.)

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So she has indicated that she has some other issues, she would like to share with us, so maybe we can hear those issues and make a decision.

With reference to Number 11, he is stressed about school. We talked about the ability to go down and reset. So understanding that I had already talked to him about that and that he would have had the opportunity to go downstairs, we talked about school, he told me he -- it was certainly a lot of hours condensed, he's in graphic design, it's hands-on while he does that, and I told him the best I can do is go downstairs and reset. And he said no.

So I think if we asked individual people if they were stressed about missing working, et cetera, that they would give us an affirmative to that, also, he was singled out. So since the Court already gave him the opportunity to go down and reset for jury service and he didn't want to do that and I think four people ahead of him had done that, then I cannot excuse him.

Number 4 indicated that he said that he wanted to disclose that a friend of his in Boulder had shot somebody in a home invasion in self-defense, then the questions afterward, if I check my notes -- the question

5

afterward went back to the initial aggressor, went back to the use of self-defense, and he was able to respond affirmatively. I think he was just letting us know that a friend of his shot somebody in self-defense during a home invasion. Certainly I'm not going to excuse or question him about that because his answers were appropriate afterwards, he just felt that it was appropriate to bring that to our attention because the issue was self-defense.

So we have Juror Number 9 waiting outside who would like to address the Court, so we're going to bring Juror Number 9 in and I think she's going to give us some more information about her state of mind.

(Juror Number 9 entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Hi, and do you want to come in and just sit on any one of these chairs in the front.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. So I excused you for lunch and then you got a hold of Ms. Downey, one of our bailiffs here, and you said you wanted to explain that you might not be the best juror for today or you wanted to say something, and what did you want to tell me?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: I am currently trying to get off drugs and I'm coming down and I'm just not very present right now as far as being a juror, and I'm trying to see if I could possibly reschedule for a further date

1 out or if there's any other options as far as that. 2 THE COURT: Are you having difficulty 3 concentrating today? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: Yes. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. Do you understand what's 6 going on right now? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: As far as? 8 THE COURT: What's going on with this selection, 9 have you been able to track? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: Honestly, no. I just -- I 11 know that we're on lunch right now and I just don't think 12 I'm appropriate for being a juror right now. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Can you step out for a minute 14 and wait in the hallway. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 9: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. 17 (Juror Number 9 left the courtroom.) 18 THE COURT: Okay. So this explains, I think, 19 perhaps the head in the hand and the looking up and 20 whatever situation. She has indicated that she has this 21 physical issue which is interfering with her ability to 22 concentrate if she is coming down from drugs. 23 Any comments from either side? 24 MR. FREEMAN: Judge, I would renew our motion to 25 excuse her for cause. I think that may explain some of

her behavior, but it seems pretty clear that she's having difficulty concentrating, following what's going on. I'm concerned that if her behavior remains the same throughout the day and throughout the trial, that we're always going to be looking over at her to see if she's awake or if she's concentrating and sort of trying to monitor her, and I just don't think that's a good idea. So I would ask to excuse her for cause.

THE DEFENDANT: I've got no objection, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: -- to her being released for cause, unless you wanted to reset her. I have no opinion one way or the other.

THE COURT: No, I'm just going to go ahead and excuse her for cause. I think that at this point in time, if she had given me a heads-up when I said is anyone incapable by reason of physical or mental disability at this point of rendering satisfactory jury service and she told me that there was difficulty in concentrating right now, then I would have gone ahead and released her. I'm going to release her right now, and I'm just going to excuse her from service. She does not have to come back after lunch. She's free to go.

THE BAILIFF: Thank you.

THE COURT: We'll just go ahead and replace her seat then. What we'll do is -- that is Juror Number 9, so we're going to replace Juror Number 9 when we get back and then, Mr. Freeman, I'm going to give you a few minutes, like, five minutes to talk to new Juror Number 9.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay.

THE COURT: Who will be whatever -- what number are we at now, 33, I think. And at that point, I'll give you a couple of minutes to speak with that juror because you already spoke with our Juror Number 9 that we struck.

And then, Mr. St. George, unless there's an issue with Juror Number 33, I think it's going to be -- then Mr. St. George, you'll have to opportunity to speak with all of these and then along with that new juror.

We'll see you back here at 1:30.

MR. MENGES: Thank you, Judge.

(A recess was taken.)

THE COURT: We've had jurors out in the hall.

We've excused Juror Number 9. My thought is we would

bring the jurors in, seat the jurors, call a new juror,

which I think is 33 for Juror Number 9, and then,

Mr. St. George -- I would give, rather the district

attorney about five minutes to talk to that juror and then

if there's no issue with that juror, we'll go right to

Mr. St. George.

If that juror says they need to be excused for some kind of reason, they know somebody or something like that, then I'll just excuse them and we'll continue with the process until we get a juror seated in that ninth seat, and then we'll go to you, Mr. St. George, for your voir dire, okay?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So we're going to bring the jury in, everybody's ready?

MR. FREEMAN: Yeah, the People are ready.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

(The prospective jurors entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Everybody be seated, please.

Welcome back everyone. We've had to replace Seat Number 9, and so I think then our next juror is Juror Number 33. Juror Number 33. And it's up here in this Seat Number 9 right up here in the box.

Okay. So I'm going to ask you a couple of questions to get caught up and go through some of the questions that we asked initially. And so I wanted to ask you if you knew anybody seated at the these tables?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: No.

THE COURT: Are you a compensated employee of a public law enforcement agency?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I'm not.

1 THE COURT: Do you have those qualifications to 2 sit as a juror, do you remember those? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yeah, I do. 4 THE COURT: Okay. And would you suffer an 5 extreme hardship if selected to serve for this period of 6 time. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: No. 8 THE COURT: Have you had previous jury service? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Just to this point, then 10 I was excused a couple years ago. 11 THE COURT: Okay. And do you have friends or 12 family in law enforcement? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: One friend in Littleton's 14 academy. My grandfather was a Denver police officer for 15 30 years, I believe. Retired as a lieutenant. That's it. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Now, the fact that you have 17 friends, family in law enforcement, does that impact your 18 ability to be fair and impartial with us here today? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I don't believe so. 20 THE COURT: Can you judge the credibility of a 21 law enforcement officer just as you would any other 22 person? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Difficulty hearing or seeing? 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33:

panel?

THE COURT: Do you know anybody else on the

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I don't.

THE COURT: If you were selected as a juror in this case, would you be able and willing to render a verdict solely on the evidence presented at trial and the law as I give it to you in my instructions disregarding any other ideas, notions or beliefs about the law you may have encountered?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything that came up or came to your attention that if you were selected as a juror, you could not or would not be fair and impartial in deciding this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Could you --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: So I'm 33.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I've lived in Jeffco for 30-plus years. I have a bachelor's degree in finance. I'm in the oil and gas industry right now working. Not married, no kids. My father was self-employed in the landscape industry. Mother was or is in Jeffco Public Schools. Interests, anything sport's related, outdoors, skiing, snow or water. Don't really like to watch a lot

of TV but listen to sport's radio --1 2 THE COURT: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: -- and news. 3 4 THE COURT: So I am now going to let Mr. Freeman 5 ask -- come up and just ask a few questions, and you're kind of on the hot seat here. 6 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Great. 8 THE COURT: You're the only juror he's able to 9 talk to. 10 MR. FREEMAN: Thank you, Judge. 11 Welcome. Just a few questions, just kind of 12 along the same lines I asked all the other jurors. Have you heard that term "justice is blind"? 13 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yeah, earlier today. 15 MR. FREEMAN: Earlier today, so you were paying 16 attention. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yep. 18 MR. FREEMAN: Do you agree that it's an ideal 19 that a jury should strive for to be, as much as you can, 20 to be blind to things like race, color, religion, 21 socioeconomic status. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I do believe they should. 23 I think it's human that they aren't. 24 MR. FREEMAN: Right. That we all come in with 25 biases and life experience?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Right.

MR. FREEMAN: Would you try your best to try to reach that ideal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Absolutely.

MR. FREEMAN: Along those similar lines, the defendant has chosen to represent himself. If you decide at some point that you think that was a bad idea for him, do you think that you might feel sorry for him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: No. I mean, like you said, he made his own choice.

MR. FREEMAN: His choice, okay.

If, Ms. Decker, and I, you know, we don't pull any punches and we object and we put on our case just as vigorously as we would if he was a trained attorney, are you going to look badly upon us, like we're beating up on him or ganging up on him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I would assume you would just do your job the best you could, so nope.

MR. FREEMAN: Do our jobs, okay. Thank you.

What about this concept we ask you, in fact, the Court will instruct you not to consider penalty or punishment in your deliberations so, therefore, you should not consider what might happen to the defendant if he's convicted of one or more of the charges, is that something you think you could try to set aside?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I believe so.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. If you're convinced of his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, do you think you would hesitate to vote for guilt knowing that there might be some significant consequences to him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I don't think so.

MR. FREEMAN: What about this idea that if you're chosen as a juror, one of your jobs is to determine credibility of witnesses, whether to believe all of a witness's testimony, some of it or none of it? Do you think that's something that you can sort of try to do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yeah, I can try my best for sure.

MR. FREEMAN: Right. And I can't -- you know, I can't tell you what you're going to hear, but the Judge is going to give you those factors to guide you. Whether it's consistent with other witnesses, whether the testimony is consistent with the physical evidence, things like that.

What about if somebody has an interest in the outcome of the case, is that a factor you think that's fair to consider?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: What do you mean?

MR. FREEMAN: Well, so, let me give you an example. Mr. St. George does not have to testify and if

he does not testify, the Court will instruct you at the end of the trial that you cannot hold that against him, you cannot consider that as evidence of guilt in any way. But if he does decide to testify and take an oath and get on the witness stand, he will have an interest in the outcome, would you agree?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: He has a strong interest in being found not guilty --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Right.

MR. FREEMAN: -- so that he could avoid those potential consequences. Do you think that's fair to consider whether you're deciding to believe his testimony or not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I don't know. I guess for that purpose, yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Let's talk about use of alcohol during a crime. How do you view somebody who commits a crime while they're under the influence of alcohol or maybe even intoxicated?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: To go along the lines with what was already said. I kind of believe everyone's responsible for their actions no matter what.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Are you -- are you less likely to hold somebody accountable because they were

1 intoxicated when they committed a crime? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Slightly. 3 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Why? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Majority not. 5 MR. FREEMAN: Why do you think that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Just from some of the 6 7 examples that were said earlier. Depends on the 8 situation, the person, the relationship, et cetera. 9 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. If you think somebody made 10 a bad decision, in part because they were intoxicated, and 11 maybe you even surmised that it's a decision they might 12 not have made if they were sober, but nevertheless, they 13 commit a crime while under that condition. Are you likely 14 to not hold them fully accountable for that crime? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I don't think so. I 16 think that they should be held accountable. 17 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. What about my discussion 18 about attempts to commit a crime. Do you agree that 19 people who attempt but are unsuccessful to commit a crime 20 should still be held accountable for that attempt? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I do. 22 MR. FREEMAN: Do you remember my goofy example 23 I'm going after Fred? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Right. 25 MR. FREEMAN: I want to kill Fred, I posted on

Facebook. And two examples, one I swing and miss because Fred ducks, and the other one I swing and I whack Fred.

Do you think one of those cases is stronger than the other?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I don't, given that you're trying to kill Fred and because he was quicker, it's still the same.

MR. FREEMAN: So you're saying they are about the same weight and same strength. Would you agree that in the instance that I actually hit Fred and severely injured Fred, that's maybe a more egregious example that a court should take into account at sentencing, but it has nothing to really do when whether I'm guilty or not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Right.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Lets talk about self-defense. Would you agree that everybody sort of has a human right to defend themselves?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Absolutely.

MR. FREEMAN: And we talked about this idea that has to be subjected, meaning the person has to have an honest belief in the need to defend themselves. But, also, there's an objective side, that it has to be objectively reasonable from sort of people watching from the outside. Does that make sense?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yes.

MR. FREEMAN: Do you agree that somebody who is an initial aggressor should not have the right of self-defense unless they withdraw and communicate that withdrawal to the person. I know it's kind of a goofy example.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Perhaps to some degree.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. What do you think about
that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I think if anyone's starting the interaction, they lose a lot of that, you know, initial ability to claim self-defense because --

MR. FREEMAN: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: -- they initiated it to start off with, so I think they are kind of giving up that right to that.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Let me give you that example. Say, I'm at the bar. I see Fred, I don't have a bat so I just go up and I just start punching Fred. Fred fights back, kicks my butt. I'm down on the ground, helpless in the fetal position and then Fred really puts the beaten on me. I'm no threat to him at that point. I'm begging for mercy. Does Fred have a right to self-defense?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I think there's a moral obligation to understand the situation to be protecting

1 yourself, but then about going above and beyond after that 2 fact. 3 MR. FREEMAN: Yeah. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Freeman, we're right there. 5 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. If I could just finish this 6 thought? 7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 MR. FREEMAN: That's sort of what I was getting 9 at, is even though Fred might have initially had that right of self-defense, self-defense would not allow you to 10 11 exact vengeance, would you agree with that? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yeah, I mean depends on 13 the situation, of course. 14 MR. FREEMAN: Right. Everything is different. 15 Just really quick, lastly, that idea that we got 16 police officers that are charged as victims of violence. 17 Does that fact alone cause you to have any concern about 18 your ability to be fair? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I don't think so. 20 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. All right. Thank you, sir. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yep, thank you. 22 MR. FREEMAN: Thanks, Judge. 23 THE COURT: Mr. St. George? 24 MR. ST. GEORGE: Thank you, Your Honor. Your 25 Honor, all things considered, do you mind if I take an

extra five minutes as well?

THE COURT: I'll give you an extra three.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Thank you.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. ST. GEORGE:

Firstly, I appreciate everybody being here today. My name is Eric St. George. These are my team over here. These men have given me a lot of their time and their talent, so I am not without help.

I'm going to try to do the best to spend more of my time up here listening and less of it talking. I'm not that interested in the sound of my own voice. I really want to know more what you-all think. Second person, plural, use guys, if you understand that better.

So I'd like to first start by talking about the fact that I am representing myself, and do any of you guys, for example, have a financial advisor but you also have an account that you do your trading online? Anyone in here?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah, why do you do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Practice.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Practice?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Hobby.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. How about you 32?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: I like to be somewhat in control of my own finances, and I'll seek the advice of an expert but I like to do my own research and think about what's going on with my money, my finances.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Because at the end of the day, it's your money, isn't it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: Right. I have more at stake whether to lose or gain.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Right. And if, you know, during the trial if you see me consulting my counsel, getting that advice, do you think we can all be fair and understand that that's what I'm doing?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah, great. So it's already been mentioned that this particular case does involve police officers. And we all have seen the news. There's terrible tragedies in the news regularly. Police are shooting civilians. Now there are civilians shooting police. We know that those stories are sensationalized.

This incident isn't necessarily one of those stories. Does anyone have an opinion on -- are you going to be able to set aside what you may have seen in the news, what you may have heard in some other situation and think discreetly about this situation, about evidence that you're going hear in this case?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: I see you nodding, Number 19.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 19: Yeah. Yeah, that's the reason I don't watch the news because there's sensationalized and it has a point of view I feel that they are trying to get across to me versus truly the facts.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah, anyone else brave enough to venture an opinion on this too?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Maybe you Number 8?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: I would reiterate what she says, I don't watch a lot of television news for that exact reason. I like to read the news and weigh and evaluate the facts and merits of each situation.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Very good. So we know that that -- we're not going to bring in outside facts from some other story into this one. We're going to do our best to be fair and judge this based on the evidence that's brought forth.

So on the subject of evidence, is there one type of evidence that maybe carries more merit than the other?

Do we have an opinion on that subject? If you have a piece of physical evidence and it kind of goes against what's been testified to or if you've got testimony from

one person that goes against what you've seen otherwise, would we have an opinion as to which one we might give more credibility to, which one we may weigh more?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Maybe you, Number 12?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: I don't have an opinion because I don't have the specifics. I think I'd have to know more about your question before I could answer it. I think what you're asking is does physical evidence outweigh or not testimonial, is that what you're saying?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah, I think that's a good thing to talk about. Let's talk about that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: I would say there's no absolutes without specifics, but physical evidence would be pretty compelling to overcome but not absolute.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. Does anyone else have an opinion on that subject?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: 15, I see you nodding your head.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: I agree.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah. All right.

So this case also does involve guns and guns is kind of a hot button thing that people talk about. Who among us own guns?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah. And among us, who has a concealed carry permit, they carry their weapon? Number 24?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: 24.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Tell me how do you -- how do you feel regarding a person if they carry a weapon ad using that weapon when it comes necessary?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 24: You'd have to be awfully careful and you can't -- I'm just talking about my own personal thing, you can't take it lightly. I've been to class to get trained for it because there's that big of a concern. Just because I carry a weapon doesn't mean anything other than I want to defend myself and family. So I don't feel I have the right to judge any situation more just because I carry a weapon.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. Anyone else -- anyone else carry? Anyone else have an opinion on being a concealed carry?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 19: I don't carry, but my husband has his license. The only time we use it is when we're going back country and those types of things, but that said --

MR. ST. GEORGE: That's a good place to have -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR 19: Yeah, but that said, we

also know if something were to happen he's ready to protect us.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Tough decision, isn't it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 19: Uh-hum.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Anyone among us feel that people do not have a right to own weapons? The Second Amendment there's another one of those hot button subjects that gets discussed in the media and people have very strong opinions. Does anyone here feel that they could not be fair because they definitely in their hearts believe people, private citizens, that is, should not have weapons and should definitely not be using them for any reason whatsoever?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Maybe you Number 7, do you have an opinion?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: I think everybody should be allowed to carry.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Yeah, it is a right to, you know --

MR. ST. GEORGE: It is a right, it's given to us by the Second Amendment, that's right.

And how about you Number 8, you mentioned earlier that you're an NPR listener, that may -- you may

have an opinion on the subject regarding guns.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: I'm not sure I agree with Number 7's carte blanche, but I think there are situations where there's appropriate and I think there are situations where it isn't.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Do you personally feel that given -- given the evidence that may come out in this case, that you could make a fair decision, regardless, if it say, for example, something came out in this case that went against your deeply felt beliefs, would you be able to fairly and honestly give a verdict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: I believe so.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah. Everyone else agree that they could do that?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: So there's another -- another hot button subject that's going to be brought out in this case, that's the one of sexual contact. And right now in the media, we've got a lot of people who are finally getting the strength to come forth and they're saying, "Me to." And, you know, that takes a lot of courage and there's hard.

Of course, there's the flip side of that coin that there may be some people in this world who aren't honest on that subject, that they use it as a tool or they

take advantage. Does anyone have an opinion regarding that? Could you be fair, could you -- could you hear someone's testimony and decide whether they're being truthful or not?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Number 19, I see you nodding. I appreciate you doing so, too, by the way.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 19: Well, yeah, again, I think it gets back to all of, not just the testimony, but all the evidence and even how the person is, you know, how they, I'll use the word "read" when they're giving their testimony. I think there's a big task to take into consideration their testimony any other evidence that there is.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. Does anyone here maybe had something horrible happen to them in their lives that they don't feel like they could be fair because -- or maybe for one reason or another, maybe it was someone close to them, maybe there was some incident, I don't know, but because of that, hearing someone else give a testimony might perhaps make you feel in a way that would make it difficult for you to render a fair verdict based strictly on the evidence itself?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: Yep, I would have that issue.

MR. ST. GEORGE: That would be tough for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 18: Yes.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Thank you for your honesty. I won't ask you for anything personal or for anything deeper than that.

Anyone else here feel like that would be something that would be a problem?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Go ahead, 24, is it -- 33, I'm sorry.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Yeah, I wouldn't like to get into it myself, but there was a family issue regarding some of that that's a little difficult to talk about.

MR. ST. GEORGE: There's a super touchy subject. PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: For sure.

MR. ST. GEORGE: And here's the thing, we're going to talk about it here. There's going to be wide open in an open court, and if anyone feels that they may have trouble being able to be fair, they would say, I have serious doubts about being fair. You know, we would need to know that. Go ahead, 22.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: I'm just agreeing with what they're talking about. I mean, I really don't want

to get into it, but it would be a challenge.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. So that having been said, is there anything else that, you know, from the limited amount that we -- that we know here so far, anyone have any other personal reasons why they don't think they can be a juror because they have deep felt opinions? I mean, we kind of touched on the, you know, the police issue, you know, people -- people being shot by police and police being shot, it happens. We talked about guns. We talked about concealed carrying. We talked about sexual contact. Anything else about the charges that you heard read that might prejudice what's -- what you feel, what you think in your mind.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: I have to be honest this whole sexual contact thing, you know, I have a situation in my family too where there's kind of hard to hear and, you know, there's -- I just have a little bit of a problem with it. There's somebody that I want to go after for doing something. Do you know what I mean? But at the same time there's, you know, I just have to -- yeah, it is a touchy subject, you know.

MR. ST. GEORGE: It is a touchy subject, that's why we're talking about it now. So do you -- do you feel that you could still be a fair juror? Do you think that you could -- you could hear testimony from both sides of

an issue like that and render a fair verdict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: I could try my hardest, do you know what I mean? I mean, it guess it just really depends on what it is, you know.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. How about the use of alcohol. Who all amongst us drinks.

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah. Is anyone here a teetotaler, someone who doesn't drink at all?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: Water, that's all they'll let me have.

MR. ST. GEORGE: So you might have preferred a cold beer if you were allowed to have one?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 31: I never liked beer or alcohol, never did.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. Does anyone -- if evidence is brought forth that someone's intoxicated, they've been drinking, would it be -- would you have any difficulty weighing a fair opinion on what -- on the evidence? Would that color your opinion of what occurred if, say, someone said that person was drunk? Does being drunk completely preclude someone from being able to make decisions?

I mean, sometimes you're drunk and, say, your spouse wants to have an argument with you. You could have

1

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

been more tactful if you hadn't have been drinking, but it happened when it happened? I saw you nodding your head 3, how about you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: I've just had a really rough time with it as far as family goes when I was growing up. When I was really young, my dad would drink a lot and he would get verbally and physically abusive, so there's difficult for me to be around. That's why I don't like drinking, period. I don't go to parties or anything that reason. I strongly dislike being around alcohol, period, because there's been such a hard thing for me to deal with as I was growing up. Like, there's just not something I take lightly too much.

MR. ST. GEORGE: I'm sorry for your -- your experience.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: That's okay, it's not anyone's fault.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Would anyone have any problem agreeing that there's different kinds of drunks? Some people are kiddy drunks, some people are belligerent drunks, some people are just sloppy, stupid drunks. Would anyone have a problem with that being possible?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: No? 27, what do you think on the subject?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: There's all sorts of drunks, absolutely. Yeah. Some get mean, some get happy.

MR. ST. GEORGE: So we're going to have -- we're going to talk about drinking, that's going to happen in this case. You know, I just want to see that everyone can render a fair judgment and not have alcohol color their judgment one way or the other.

How about the presumption of innocence? The idea that someone's had criminal charges put against them but that doesn't necessarily mean they're guilty automatically. No, this is going to be the first time that any of this evidence has been brought forth is going to happen. No judgment has been made on this.

Those of you who are impaneled on this jury are going to be the ones who have to make that judgment.

What do you think, Number 21, about the presumption of innocence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: That's what our system says that you're presumed innocent until proven guilty.

MR. ST. GEORGE: What do you think it means?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: I think it means we don't take the defendant and assume guilt unless it is proven.

MR. ST. GEORGE: What does everyone else think about that, does that sound about right?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: And does it -- how about reasonable doubt. Reasonable is using your reason and your commonsense. So we're going to have to determine, I think the Judge was pointing out the difference between this side of the scale is just a little heavier beyond a reasonable doubt.

Does anyone have any question -- or, I'm sorry, does anyone have an opinion, rather, on reasonable doubt? What they think that means or how that would -- if they could be fair regarding reasonable doubt, 11?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: I'm sorry, can you repeat it?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Reasonable doubt, we were -- we were saying that the idea that we have to use or commonsense and our reason and we have to make the determination of something beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you feel like you could render that kind of a decision?

Could you -- could you look at the evidence, hear the testimonies, weigh it all out, and determine whose made a stronger case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: Uh-hum. Yeah, I believe I can.

MR. ST. GEORGE: You too, 10?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 10: Yeah, I would agree.

MR. ST. GEORGE: And then there's the subject of the burden of proof. The burden of proof is on the prosecution or the State's side. They will have to bring the evidence forth in order to prove beyond that reasonable doubt that what they have alleged is true.

Does anyone have -- have an opinion, do they see one side as one way or the other regarding that subject of burden of proof, understanding that the -- as the defendant is presumed innocent, burden of proof must be brought forth by the prosecution? Number 28 -- 6, rather, 26?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 26: No, I think you have to listen to the evidence and if they prove it, then you decide which way you think it goes. So I don't have any question on that.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Pete, do you have any other questions that I can ask?

(Pause in the proceedings.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: So Number 3, you were talking about the -- about your family history with the alcohol.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: Yeah.

MR. ST. GEORGE: As a juror, that having been said, do you absolutely think that you can -- you can be fair that you can --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: I mean, I totally

understand, like, drinking to an extent. Like, certain people drink because of certain things and I totally understand that. But I think that they have every -- like, they can control their actions based on what they're doing. So if they want to drink and they want to do that, I think that people have every mind state to drink to an extent and understand when that extent like runs out.

And that's just -- I think people have every choice in the world to do whatever they want and drink whatever they want but to an extent.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. Number 33, you had -- you had mentioned something regarding sexual contact. Tell me -- tell me a little more about how you would be able to be fair and judge that without having your personal --

THE COURT: Mr. St. George, I think perhaps we're going to reserve that to the end and talk outside the presence of the other jurors from what was discussed already by these jurors.

MR. ST. GEORGE: All right.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ST. GEORGE: I wasn't going to go into any deeper into his personal business allowed. I'm sorry if you felt like that was the direction I was heading. I was

1 going to ask if he felt that he could be fair. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: I mean, this is a new 4 experience for me, obviously. I can only tell you I'll 5 try. 6 MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: That's -- until it 8 happens, I don't know. 9 MR. ST. GEORGE: Sure. You haven't heard any of 10 the statements or the evidence yet. 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Right. 12 MR. ST. GEORGE: But you feel like you could --13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 33: Try, yes. 14 MR. ST. GEORGE: -- try? Okay. 15 And number 22, you were also saying -- tell me 16 if you could be fair regarding allegations of, you know, 17 illegal sexual contact? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: You're asking if I could 19 be fair? 20 MR. ST. GEORGE: If you could be fair in 21 rendering a decision? You could hear the evidence and you 22 could weigh a verdict based on the letter of the law, the 23 way the law is written and based on the instructions that 24 is you'll be discharged with? 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: In terms of this matter,

there's hard to know what you're going to think or feel or the images that are going to come into your head when the topic comes up. So I can't promise anything on what's in my head, I can just promise to try and work around it, I guess.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. And on that subject, jury instructions. At the end of -- at the end of closing arguments, you'll get instructions from the Judge regarding how to interpret the law, how the law is spelled out. And if you were to find that a verdict -- that based on the law, based on the evidence that you were -- that you heard or saw may go against your own personal feelings or opinions, would you be able to render a verdict that went against your own personal feelings or opinions on a subject? How about you Number 1?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: I'm sorry, could you repeat it?

MR. ST. GEORGE: No problem. So what we're saying is, the jury will be given instructions and these instructions will explain precisely how the law is to be measured and in what instances you would render a verdict of guilty and in what instances you would render a verdict of not guilty. And if the evidence, according to the jury instructions, you were to -- you had to render a verdict that was contrary to your own personal beliefs or the way

you feel, would you be able to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: I would be able to go by how I read it as either not guilty or guilty, so if there's guilty, of course, there's guilty. But what -- because you're saying we're getting papers of instructions, correct?

MR. ST. GEORGE: The Judge will read them out and I believe you'll have them.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: Yeah, so with the evidence given, I'll be able the tell if there's guilty or not guilty.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. Number 4, I can't recall whether or not you raised your hand on the subject of gun ownership?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: I did.

MR. ST. GEORGE: You do own guns?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: Yes.

MR. ST. GEORGE: And your feelings on the use of guns and carrying of guns and self-defense with guns.

Tell me where do you fall on that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 4: I definitely do believe the Second Amendment right. I think there's a lot of problems in society about how people take that right and act out on it. I personally believe we should probably have a system in this country of different laws around gun

rights and gun ownership. But since we don't have those different rules, I don't get to make those. I believe I can follow and render a verdict based on what we do have in place today.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. How about you 27.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 27: I personally don't like guns, but I'm not going to infringe on somebody else's -- I come from a long line of gun owners, and I wouldn't take that right away from somebody else.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. And Number 3, how do you sit on the gun owning?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: I have a lot of crappy things happen with guns in my family as well. But, I mean, I can't make that decision for anybody else. I think that they have every right in the world to own a gun and do as they please with it, as long as it is --

MR. ST. GEORGE: Legal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: Yeah, good way to put it.

But I mean, no, I would not think of anybody as in the wrong for having a concealed carry in that respect at all.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Number 15, are you personally a gun owner?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: No.

MR. ST. GEORGE: How do you feel about people

who own guns and carry guns for self-protection.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 15: I think it carries a lot of responsibility and people -- I think there could be more done with the way gun ownership is, but I'm not opposed to people having weapons for self-defense and hunting, for example.

MR. ST. GEORGE: How about you 30?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: I believe in the right to own guns. I have some problems with carry to conceal weapons and what the purpose of that would be and why people would feel the need to have to do that and what their -- what their -- what they might do, their drinking to have a concealed weapon, whatever.

MR. ST. GEORGE: You raise a good issue. Does someone who -- does one who carries a concealed weapon, are they out looking for a fight? Are they deliberately looking to use their weapon by virtue of the fact that they carry or do you have no opinion one way or the other on the subject?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: I don't know why people carry concealed weapons or what their purpose is for doing that.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Because there's, I mean, maybe there's different for everyone, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: Uh-hum.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Anyone who carries a weapon, they have their reason and they choose to do that.

How about you number 12, regarding carrying concealed. Do you think that people who carry concealed are out looking for trouble?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: Not inherently, but I think that whoever does, carries themselves in a different way at a different standard with accountability.

MR. ST. GEORGE: How do you mean?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: If you have a gun, you have to make a judgment that people who don't carry a weapon, you make a different kind of judgment. You're exposed to the opportunity to make a judgment that puts everything, including yourself, at risk and others and whatever led up to that.

I don't carry one. I don't have to make that determination. If you do or did, if that's what this is about, you have an extra layer of responsibility.

MR. ST. GEORGE: There's a big responsibility, isn't it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: Uh-hum.

MR. ST. GEORGE: How about the fact that police carry guns?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: That's their job.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. Do you think that

police, by virtue of carrying guns, do they automatically have any disposition one way oar the other regarding those guns?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: I would say any time someone by measure of career puts themselves in harm's way, they hopefully, and I would believe, do believe, have been at least trained for those kinds of situations. But I think it would be very difficult to judge someone in that situation who carries a weapon to protect society or themselves as opposed to someone who is a civilian and carries a concealed weapon. There are two different things in my opinion. That's overall, my conclusion.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Does anyone else share that opinion?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah. I see you nodding, 22 and 21. In that order then, we'll start with you 22.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: Ditto on that and the responsibility layer for having a concealed weapon is much higher. There are a lot more restrictions on it. You're not allowed to be in bars and banks and other places, school, et cetera, which means that you can't be -- you can't engage in a lot of the behaviors that warrant why you shouldn't be in those places.

So if you have a concealed weapon on you, you

shouldn't be drunk. You shouldn't be in situations where you might be tempted to use that weapon without a clear head and proper judgment. You have that -- you absolutely have that responsibility and you pick that up when you put that gun in the holster, which is to say that everyone absolutely has a right to wear it, wear the weapon with them, wherever they please within the letter of the law. Totally fine, I know lot of people that do. Some of them are itching to catch bad guys and some of them are doing it for their own self-defense and to each their own. But they all have to be held to a higher standard.

And as part of what a peace officer's job is, they have to be able to protect themselves and others and that's the purpose for their weapon. Whether they choose to carry one outside is probably a decision that wouldn't be a hundred percent amongst all the officers. So I would image when they are non-uniform, they would have to be in the same letter of the law as everyone else that has a CTW.

MR. ST. GEORGE: How about guns in the home.

What if they were walking around with guns, what if it was at home?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: You can walk around with a gun as much as you'd like, I'm not sure I understand your question.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Does a purpose have the right to defend themselves in their home with a their gun?

MR. ST. GEORGE: How about you 21?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 22: Absolutely.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: I agree with that. I don't own a gun and I don't care to. People that do, as long as they're responsible about it, I don't have an issue. But, yeah, in your home, if somebody breaks in, I don't know. If it becomes just an argument that's where I have a problem if somebody has guns and they get angry about something, it could escalate.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Right. I keep omitting you over there number -- are you 14?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 14: Yep.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Tell me your opinion on guns and what we've been talking about here and tell me if you could render a verdict one way or the other if you were to hear the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 14: I personally don't like guns, but I accept them and I think that it's okay for anybody to have them if they want to but the law does to apply to them. I also think that there needs to be further education about gun enforcement and how to properly use a gun when it is necessary.

And as far as police officers, I believe that

it's their in line of duty and it's their protection for citizens and for themselves.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. How about you, 13, over there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: I think I'm in agreement with a lot of the stuff that people are saying. I personally will probably never own a gun, and I don't say I agree the law, but it is the law that people are allowed to have guns and allowed to conceal carry.

If you want to talk about people who drink with guns, I mean, definitely what Juror Number 12 was saying, if you think about it, right, a law enforcement officer would never be drunk on a job with a gun, so that's something to consider. Is that enough?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Kind of just the stuff I was thinking about as everyone else was talking.

MR. ST. GEORGE: And that's why, you know, we're talking about guns here because for people who are not gun owners and don't like guns, would they be able to look at someone who does have a gun and did have the unfortunate circumstance of using it, would you be able to look at it based just on the law as the law is written and render a verdict based on that law. And because that's -- that's going to be tough.

You know, there's going -- should someone try to color your judgment, will you be able to look at strictly the law?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Yeah, for sure. And I think if the law is provided by the Judge and I can say, okay, this is what the law is, because honestly I don't know all the laws. I'm completely honest. I assume most of us don't know all the laws. But if I have, like, you know, the law from somebody that's a credible source saying this is the law and then I have the other pieces of information, then I can make a sound judgment based on that.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. Number 5, I've omitted you as well. How do you feel on this subject of guns and the law?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 5: We own guns. I'm not really sure about shooting them, but I absolutely believe that we have that right and I think there is an absolute responsibility. Like everyone's been saying, that guns and alcohol very much like cars and alcohol don't really mix. Obviously, what people do in their own homes, that's your own thing unless someone else is pulled in but...

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yeah, would perhaps be poor judgment to get drunk and go play with your guns.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 5: (The prospective juror

nodded her head.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: But what if the trouble came to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 5: Yeah, and you didn't plan ahead of time to not drink because there might be trouble coming, yeah, so...

MR. ST. GEORGE: And who sits around thinking and hoping for trouble, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 5: Yep.

MR. ST. GEORGE: So what about you, Number 7, I don't think you and I talked about guns much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: No, man, but I'm on the same thing. There are a lot of peace officers that never use their guns, you know, the way they're supposedly to. You know, I mean, I've seen a whole bunch of videos and stories of cops just pulling out their guns shooting people without even -- do you know what I mean?

I don't know, it's -- like I said, I feel like we all should have a right to own a gun and everything, but at the same time, you talk about police officers, I feel like they don't use their guns the way they're supposed to.

MR. ST. GEORGE: It's unfortunate when that happens, isn't it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Definitely. And I -- I

don't know. I just -- yeah.

MR. ST. GEORGE: That having been said though, this case is not necessarily one that you've seen on the news.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: No.

MR. ST. GEORGE: It's not -- would you be able to render a fair judgment in this trial with these facts that would come out?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: I guess I have to hear more of what's relatively going on with the whole thing, you know. I mean it's pretty well, with the whole sexual activity and the guns and everything, it's --

MR. ST. GEORGE: It's a scary world out there, isn't it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Definitely.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Guns and booze and -- yeah.

And on that subject of self-defense, how would -- if you heard evidence regarding self-defense and you had to make the decision was this self-defense or was this something else, how would you go about making that decision?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Man, well, you know, when the cops are tagged to do something they have to do it.

If you're sitting fighting back, that's on you. Do you know what I mean? That's going to be your issue, your

saying?

problem. Because first thing you do is obey the law.

You've got to do what they say, do you know what I mean?

If they said, Stop, put your hands up, just listen to them.

For the most part, if you don't listen, they are going to end up shooting you. I just feel like nowadays cops, they just shoot you. They just shoot, man, they don't care. I don't think they want to just Tase anybody or try to handcuff, I think they are out to kill people sometimes.

MR. ST. GEORGE: It's a harsh condemnation of law enforcement, but it's been in the news, hasn't it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: Yeah, yeah. And I've had friends that have situations with cops, it goes a little deep, you know.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Right. I understand.

How about you, 32, you heard what, 7, was

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: I don't feel like overall that cops are out to just kill and shoot people. I know that does happen sometimes. Just like any other profession, there's good ones and bad ones. And, unfortunately, with bad cops, you know, that use their gun inappropriately, maybe the testosterone level gets in front of them and they make a bad decision, like, that

does happen. But I don't think that's all of them, no.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Being a cop's probably a hard job, isn't it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: Definitely. It's a lot of pressure and it's easy for us, a society, to sit back on a comfortable couch and watch the news and say, He should have done this and that and, like, you know, Monday morning quarterbacking. But it's just different when you're in that position when the tensions are high on both sides. Both sides may or may not have weapons. Sometimes the cops know if they do or don't have a weapon, you know, if the other person does or doesn't have a weapon, I don't know so...

MR. ST. GEORGE: And in hindsight -PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: It's scary.
MR. ST. GEORGE: You mention hindsight --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: Hindsight is 20/20.

MR. ST. GEORGE: What you think about hindsight, do you think you could hear the testimony or see the evidence that's going to come out in this case and sort of put yourself in that position? Place yourself there in that moment and try to image what that person was seeing, hearing, feeling, and render a judgment based on that and not on the hindsight, not on the 20/20 looking back now that all the facts are spelled out and laid out? I mean,

it's much easier to see it that way, isn't it? Do you think you could be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 32: Yeah, I think I could be fair and objective in that sense because with my job, I've also been put in some tense situations and, you know, looking back, you can say, I would have done this different or that different or taken a deep breath beforehand or whatever.

So I know that -- what it's like to be in those kinds of situations that, you know, life happens all the time, and so, yeah, I believe I can fairly look at that situation and try to deconstruct it and come up with a fair decision based on the fact and evidence.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Anyone else venture an opinion on hindsight, seeing it from the beauty of looking back?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: I saw you kind of nodding your head. Number 1.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: I'm sorry, I was yawning.

MR. ST. GEORGE: I apologize, I didn't mean to call you out then.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: It's okay.

MR. ST. GEORGE: But since I did pick on you, how do you feel about being able to -- can you see yourself kind of putting yourself in someone's else's

1 shoes walking around in it for a minute and making a 2 judgment based on that. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: I can put myself in someone else's shoes, yeah. You're asking me if I can 4 5 make a --MR. ST. GEORGE: A fair and balanced decision of 6 7 one that's based strictly on the law? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 1: Yeah. 9 MR. ST. GEORGE: How about you, 8, I see you 10 looking up. 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 8: Yeah, I mean, I think 12 there's a balance between understanding what the person or 13 people may have been thinking at the time versus what the, 14 you know, other contemporaneous facts are and what the law 15 says. And I think it's a balance of understanding all of 16 those elements together. 17 MR. ST. GEORGE: Great use of the vocabulary, 18 contemporaneous, too, I like that. So, yeah. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Can I ask a question of 20 you? 21 MR. ST. GEORGE: Sure. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: I think I'm confused by your question. Is that allowed? 23 24 MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor? 25 THE COURT: Go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: I sounds to me if we can judge something based on a state that you were pretending to be somebody else back then. But the fact is, we're here and now today and there are facts, right? I mean, there's a law, we're going to be presented with evidence and then we make a judgment based on that?

THE COURT: Okay. And I'm going to jump in.

Yes, you are jurors here. You have not -- you weren't

present at the scene when alleged events occurred, and we

don't speak about what would be heard in the courtroom

during the course of the trial during voir dire.

But you, as jurors, are going to listen to the testimony and you're going to review physical pieces of evidence if produced or photographs or whatever is produced in this case. You're going to listen to the arguments that are made in front of you, then you are going to make decisions about facts from your perspective as jurors reviewing it after the fact.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Okay.

THE COURT: And then you will get law that I give you in instructions. I'll read that law to you and you'll have copies of the law back in the jury room to be able to review. And then you'll take the facts and you'll filter it through the law and you'll make a decision whether or not the People have met their burden of proof.

And that's how you'll decide.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. ST. GEORGE: As well, Your Honor, thanks.

So we talked about people who are interested in the outcome of this case, and we suggested that, you know, whether I do or do not take the stand, that I would have a pretty serious interest in the outcome. I mean, obviously I'm interested in being not guilty because I wouldn't have pled that way otherwise.

But do you think other parties might be interested in the outcome? Perhaps some of the witnesses? Perhaps the law enforcement? Would anyone have a -- would you be able to see everyone's interest in the outcome and that everyone involved in this case has their own self-interest and may give their testimony based on that self-interest?

(No verbal response.)

MR. ST. GEORGE: 21, I kind of saw you nodding a little bit.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: I agree with that. I think it's quite possible. I would hope that I could determine from what they said.

MR. ST. GEORGE: It's going to be

something -- you're going to have to look at the people who are giving the testimony and kind of judge from their faces and the way they're carrying themselves and, you know, what their choice of words exactly what they say.

And you think you could absolutely render a fair judgment based on that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 21: I'm not sure I could absolutely, but I would hope I could do my best.

MR. ST. GEORGE: We do it all day every day, don't we? We do it in our personal lives. I mean, we have to take account of what's going on around us and render some opinions on what's happening.

I mean, how about you, 12, what do you think about what some of the -- some of the other parties, what they might think? What they're interests and outcome might be?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: I'm not being disrespectful. I'm having a hard time keeping up with your question. Any time either side, both sides take time to be in court, of course, they have an interest. So I don't understand. If I just stand back and as fairly and objectively as possible based on my experiences in life and what I've heard and seen, could I be objective and not be predisposed to whatever interest either side has? If that's your question, yes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But to say one side's ahead of time being unfair or not, I don't have an opinion on that. You wouldn't be here if you didn't have both sides, an interest in this, so I'm having trouble following your question.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Let's make it more pointed then.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: Yep.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Police. Do you think law enforcement has a vested interest in the outcome of trials?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: Yes.

MR. ST. GEORGE: And do you think that when you hear a member of law enforcement giving testimony stating what they saw or what they think they saw or what they felt or mentioning a piece of physical evidence and trying to make some judgment as to what that piece of physical evidence may mean, do you think that they have a predetermined opinion, they have an interest in the outcome? I mean, certainly, they don't want to see their cases fall apart on them, do they?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: That's was my point, they wouldn't be here if they didn't have an opinion and a point of view that they were convinced is right.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: That's my point.

23

2425

MR. ST. GEORGE: And do you think that you can incisively see that in them and perhaps weigh their testimony based on that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: I think the only way I can answer your question is that if you're looking for an answer that says can I analyze based on degrees of life experience and what was said and the law with the help from Judge, I think I have the capability of doing that. But I just don't understand your question, it's too -- it's too inclusive.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. I apologize if I'm being a little too vague. And necessarily so because we can't talk about any specific evidence at this juncture. We have to choose our jury and then we'll share all the evidence then.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: Right.

MR. ST. GEORGE: So that was all I was asking is, you know, the idea that there is an interest in the outcome was brought forth before and we wanted to, you know, discuss -- it's on both sides.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: Right.

MR. ST. GEORGE: And can we weigh that equally, can we look at, well, they have an interest, they have an interest. And how are there -- how is there testimony going to be given based on their interest?

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 12: I think if you're still 2 talking to me, I think that's how we began the 3 conversation with justice is blind. I mean, that's what 4 we're go back to. 5 MR. ST. GEORGE: Fair. Thank you. 6 Your Honor, I really don't have anymore. I'd 7 like to yield back the rest of my time. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. ST. GEORGE: Thank you. 10 THE COURT: At this point in time it's a good 11 point for us to take a break, so I'm going to ask 12 everybody to exit the courtroom. 13 Keep an open mind. Don't do any investigation. 14 Don't discuss the case, and we'll have you back here in 15 ten minutes. 16 (The prospective jurors left the courtroom.) 17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So we have all of 18 our jurors out of the courtroom and we are finished then 19 with voir dire right now. 20 And, Mr. St. George, is there anything you'd 21 like to address me on with regard to this? 22 MR. ST. GEORGE: Bear with me one moment, Your 23 Honor. 24 (Pause in the proceedings.) 25 THE COURT: Do you know what, I'm going to give

you a couple minutes.

MR. MENGES: We're good. Judge, we're done.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I'm thinking of Juror Number 33, and I think he was reasonably clear that he couldn't be fair. I'll try to be fair is not I can be fair. I think there's case law in regards to that and he specifically did use the word that he would try to be fair. He specifically had mentioned an issue regarding the sexual contact, and so I think I would like to strike him for cause based on his using the words "try to be fair."

THE COURT: Any response?

MR. FREEMAN: Judge, I'm not aware of any case law that says that a juror's representation that they're going to try to be fair is insufficient. In fact, I think that's all we can ask of jurors, and he made it clear that he was going to do his best to be fair and without going into any more specifics about what his issues were, there's simply not anywhere close to a challenge for cause with him at this point.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, that case law would be *People v. Sandoval*, Colorado Appellate 1985.

THE COURT: What's the citation?

MR. ST. GEORGE: It's 706 P.2d 802, and specifically they said, "I guess I could be fair" is not

good enough to ensure fair and impartial. And I would -- I would tend to agree and that would be the language that he was using.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'm taking a look at that case right now. Page 203, the Court gives us some facts about the case during jury selection when one of the venireman was being interrogated by the prosecutor, he indicated his reluctance to serve on the jury and stated that he thought these feelings would affect how he would deliberate and listen to testimony. When pressed by the district attorney as to whose side of the case would be effected by this attitude, he stated that he, quote, guessed, unquote, he would be a fair juror.

But when asked that he understood that fairness applies both to the defendant and to the state he responded, quote, The defendant ain't fair to me because I have had him wreck my vacation to come over here, end quote.

In that respect, I think we're in a quite different situation. I receive a lot of comments from jurors, some jurors just say, yes, I can be fair, other jurors sometimes say they can't be fair or they can't give me any assurances at all.

In this case we heard "I'll try to be fair." I can't -- I have nothing else to say that this juror wasn't

fair in any respect, and "I'll try to be fair" is actually what we can ask of juries. I think some people say, I'll absolutely be fair -- "I'll try to be fair," I find to be a good faith effort by the juror to follow the rules that the Court lays out for them. So I'm not seeing that the Sandoval case would control under these situation.

You know, whether or not you deny a challenge for cause is always within the sound discretion of the Court. And, certainly, finding that "I'll try to be fair" is insufficient is not something that I can do. So I'll deny the challenge for cause with regard to Juror Number 33 based on his statement, "I'll try to be fair."

Okay. If that's where we are then, we will continue -- we will take a break and then come back and do peremptory challenges.

Are people ready for peremptory challenges?

MR. FREEMAN: We should be by the time we get back.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ST. GEORGE: As well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. MENGES: What time, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I told them about ten minutes, which is probably unrealistic because there are a lot of jurors to use the restroom. I would say a couple minutes before

1 three. 2 MR. MENGES: Couple minutes before three, okay. 3 THE COURT: Just so we're ready to go at three. 4 And then everybody should know we will go 5 through peremptory challenges and I guess we'll just take 6 them back for five minutes and clean the courtroom up a 7 bit, but go right into opening statements. 8 MR. FREEMAN: And we have a couple witnesses 9 here. 10 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 11 (A recess was taken.) 12 THE COURT: So we're going to be back on the 13 We had one challenge for cause. Nobody asked the 14 Court to talk to jurors outside the presence of other 15 jurors, there's no other requests, additions, et cetera, in this case. So we're ready to go for peremptory 16 17 challenges. 18 MR. FREEMAN: The People are ready. 19 THE COURT: Are you ready to go for peremptory 20 challenges? 21 MR. ST. GEORGE: Yes, I am, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MR. ST. GEORGE: Thank you. 24 THE COURT: Remember, we're going to strike from 25 We are not going to tell the person who is in

1 seat number 13 that they are the alternate but they would 2 be the alternate so you know who everyone is. 3 Everybody, we're bringing the jury in now, 4 right? 5 MR. FREEMAN: Yep. 6 MR. ST. GEORGE: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Six challenges. 8 (The prospective jurors entered the courtroom.) 9 THE COURT: All right. Everybody be seated. 10 So, ladies and gentlemen, we are ready now for 11 peremptory challenges, we begin peremptory challenges with 12 the prosecution. 13 MR. FREEMAN: Honor, the People would thank and 14 excuse Juror Number 11. Thank you, sir. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 11: Okay. Where do I go? 16 THE COURT: Thanks so much for your service with 17 us here today. 18 THE BAILIFF: Juror Number 14, can I have you 19 take his spot, please. 20 THE COURT: We need all the badges then. 21 MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I would like to 22 thank and excuse Number 33. 23 THE COURT: Thanks so much for your service with 24 us today. 25 THE BAILIFF: Number 15, can I have you take his

1 spot, please. 2 MR. FREEMAN: Judge, the People would thank and 3 excuse Juror Number 7. Thank you, sir. 4 THE COURT: Thank you so much for your service 5 with us here today. PROSPECTIVE JUROR 7: No problem. 6 7 THE BAILIFF: Number 32. 8 THE COURT: Mr. St. George? 9 MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I would like to 10 thank and excuse Number 1. 11 THE COURT: Thank you so much for your service 12 with us here today. 13 THE BAILIFF: Number 30, can I have you take her 14 spot, please. 15 MR. FREEMAN: Judge, the People would thank and 16 excuse Juror Number 3. Thank you, sir. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 3: Thank you. 18 THE COURT: Thank you so much for your service 19 with us here today. 20 THE BAILIFF: Number 18, can I have you take his 21 spot, please. 22 (Pause in the proceedings.) 23 MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I would like to 24 thank and excuse Number 12. 25 THE COURT: Thank you so much for your service

1 with us here today. 2 THE BAILIFF: Number 19, I'm going to have you 3 take his spot, please. 4 MR. FREEMAN: Judge, I'm going thank and excuse 5 Juror Number 19. 6 THE COURT: Thank you so much for your service 7 with us here today. Good hesitation. 8 THE BAILIFF: Number 31, can you go to that 9 spot. 10 (Pause in the proceedings.) MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I'd like to thank 11 12 and excuse the juror seated in Seat Number 1. I can't see 13 your number. 14 THE COURT: Number 30? 15 MR. ST. GEORGE: Yes, Number 30, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Thank you so much for your service 17 with us here today. 18 THE BAILIFF: Ma'am, can I have you take her 19 seat, Number 21. 20 MR. FREEMAN: Judge, we are going to thank and 21 excuse Juror Number 13. Thank you, ma'am. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR 13: Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Juror Number 13, thanks so much. 24 THE BAILIFF: Number 22. 25 (Pause in the proceedings.)

1 MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I would like to 2 thank and excuse Juror Number 22. 3 THE COURT: Thank you so much for your service 4 with us here today. 5 THE BAILIFF: Juror Number 23. 6 MR. FREEMAN: Judge, we would like to thank and 7 excuse Juror Number 4. Thank you, sir. 8 THE COURT: Thanks so much for your service with 9 us here today. THE BAILIFF: 24. 10 11 MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I would like to 12 thank and excuse Juror Number 21. 13 THE COURT: Thanks so much for your service with 14 us here today. 15 THE BAILIFF: Juror Number 25, sir. I'll have 16 you in the back row. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. We try the make it as 18 cumbersome as we can. 19 All right, then. Ladies and gentlemen, we have 20 our jury for this case. Can everyone sit with us and be 21 fair and impartial? 22 PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Can everyone follow the Court's 24 instructions with regard to the law? 25 PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, then.

I'm going to swear you in as jurors in this case. I'm going to excuse all of the jurors in the array then. Thank you so much, we could not have done this without you.

THE BAILIFF: Make sure you give your lanyards to the law clerk that's out there.

THE COURT: Yeah, you have to give your badges up.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: We're going excuse you for a couple of minutes so that we can clean up the courtroom. You'll have a moment to put those on.

Okay. I'm going to ask everyone then to raise their right hand. You are the jury, and you have been selected in the case of People versus St. George.

(The jury was duly sworn.)

THE COURT: All right. So you are our jury in this case selected to consider this. What I'm going to do is excuse you for a couple of minutes so you can go back to the jury room. We're going to clean up the courtroom a bit and get it set up.

You're going to come back. I'm going to give you some basics as to instructions, then we're going to begin with opening arguments and potentially a witness or

two. All right. We'll see you back here in just a minute.

(The jury left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Mr. St. George, you're ready on your opening and you have everything you need for that?

MR. ST. GEORGE: I am, Your Honor. Thank you.

If you would just afford my team to say hello to my
gallery.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Our jurors are just about ready to come out, and everybody's back in the courtroom. So it is my understanding that the prosecution gave Mr. St. George a copy of exhibits, right?

MR. FREEMAN: I showed him the few exhibits, at least photographs, that we plan to show to Ms. Elliott who is the first witness.

THE COURT: Okay. So ahead of time and then -- is there -- and he has a notebook of them, right?

MR. FREEMAN: Yeah, he's got a whole book of them.

THE COURT: Okay. So he has the notebook of them. Did you want to use my copy up here so that the witness can just open it up after and look at it as opposed to walking back and forth?

MR. FREEMAN: Are your -- I mean, I'm assuming

1 the exhibits are in plastic sleeves? So we would just 2 have the witness --3 THE COURT: I don't -- you gave me this 4 notebook. 5 MR. FREEMAN: Right. Yeah. Can I approach? 6 THE COURT: Sure. They're just paper. And if 7 we do do that -- I have a notebook here if Mr. St. George 8 wants to do the same thing with his exhibits, that's just 9 a plain empty notebook. MR. FREEMAN: Judge, my only concern is these 10 11 are hole-punched and I just would rather not have the 12 official exhibits have whole punches in them. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. 14 MR. FREEMAN: I can hand them -- or have the 15 bailiff hand them to them in a bunch. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. FREEMAN: So there's not a lot of back and 18 forth. Do you guys want these? 19 MR. MENGES: No, we've got one. I'll punch them 20 tonight. 21 THE COURT: All right. So, everybody, we're 22 going to bring out the jury. I'm going to give them some 23 brief instructions. 24 (Pause in the proceedings.) 25 THE COURT: Okay. We're ready for the jury?

MR. FREEMAN: Yes.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We'll bring the jury in.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

(The jury entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. As soon as everyone's in.

THE BAILIFF: Judge, I'm going to have him sit here because he has a knee problem.

THE COURT: Absolutely. Be seated. Everybody be seated.

And, ladies and gentlemen, if for some reason -- if something -- if you have a knee that's a problem or a back that's a problem and it helps to stand up or whatever, it's fine to do that. If you need a break, just give me a sign and we'll watch for that and we'll accommodate that too. It's perfectly okay.

So before we begin the trial, I'd like to tell you about the procedures we'll be following. I'd like to explain how the trial will be conducted.

The first step in the trial will be opening statements. Either attorney may make -- either attorney and Mr. St George may make an opening statement if they choose to do so. Mr. St George may reserve opening statement until later in the trial or may elect not to make an opening statement at all.

Ladies and gentlemen, opening statements are not evidence. Their purpose is only to help you to understand what the evidence will be.

Next, the prosecution will offer evidence.

Evidence consists of the sworn testimony of witnesses,
exhibits received in evidence, and stipulated, admitted or
judicially noticed facts.

After the prosecution's evidence, the defendant may present evidence in his own behalf but he is not required to do so. I want to remind you that the defendant is presumed to be innocent. The prosecution must prove the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant does not have to prove his innocence, call any witnesses, or introduce any evidence.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we've discussed before, you're going to have to decide what testimony to believe. You should carefully consider all of the testimony given and the circumstances under which each witness has testified. Consider each witness's knowledge, motive, state of mind, demeanor, and manner while on the stand. Consider the witness's means of knowledge, ability to observe, and strength of memory. Consider, also, any relationship each witness may have to either side of the case, the manner in which each witness might be affected by the verdict and the extent to which, if at all, each

witness is either supported or contradicted by other evidence in the case.

You should consider all facts and circumstances shown by the evidence which affects the credibility of the witness's testimony. You may believe all of the testimony of a witness, part of it or none of it, it is up to you.

At the conclusion of the evidence, I'll tell you the rules of law which you are to use in reaching your verdict. I'll read those rules of law and you'll be allowed to take them with you to the jury room during your deliberations.

After you've heard all the evidence and the instructions, the prosecution and the defendant may make their closing arguments. And like opening statements, closing arguments are not evidence. The prosecuting attorney will have the opportunity to reply to the closing argument made by the defendant. That's when you go to the jury room to deliberate on a verdict. Your purpose as jurors is to decide what the facts are and your decision must be based solely upon the evidence and the law I give you in my instructions.

At times during the trial, both sides are going to make objections. This simply means that the individual making the objection is requesting that I make a decision on a particular rule of law. It is the duty of a party to

object to evidence which he or she believes may not properly be offered. Do not draw any conclusions from the objections or from my rulings on the objections.

If I sustain an objection to a question, the witness cannot answer it. If I override or overrule an objection or say I'll allow it, that means the witness can answer it. If I've sustained an objection, you must draw no inference from the question or speculate as to what the witness would have said if I permitted that witness to answer.

At other times, I might instruct you not to consider a particular statement that has been made. You must not consider any evidence to which an objection has been sustained or which I've instructed you to disregard. Such evidence is to be treated as if you have never seen or heard it.

It's my job to decide what rules of law apply to the case. You must follow all the rules as I explain them to you and you may not follow some and ignore others.

Even if you disagree or don't understand the reasons for some of the rules, you must follow them.

You'll then apply these rules to the facts which you've determined from the evidence, and this is the way you'll determine whether the prosecution has proven the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt.

During the trial I may need to talk with the parties outside of your hearing about questions of law. Sometimes you may ask be asked to leave the courtroom while I discuss such matters. We'll try to limit these interruptions as much as possible. We understand that you are giving the gift of your time to us and we understand the sacrifice you are making to sit on this jury, so we are respectful of your time. We'll monitor your time and we'll try to keep any interruptions as brief as possible.

So everybody has a notepad?
(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Okay. So everybody has received notepads. You may use these notepads to take notes during the trial, you're not required to do so. Some people are notetakers, other people don't like to take notes. If you take notes, don't allow the note taking to detract from your close attention to the testimony and conduct of each witness and all other evidence received during the trial.

You can't possibly summarize all the testimony in the case on notes, so take notes of issues you find to be the most important. You do not receive a transcript of this hearing and that's just for your edification.

Whether you take notes or not, you should rely on your memory as much as possible or not upon your note and notes of other jurors. Any notes you take are to refresh your

own memory.

Notepads can be used in the courtroom and back in the jury room. They can't be taken home or can't be taken any place else in the building. At the end of the trial, we tear the notes off and we shred them so no one else looks at your notes, those notes are for you.

In this case we're going to allow questions for the jury. I can't allow jurors to ask questions directly of the witness, so this is what we're going to do. Either side can call a witness if they choose and then both sides would have the opportunity to question that witness.

After both sides have had the opportunity, if they wish, to question the witness, then I will look at you and say, does anyone on the jury have a question for this witness. If you do, those are preprinted forms there on the bar in front of the jury, pick one of those out and fill it out. You have to write out your question. Don't put your name on it.

Keep in mind, please, that I must apply the same legal rules to your questions that I apply to questions asked by the parties. The rules of evidence and other rules of law may prevent some questions from being asked. If the language of a jury question is just a little off, if I'm not allowed to ask it because of some rule of evidence or rule of law, I might change the wording of the

question a little bit and then I can go ahead and ask it. Sometimes I'm just not allowed to ask the question.

Please note that my decision not to ask a question proposed by a juror is not a reflection on the juror who submitted it, and you should not attach any significance of my failure to ask a question proposed by any juror. My decision whether or not to allow a question is based on the applicable rules of evidence and other rules of law, and not on the facts of this case. You must not speculate about a question that is not asked nor about what the answer might have been.

Finally, please don't discuss the questions with any of the other jurors because you're not allowed to talk about the case until the case -- until you're in the deliberation room ready to go.

So enough law right now, we're ready for opening statements so I'll hear from the People.

Ms. Decker?

MS. DECKER: Thank you, Judge.

OPENING STATEMENT

BY MS. DECKER:

The defendant wants it his way. The defendant wants to have sex with a woman who is repeatedly telling him no, but he gropes her repeatedly anyway. The defendant wants her money as she's trying to get away from

him so he shoots with his gun twice. The first time to scare, the second time to kill. The defendant wants to get away with it so when the police arrive to investigate, he tries to kill them too.

You've already met the defendant, Eric

St. George. On this night, he was very different. He was not calm and soft spoken. He was drinking, he was threatening, and he was violent.

He's charged with three counts of attempt murder. And attempt murder, because lucky for his three victims, he was a bad shot. But you will see through the evidence what he was aiming at, three people. You will hear why he was angry, and you will know what he was intending to do. And that was to kill.

The defendant wanted it his way that night. But he doesn't get it his way because you will hear the facts and you will learn the law, and the facts and the law are not on his side and that's why you're here to hold him accountable.

So let's go back to the night of July 31, 2016 going into the early morning of August 1, 2016. It's the defendant's birthday, so he wants to celebrate a little that night and he wants some female attention, so he calls an escort service, Denver Ladies, and he picks out on website a girl name Effy. You'll meet her. Her real name

is Emily Elliott.

He arranges for her to come over to his apartment, and so she does. She arrives at about 9:02 p.m. And once she arrives to his apartment they meet and she explains to him first, she's not a full-service escort, meaning she's not going to have sex with him. She'll provide a dance and things like that.

But when he hears he's not allowed and not going to have sex with her, he says, Well, that's a problem. So as per protocol, she gets on the phone with her dispatcher who speaks with the defendant and says, You've got this girl there, are you sure you want to let her go now? She's already there. She's not going to have sex with you. And he says, Okay, I'll keep her. Agreeing to the terms of the service.

So, Ms. Elliott item goes into the defendant's bedroom, he gets down into his boxer shorts and she provides a dance, or, at least, she beings providing this dance until the defendant starts touching her inappropriately.

He touches her on her vagina first, and she says watch your hands. The defendant touches her on her vagina again. She says, if you're going to do that another time, I'm leaving. The defendant then grabs her waist and kisses her stomach. She pushes him away and says you

can't do that. He says, You're no fun, reaches around and touches her vagina again and that's the end of it and she says, Okay. I'm done here. I'm leaving.

But the defendant isn't happy because he already paid her over \$200 once he agreed to her terms of service, i.e. not having sex. He says you can't leave, I've already paid you. But she pushes past him and pushes out his apartment door and she gets outside. The defendant's mad.

Emily Elliott immediately, per protocol, gets on the phone with her dispatcher and says, Hey, I'm ending this call. Because he had been groping her, touching her inappropriately. She's going out to her car and at that time hears a gunshot. It's the defendant who's behind her and who fires a shot up into the air. You'll hear this recording.

Then the defendant levels his handgun at her and shoots at her as she's trying to get into her car. She makes it out of there alive, nearly hitting the defendant who's behind her in the parking area outside of this complex. Squeals out of there.

She's on the phone with her dispatcher and then gets on the phone with her boss who says she's the one who needs to call it into 911. You'll hear the phone call between her and her dispatcher as she's calming down.

You'll hear her say, Oh, my God, he has a gun.

She leaves there at about 9:45 p.m. and calls 911 at 10:12 p.m., close to a half an hour later.

She'd been on the phone with her own dispatcher unsure if they were going to call 911 for her in that time frame.

So given that this isn't an emergency, police don't role up with lights and sirens. They want to figure out and asses the situation. But what was going on as police are learning about this incident, about half an hour later, is that the defendant leaves his apartment and goes to a bar about a half mile away, the Rusty Bucket.

He has a couple shots. He has a couple beers.

You'll hear from the bartender, Adam Carr, about what he had to drink and that he appeared distraught. The defendant didn't tell Adam Carr why he was distraught, but that's how he seemed.

Around the time the defendant gets home, shortly thereafter, police arrive to his complex and they don't know this complex, they don't know where the defendant lives, his exact amount. They do know that there are allegations of a weapon, so they want to make sure that they stay safe.

They get to the apartment complex, and I'll show it to you here on People's Exhibit 3. Here is the defendant's apartment, Unit 103 in the middle of this

exhibit. Officers arrive on scene and congregate to the southwest corner of his building determining what to do. What they need to do to find the defendant, to speak with him, to just get his side of the story.

So Sergeant Maines walks around the backside of defendant's apartment right here to the backdoor. The lights are on and he can see there's an aquarium in there and there's a tent that's apparently drying in the apartment, which Emily Elliott had described to Sergeant Maines as being the defendant's apartment.

So Sergeant Maines identifies where the defendant lives. He goes back to where the other officers are at the corner of the apartment building. Then Sergeant Maines and Agent Trimmer go behind the defendant's apartment again. They're trying to get at this apartment and view it from all angles. Because this person's who's just committed a crime, they don't know if he's going to flee. And as you can see, there's a lot of open space to the north side of the defendant's apartment. They also want to make sure that they have all windows and doors covered, in case this person, who used a handgun earlier in the evening, is dangerous to them or anyone else.

So while Sergeant Maines and Agent Trimmer go to the backyard again of the defendant's unit, Officers

Brennan and Muller, are looking at the defendant's front door and get the defendant on the phone.

They make five calls to the defendant. Agent Brennan first leaves a voicemail, identifies himself as a Lakewood police officer, says we just need to speak with you, would you come out. Agent Brennan calls a second time and gets the defendant on the phone. Again, Agent Brennan identifies himself and others as Lakewood police officers there to talk to him asking him to come out. But the defendant doesn't. Doesn't want to speak to them. The call has ened. Agent Brennan calls again, leaves another voicemail with the same information.

Agent Muller calls and tries to reach the defendant several times. Again, giving the same information that we're here, we are Lakewood police. You can call dispatch to verify that we are who we say we are, that is Lakewood police officers, and we just want to get your side of the story about what happened tonight. We heard there was a shooting.

The defendant did not come out, at least not then. Sergeant Maines and Agent Trimmer are behind his unit, they see lights go out. They're standing without protective cover behind a skinny tree but they're shrouded in darkness. There isn't much light back there where they were at that time.

The defendant comes out his backdoor with his cell phone and they don't announce themselves because they're not protected. They don't know if the defendant is armed. They don't want him to flee.

The defendant goes back into his apartment and they get into a better position to be able to see him and to keep themselves safe. They go to the northeast corner of the defendant's apartment complex.

Once there, they hear the unmistakable sound of a shotgun wracking. The defendant wracks his shotgun, meaning it's ready to fire. Knowing that this is a very dangerous sound, Sergeant Maines immediately calls out a Code 1. All Lakewood officers who are available, please come to this residence now.

Sergeant Maines and Agent Trimmer, knowing how close they are to the defendant with this loaded shotgun that is ready to fire, try and find a safer position.

Agent Trimmer and Sergeant Maines go to this -- where this truck is on the east side of the building. Sergeant Maines decides to get a better position so that at least one officer has a view of the backyard to watch what the defendant is doing back here.

So Sergeant Maines leaves Agent Trimmer here on the driver's side of this truck and walks around the other building and winds up on the north side of the next door

building. That's where Sergeant Maines is able to watch what the defendant is doing, and the defendant is just walking around the back of his apartment. But then Sergeant Maines sees him walk with purpose and more quickly.

He airs to Agent Trimmer who is still at that driver's side of that truck, he's coming toward you.

Agent Trimmer, at this point, is crouched behind the engine of this Dodge pickup truck. She's covered in light because, unlike the backyard where there's hardly any light, she's under spotlights of this garage area.

So she huddles in close to that driver's side tire protecting herself with the engine of the truck and also crouching in so that she doesn't create much of a shadow next to her so that if the defendant sees her, it's harder to see her so that she's protected there.

She hears gravel, someone walking on gravel and you'll see that that's right about here. So the defendant, she hears, is coming towards her. This is the truck in exhibit 125 where Agent Trimmer was hiding on the left side of that truck, the driver's side. The defendant walks on this gravel, she hears and he walks around to the back of that truck.

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: We can't see your laser pointer at all.

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: I thought maybe it was me, your laser isn't working on the screen.

THE COURT: And we also have that.

MS. DECKER: I'll try not to blind anyone with this one. Thank you.

Agent Trimmer is here, the defendant walks from here around. When the defendant gets to the backside of the truck, he immediately squares and points his shotgun, levels it at Agent Trimmer and he fires first. Agent Trimmer immediately fires back. She runs to the passenger side of that truck and the defendant mirrors her movement and follows her. Again, he shoots and she shoots back. That second time she thinks, "I missed."

She tries to get away from him for the third time and runs to the driver's side of that truck. The defendant, for the third time, follows Agent Trimmer with his shotgun and Agent Trimmer fires again, then losing sight of the defendant.

Sergeant Maines who is still back here, hears all this but doesn't have a view of what's going on and he wants to help Agent Trimmer not knowing whether she or anyone had just been shot. Sergeant Maines sees the defendant walking back towards his apartment.

And thanks to Sergeant Maines' flashlight on his gun, the defendant sees him. The defendant fires around

at Sergeant Maines. Sergeant Maines ducks behind some bushes, peeks out again. The defendant fires again at Sergeant Maines. Sergeant Maines is checking to see whether he's been shot because the shots were so close. The defendant fires a third time at Sergeant Maines and then they hear him go back into his apartment.

Agents are now arriving on scene and hear three more shots coming from within the defendant's apartment about 20 seconds apart. They then get a call from dispatch saying the defendant has called 911, he's been shot in the legs and they instruct him, okay, come out. We will help you. Don't bring a gun.

The defendant does come out but with a .380 handgun. He comes out of his front door. Officers kick it away so that they can get him help and they immediately apply tourniquets to his legs and get him to the hospital.

So let's talk about the physical evidence that you have up to this point. You have physical evidence that you will see and hear and you have the testimony of not just the direct witnesses, Emily Elliott, Sergeant Maines, Agent Trimmer, but the neighbors in the area and other officers who are arriving on scene because of that Code 1.

So let's talk about that physical evidence first. With relations to the guns, you'll have several

spent casings --

THE COURT: Ms. Decker, are we done with this?

MS. DECKER: Yes, thank you.

You'll have several spent casings pertaining to the shooting with Emily Elliott. So while Emily Elliott will tell you she thinks that he shot up in the air farther out, closer to her car, what you can see in the first slide that was shown in this parking area to the right bottom side of the slide. While she thinks that he shot up in the air more towards her car the first time, there is a bullet trajectory in his breezeway of his apartment. You have that.

You have two spent casings consistent with the Ruger that he fired first up into the air, and then his Taurus handgun that he filed directly at Emily Elliott and bullets that match those two guns.

As for shooting at Agent Trimmer, Agent Trimmer will tell you she shot at the defendant three times and her spent 9-millimeter casings are right around that truck, consistent with where she was hiding from the defendant. The defendant shot first at Agent Trimmer. Shot at her again and then shot three times at Sergeant Maines, and you will see a trail of five spent shotgun casings matching that shotgun from that truck all the way back to his apartment.

You have three shots that were in his apartment. Once he got inside, he decided to shoot in there as well. You'll have impact patterns of those shots as well as three additional spent casings from that .380 Ruger. You also have -- speaking of impact patterns, the impact pattern that was directly above Agent Trimmer's head in the garage right to the left of the driver's side of that truck. You have another impact pattern of the defendant's shotgun over her head at that second shot. Consistent with one of the shots fired at Sergeant Maines, you have a shot on that neighboring building. The other two shots got too close to Sergeant Maines to leave impact patterns because they hit the bushes nearly missing him.

In addition to all this physical evidence that corroborates what all of these victims will tell you, you have what the neighbors will say and what the officers who are arriving on scene will say. There was no 911 call with that first series of gunshots with Emily Elliott.

You'll hear from, for example, Keri Pokorny who is a neighbor who lives nearby. She'll tell you that she went out for a smoke around 9:00-ish and she sees this car that she doesn't recognize, Emily Elliot's car. And that she hears what's going on. She think some girl's talking outside, as Emily Elliot's on her phone with her dispatcher explaining I'm leaving this call because of

what he's doing to me. And then she hears Emily Elliott says, Oh, my God, he has a gun. And then she hears Emily Elliott squeal out of there in that car.

But she doesn't call 911 because, as some of the neighbors say, it's still July, first day of August, fire works, a car backfiring and then it was quiet. It was quiet in the apartment complex after that. So you don't have any initial 911 calls, but these neighbors did hear what happened. Keri Pokorny even sees the defendant still in his boxers walking back towards his apartment building.

You have other officers who arrive on scene, and they'll tell you they hear the big boom of a shotgun first. Several officers will tell you boom first, the defendant's shotgun, a series of smaller pops, boom, another shotgun. Now, the testimony on this with officers arriving on scene, with neighbors who aren't familiar with guns, it will be a little bit inconsistent, but there is a consistent theme. Boom, series of shots, boom.

There's also some cell phone evidence in this case. The defendant's texts with Emily Elliott, so we know the time frame that she arrives there at 9:02 p.m. When the defendant goes to the bar, he knows he's in trouble, so he texts his friend Eric Yingling and he says, I can't go home. He then texts with Eric Yingling trying to set up an alibi, okay. Eric, I was with you tonight.

So you'll have that evidence as well.

At the end of this case, the defendant doesn't get it his way. That night, the defendant was violating, threatening and tried to kill. That's why at the end of this case, we are going to ask you to find the defendant guilty.

THE COURT: Mr. St George?

OPENING STATEMENT

BY MR. ST. GEORGE:

We are here today because the State has alleged that I have attempted to murder three people. The evidence throughout this trial will show that I am categorically not guilty of all of the charges that the State has levied against me.

I did use deadly force in defense against two people. This is absolutely true. I did use non-deadly force in defense of myself against a third. This, too, is absolutely true. I am not denying my use of force. The evidence will show that my use of force was authorized, it was completely legal, it was reasonable, and it was justified; albeit, incredibly unfortunate. A man's right to act in self-defense is a natural, essential, and inalienable right protected by the constitution of this state.

The charges against me include allegations made

by an escort, Emily Elliott, allegations that are false. And that she knew to be false at the time that she made them. In a recorded telephone call, you will hear her tell you with her own voice that she knows her allegation is not true. You will hear her say when she didn't know that she was being recorded, that I did not shoot a gun at her. You will hear her say that she believed I shot in the air to scare her.

There will be no physical evidence to support her allegation that I shot at her after shooting in the air. There will be no physical evidence to support her allegation that I sexually assaulted her. The evidence will show that her allegation of my having touched her illegal -- illegally was a tool to manipulate law enforcement into doing what she wanted them to do.

She may have felt disrespected, as she claims.

Feeling disrespected is subjective and cannot be either proved nor disproved using evidence. And disrespecting an escort is not a crime. This disastrous series of events would have never occurred if Ms. Elliott had not lied.

The charges also include those allegations made by two members of the Lakewood Police Department. The evidence will show that I did not know nor could any reasonable person have known, using their commonsense and reason that these individuals were police officers. The

evidence will show that they did not identify themselves.

Private citizens are not allowed to have vehicles that are marked up to resemble police departments. This is so that you can be sure that when you see a police vehicle, you know the identity as a police officer of the person inside of it. Private citizens are not allowed to have red or blue flashing lights mounted on their vehicles. This is to ensure that when you see red and blue flashing lights mounted on vehicles, the identity is a police officer who is flashing them.

Private citizens are not allowed to wear a police uniform or impersonate an officer with a badge. This is to ensure that when you see a police uniform or a badge, you can be reasonably sure the identity as a police officer of the person wearing them.

The evidence will show that none of these devices were used to identify those people who are outside of my home at 12:17 in the morning in the dark, in the silence.

The State will present a case wherein they will tell you that these officers identified themselves through a series of telephone calls. There is a means by which you can possibly identify who is calling you on the phone. It's through caller ID, a little piece of 1990s technology

that forever ended the prank phone call, ruined part of my teenage years.

The evidence will show that even this form of identification was disabled. The officers blocked their caller IDs when they were placing their phone calls.

There was no way to know who was making these calls.

Also, when given the opportunity to shout, to speak, to use their voices directly to identify themselves to me, they did not. They remained mute. They hid themselves. This entire tragedy could have been avoided if a police officer had just shouted out, "Lakewood police," but it never happened.

These police may not have intended the consequences of their actions. They were surely clueless to the way that their actions or their lack thereof would have been perceived from my point of view. Their greatest failure on this night in question was that they did not put themselves into another person's shoes. They did not consider what I was seeing. They did not consider what I was hearing. They did not consider what I was feeling.

They work as police officers every day or night as it may be. They take for granted various aspects of their jobs as just normal, things that we common, private citizens would feel frightening or threatening. Parking

their marked police vehicles away from us and sneaking up to his on foot covertly under the cover of dark, this wouldn't seem like something that police would do to us common citizens.

When we get pulled over for speeding, a marked police car with flashing red and blue lights move us to the side of the road. An officer in a uniform with a badge comes up to your window. We might presume the same if we were suspected of a crime and an officer contacted you at home. Perhaps they'd knock on your front door and then talk you. Perhaps they'd call you on the phone and ask you to come outside, and then they talk to you. Perhaps they'd call out to you on a bullhorn and ask you to come outside.

MS. DECKER: Your Honor, I'm going to object to argumentative. This is opening statements and should be just a recitation of the facts. I believe this is argument.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, this is --

THE COURT: All right. Let's just continue and you can present your options as you go along, but this isn't closing argument.

MR. ST. GEORGE: I understand that, Your Honor.

The evidence will show that they would then talk to you perhaps. Regardless, if they were police, you'd

see the familiar marked police car, flashing red and blue lights, you'd see a uniformed police officer. All assuring to you that this contact is legitimate, genuine and legal. More so, that it is safe. Police would never initiate physical harm against one of us, us common citizens.

July 31, 2016, I woke up above 10,000 feet. The best time of a Colorado morning. It had hailed over night south of Kenosha pass, wetting my tent, my bed roll, and my backpack. It's not a crisis, nothing I'm not prepared to handle. Not the first time and probably won't be the last. I love the adversity the back country deals me. It provides a challenge, an opportunity to succeed, and goals to achieve. Most importantly, I get to see the views that you don't see unless you get yourself out there.

It was my second night out. I'd hiked 20 miles over the course of the first two days.

MR. FREEMAN: Your Honor, I'm going to object to relevance.

MR. ST. GEORGE: It's absolutely relevant, Your Honor, this is what I was doing that morning.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ST. GEORGE: And I'll make it short.

THE COURT: Okay. We can briefly talk about what you were doing that morning.

MR. ST. GEORGE: My muscles were sore and there were miles between me and the truck. I had my coffee and my breakfast, packed my gear, headed out of camp. A few hours later, I was at the trailhead in the truck heading home.

This was my 39th birthday. I had no clue what was going to happen to me later that night. Never in my worst nightmares could I have envisioned my night would end up in an outright gunfight leaving me with potentially mortal wounds. Never in my worst nightmares could I have foreseen that I would be charged with attempting to murder anyone, anyone.

It was my 39th birthday. I was glad to be spending the weekend out on the trail hiking with friends. Once back in town, we went out to celebrate my birthday over lunches and some cocktails.

The evidence will show that later that evening, I made the decision to buy a risqué and adult and indulgent little birthday gift to myself. I went to backpage.com. A notoriously seedy website that deals in these sort of transactions. I browsed in the advertisements under the heading of "female escorts." Escort is the euphemism used to describe what I was shopping for.

I found an add that I estimated to be the

sleaziest one, a neck down photo of an attractive looking young woman in black lingerie posing in front of a bed.

The ad was naughty. It appeared to be what I was looking for.

I called the number and I invited the female voice that answered to come over to my apartment. The evidence will show that this indulgent little birthday gift to myself is going to go completely awry. I probably wasn't completely comfortable with what I was doing to begin with. It was immorally, objectionable as all hell.

The cliché that if you don't want to tell your mother about it, you probably shouldn't be doing it. It still has merit even at my grown age. I had invited a stranger from a questionable website, backpage.com, into my home.

We'll hear testimony that during this encounter -- we'll hear testimony regarding this encounter. The State is going to try to present a case to you that I behaved as a petulant boy. That this escort denied me sexual services and so that I acted violently.

They'll try to find the evidence to support the statements made by Emily Elliott, that I assaulted her sexually. But it doesn't exist. They'll claim that I then chased her out into the parking lot menacing her with a gun firing it into the air. They'll try to find

evidence to support Ms. Elliott's report that I then levelled my arm toward her and I fired a gunshot directly at her with the intent to kill her. The State will fail in this endeavor.

The physical evidence doesn't exist to support their story. The evidence that does exist tells a different story. The witnesses that we'll hear from, their testimonies will tell a different story. The truth is a different story.

The story of the escort ends at 9:47 p.m. with the taillights of her car rounding the corner at the end of my street and leaving my view. The next story begins two-and-a-half hours later at 12:17 in the morning. This story ends even worse than the first. This story includes me experiencing the most horrible terror of my life. A potentially lethal pair of wounds, the threat to the lives of two feckless innocent police officers.

The State is going try to present to you that a reasonable person in my place would have known that the people in my backyard were police officers. The State is going try to persuade you into believing that I actually did know that the people in my backyard were police officers.

It will be argued that I should have expected police to show up because I had shot at someone. But the

evidence will show that I didn't shoot at someone. I put a gunshot into the air to scare away a Backpage escort that I thought might have mace or pepper spray or worse, a gun herself.

I shouldn't have expected police because escorts don't call police. Escorts generally fall on the wrong side of law enforcement.

MS. DECKER: I'm going to object, again, Your Honor, this is argument.

THE COURT: Okay. You can go on and explain the facts and circumstances as you see them arguing though with regard to that would be speculative.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Understood, Your Honor.

There's evidence in the case to demonstrate this, but I'll go on from where I left off. Thank you.

If I thought anyone would call police, it would have been a neighbor reporting a loud noise in the parking lot. But it was July. If police had come out, they probably would have concluded it must have been a bottle rocket or a fire cracker.

They're going to try to make the evidence appear as though I willfully menaced these two people with a big-ass shotgun, as they'll call it. They're going to try and convince you that I assaulted this pair of people, knowing that they were police officers. They're going to

do everything that they can to make you believe that I went out into the dark of night and intentionally, deliberately and knowingly attempted to murder two Lakewood police officers. The State will fail.

The State is going to try and convince you that you don't like me. They need you to dislike me. Feelings cloud judgment. The State needs you to ignore the objectivity of evidence and make a feeling judgment of me. They're going to tell you that I was soliciting sex from an escort. I'm not charged with solicitation though.

They're going to present evidence to you that I was drinking. They're going to tell you I was slurring my speech, that I was drunk. I'm not charged with being drunk though. They're going to tell you that I'm a pro Second Amendment gun carrying, Southerner redneck. I'm not charged with being a redneck.

The district attorney may parade around the courtroom with a mock-up version of my shotgun pumping shells out through it and trying to scare you. My shotgun is scary. It's a dangerous weapon. It's meant to be scary. I'm not dangerous or scary. I've not been charged with being scary either.

The evidence will show that after repeated phone calls and no signs of police, I got frightened. I thought that someone was outside who wanted to hurt me. The

evidence is that I had reason to think that someone might be out to hurt me. The unknown callers were luring me out, and when I went out unarmed, I couldn't see anyone. There were no signs of police. If the callers were not police, then it would be reasonable to think that the callers were someone sent by the escort.

I did scare her off with a gunshot. It would be reasonable to think that someone might come out for some payback. The evidence will show that then and only then, did I go fetch up my big-ass scary shotgun. Evidence will show that I went out to my back porch and I made a sound that translates into every human language, the loud echoing crack of a shotgun being racked. In every language known to man, that sound means leave. And all signs showed that the message was heard loud and clear.

I didn't receive anymore phone calls from blocked IDs, there was nobody there. There was no sounds but the loud din of summer, air and crickets in it. The evidence is that I stood there with only the sound of crickets for six long minutes. For six long minutes I convinced myself that whoever was here, whoever was calling, who was scaring me, they've left and I would have no reason to think that they had been police.

Police don't get scared and leave. Had these calls really been police, they would have been -- they

would have happened two hours ago. Not now, half past midnight, but they didn't leave. They were hiding. Evidence will show that I started to walk around the building headed towards the front of my apartment.

It makes sense to think that if these people had left, I should be able to go out front and see that there are no unfamiliar cars out there. It's almost quarter to one in the morning. There shouldn't be anyone walking around. Even if there is a late night dog walker, I'll probably recognize them. It's a little neighborhood. I know most of the dog walkers from seeing them around.

I never make it to the front of that building. There's someone hiding. They're hiding behind a truck. That person knows I'm coming. That person has been watching me all night. That person was looking through my back windows. That person knows I have a shotgun. They heard me wrack it. That person is crunched down low so as not to be seen. That person is hiding behind a truck tire. That person has a gun too. That person has the gun drawn up and as it pointed at me when I come around the south side of the pickup truck.

As the jury, I ask you to pay special close attention to the following facts as they're brought out in testimony and in evidence. My neighbors will all testify to having heard one loud sound around 9:45, if they heard

any sound at all. Nobody will testify to having heard two sounds around that time. The physical evidence will show that only one gunshot in the parking lot, not two. Only one bullet casing was found in the street. Only one round was missing from the gun that fired it.

Police detectives attempt to confuse the four rounds missing from one gun with the single round missing from another. The one gunshot at 9:45 p.m. and the four gunshots at 1:00 a.m. are completely separated events, separated by more than three hours.

My neighbors did not know that there were police in the area. They called 911 to report the gunfire at 12:45 a.m. Had they known there were police in the area, they would have had no reason to call 911. I did not know there were police in the area and I called 911 to report that I've been shot at the 12:45 in the morning.

My neighbors report that they did not hear any sounds of police. Never once did anyone hear, "Lakewood police. Hands up. Drop your weapon." Not until after 1:00 a.m. after all the gunfire did they hear police. The police will, themselves, testify that they never shout out, Mr. St George, we're over here. We're the ones who have been calling you. We need to talk.

The police detectives who investigated this case have omitted that I exited my house two separate times to

look for identification of the unknown callers. They omit this part so that they can imply that I was immediately hostile and that I was threatening police with a weapon without looking first.

Police investigator's seized my computer and my cell phone. You'll hear testimony that they searched those for evidence of aggression towards police. They interrogated my friends, asking if I was overtly aggressive toward police. Detectives wanted to bring to trial the evidence that I hate police, that I'm biased against police. They ignore the evidence on my computer that I have clientele that are military and police.

MR. FREEMAN: Your Honor, I'll object.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Military and police --

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. ST. GEORGE: The evidence will show they ignored the policemen that are my friends on Facebook. The evidence will show they ignored my search history.

MR. FREEMAN: Your Honor, I'm going to object to argument.

THE COURT: I'll sustain this objection.

MR. ST. GEORGE: This evidence is on the record, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm sustaining the objection. This is opening.

MR. ST. GEORGE: You on the jury will take note that Devon Trimmer's account of the gunfight is not supported by physical evidence, by forensic evidence or by witness statement. Her account is a deliberate fabrication intended to convince you that I ought to have known that she was a police officer. It is false and the evidence show it.

Jason Maines' account of the gunfight will demonstrate that it was difficult to see due to lack of lighting. His testimony will be that he was hiding in the shadows or behind bushes the entire night, that he was never able to be seen as a uniformed police officer. He will even testify that at one point he mistook me to be one of his officers. He was not able to clearly discern that I was not.

The testimony of additional police officers will show that I immediately stood down once a clear police presence was known. Matt Lebsack, Dan Shube, Chris Alfano, Ryan McKalip, Jason Frink, these Lakewood police officers will all testify that when they shouted to me to put my hands up, I put my hands up. When they ordered me to drop my weapon, I dropped my weapon.

When I saw their uniforms, saw their badges heard their police commands, that I immediately submitted to them. When they communicated with me, I clearly

communicated back. I repeated their orders and complied with them making it clear to them that I was hearing and complying with their orders.

There will be a lot of information presented throughout this case. It may seem overwhelmingly difficult or complex. It may be, at first glance, an overload of testimonies, statements, physical evidence, and experts, competing voices.

It could have all been avoided. There was no reason for this to have ever happened. However, members of the jury, you will look to the evidence which distills down to two quite simple facts in order to render a verdict. There was only one gunshot early in the night, not two. And that the police did not properly identify themselves in order that a reasonable person could conclude that they were police. That's all. The whole case comes down to one gunshot and that I did not believe that they were the police.

Once the evidence of those two facts are thoroughly demonstrated, once the false stories are dispelled, we have one more story to write together. This one is going to be a different story, a story with a happy ending. The story begins here in this court today and it ends with, 'And then he went back to his life, to his friends and to his family. He went home not guilty.'

1 Thank you. 2 THE COURT: You may call your first witness. 3 MR. FREEMAN: Judge, I just need a moment to 4 speak with her. 5 Surely. THE COURT: 6 (Pause in the proceedings.) 7 MR. FREEMAN: Judge, we'll call Emily Elliott. 8 EMILY ELLIOTT, 9 having been called as a witness on behalf of the People, 10 being first duly sworn, testified as follows: 11 THE COURT: Have a seat, please. THE WITNESS: Thank you. 12 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. FREEMAN: 15 Good afternoon. Would you please state your Q 16 full name and spell your last name for us? 17 Α Emily Katherine Elliott, E-l-l-i-o-t-t. 18 And, Ms. Elliott, without telling us your date 0 19 of birth, can you tell us how old you are? 20 Α I'm 24 years old. 21 0 And without telling us your address, can you 22 tell us what city you live in? 23 I live in Parker, Colorado. Α 24 What do you currently do for a living? Q 25 Α I'm a pharmacy technician.

Q For about how long have you been a pharmacy tech?

A About six months now.

Q Okay. I want to draw your attention back to the evening of July 31st of 2016. Did you do a different kind of work back then?

A I did, yeah.

Q And what did you do?

A Basically an exotic dancer, private exotic dancer.

Q Okay. And as of that date, as of July 31st of 2016, about how long had you been doing that kind of work?

A Maybe about eight months.

Q Okay. Did you work for a particular company or a particular service?

A Yes, I did, I worked for Denver Ladies.

Q Okay. Describe how you would -- how you would meet clients, how you would go about doing that sort of employment?

A They made my ads for me. I never had anything to do with my ad books. They would take my phone calls for me and screen the callers. They would then decide if it was okay, safe enough for me to go over there and then they would call me and give me a name and a location to be at and when to be there.

Q Okay. And when you responded to those sorts of dispatches, to a location, what sort of services did you provide? What did you do?

A It was a full striptease. It went into a body massage and kind of what was called, like, a body glide, which is where I would rub my body on your body.

- **Q** Okay.
- A Yeah.
- **Q** Did you provide sexual services?
- A Absolutely not.
- **Q** Okay. Was that made clear on the advertisement that was posted?

A That's the thing my company was never very up front with that, so that was one of the first conversations that I would have with every client right when I walked in the door. These were my services I provide, sorry if that was a misunderstanding so on.

- **Q** And did you find at times that some clients were expecting or hoping for sexual services?
 - A Yes, definitely.
- **Q** When that came to your attention, that's at least what they were hoping for or expecting, how did you dial with that?
- A Well, I mean, in situations like that, I was mostly just concerned about my safety at that point

because I'm not going to do nothing that I don't feel comfortable doing. So I just found it to be the best way to be very up front and just tell them right off the bat before -- you know, usually before any money was exchanged, before anything was exchanged, it was very clear that, look, I may not be exactly what you're looking for tonight.

Q Okay. And were there times that when you determined that the client was wanting sexual services that you left, you didn't get any money, you didn't do anything?

A I'm sorry, one more time?

Q Did it ever occur that when you showed up and met a client and you determined that they wanted sexual services, that you just left without doing anything?

A Yeah, a lot of the times, I did. My company asked for a cancellation fee but, you know, sometimes it just didn't work out that way. And like I said, I'm more concerned about my safety in situations like that so...

Q Okay. Were there ever times when you got there and in speaking with a client, it was determined that they wanted some sort of sexual services and you got your dispatcher or somebody from Denver Ladies involved to sort of mediate the situation?

A Yes. I was not allowed -- under my company's

guidelines, I was not allowed to leave a call empty handed without calling them first to let them know that this was going on so they can try to kind of mediate and maybe get the client to end up keeping me anyway despite the lack of services.

Q So sometimes somebody from Denver Ladies would be put on the phone with your clients --

A Yeah. Yeah, very often.

Q -- and try to talk to them?

A Yeah, and I always had to call and check in just for my safety and all that.

Q Okay. And you mentioned your safety a couple of times. Did you go to these calls by yourself?

A Yeah, a lot of the times I did. After this whole ordeal, I did have my brother start driving me. But he never had any contact with any of my clients ever, so...

Q Prior to this event, did you ever have anybody come with you, a body guard, security, boyfriend?

A No, I always felt like I was okay enough if I just checked in, you know, and, like, if they asked if I needed coffee, which was the code word or are you okay, do you need us to call you back. If I told them I needed coffee, that I felt pretty confident that they would call me back with it and I would be okay.

Q Okay. And I might ask you about that a little bit later.

Let's go back to your ad, did your ad have a picture of you?

- A Yes, they had several pictures of me.
- **Q** Were they sort of sexy picture?
- A Yeah.
- **Q** Did it describe some of the services that you might be able to provide to somebody who is interested?

A I mean it basically, from what I remember, the few that I have seen from the company. It was more like, Oh, I'm just there to keep you company, there to you give you a good time. You know, like, I'm beautiful, whatever. You know all that kind of stuff was said in the ad, but never really full disclosure on, like, what's to be offered and what's not.

Q Okay. How about cost, was cost in the ad?

A I don't recall if cost was ever in the ad, but it was also discussed at least with a client from the operators end. That was something that they always discussed before I got there and met the client. Just so that I wasn't the one having to have that conversation with them.

Q How many did you charge for the type of services you described, the striptease?

Q (BY MR. FREEMAN) Can you read the numbers off the bottom of those on that sticker?

A Yeah, it's Exhibit 8, and then do you need me to read the case number?

- **Q** No, what's the next one?
- A Exhibit 82 and Exhibit 9.
- **Q** (BY MR. FREEMAN) I'm sorry, let's just talk about 8 and 9. I think I handed them to you a little bit out of order. Do you recognize what's depicted in 8 and 9?

A I don't know if Colorado Beauties was a different site that my former employer Cedric used, but I was only ever advertised on Denver Ladies and Backpage to my knowledge.

Q Okay. And do you recognize the ad as being either one of those?

A Not this particular ad. At least not at the top here. But these are the pictures that they usually used for me.

- **Q** Are these the type of ads that were put on the Internet for you by Denver Ladies?
 - A Yeah, yeah.
 - **Q** Similar to those?
 - A Yeah, this is basically a standard ad for me.
 - **Q** And you said you recognize those pictures as

Yeah, these pictures used in the ad, those are Drawing your attention back to that evening, July 31st, were you working as --I want to make sure I use your job title right. How did you want to be job titled, dancer, entertainer? Were you working as an entertainer that evening? At some point did you get a call from your dispatcher indicating you that you had somebody named Eric who was interested in you and they lived in Lakewood? I did receive a phone call about that. Usually they would just call and say, Hey, I had a call for you and I would say okay, get off the phone and text And by texting you the information, the address? And do you remember the particular address that

you were sent to in Lakewood that evening?

Α Not the number, but I do remember West Eastman

Place or something to that effect.

Q Is that a part of town that you were familiar with back then?

A No, I mean, I kind of drove all over the place with that job. So I kind of knew about the area, like, towards the highway, but not anywhere near his neighborhood.

- **Q** Okay. And had you ever been dispatched to this specific address and this person Eric before?
 - A No, this was the first time I ever met him.
- **Q** And do you recall about what time it was that you were told that you were to meet Mr. Eric?
 - A I don't recall.
 - **Q** Okay. Was it evening? Was it afternoon?
 - A It was evening, yeah.
 - **Q** Okay. And did you go to that address?
 - A I did, yes.
- **Q** And prior to getting there, did you speak over the phone with Eric, with the client?
- A No, I did not. My operator only took my calls. So first initial contact that I had with any of my clients was meeting face-to-face.
- **Q** Okay. And when you met face-to-face, was that at the address at the unit that was texted to you by your dispatcher?

1 Yeah. Yeah, sometimes it was a house or 2 apartment, a restaurant even, it didn't matter, but that's 3 where I would go. 4 0 Okay. On this particular evening, you said the 5 first time you spoke to him is when you met him 6 face-to-face? 7 Α Yes. 8 Q Do you remember the type of residence, the type 9 of complex it was that you went to? 10 It was like, it was kind of like a duplex-style 11 apartment. 12 Q Okay. 13 Doors on either end. Α 14 Did you have any trouble finding his particular 0 15 door or his particular unit? 16 I think I wandered for a second, but I ended up Α 17 finding it so... 18 0 What kind of vehicle were you driving back then? 19 Α I think I had my Volkswagen Passat back then. 20 Q Do you remember what color it was? 21 Α It was gray. 22 Just so we're clear, did you arrive alone? Q 23 Α Yes, I did, yeah. 24 Q Do you remember where you parked?

If his door -- if you're facing this way, that's

25

Α

```
2
      apartment.
 3
           Q
                 A short walking distance from his apartment?
 4
           Α
                 Yeah. A short walk, yeah.
 5
                 When you got there, just when you were outside,
           0
 6
      could you hear anything going on or was it quiet?
 7
           Α
                 It was quiet.
 8
           Q
                 You knocked on the door?
9
           Α
                 Um-hum.
10
                 Somebody answered?
           Q
11
           Α
                 Yes, he answered.
12
                 When you say "he"?
           Q
13
                 Eric St. George.
           Α
14
                 Do you see him in court today?
           Q
15
           Α
                 Yes.
16
           Q
                 Okay. And can you tell us where he's sitting
17
      and what he's wearing?
18
                 He's sitting right there (indicated) and wearing
           Α
19
      that suit.
20
                 I've got three guys in suits. Can you tell me
21
      what shirt, what color shirt?
22
           Α
                 Blue shirt, dark tie, dark coat.
                A little bit longer hair than the other two?
23
           Q
24
           Α
                 Yes, yes.
25
                 MR. FREEMAN: Judge, may the record reflect
```

his door, then I parked more towards the right end of the

1

she's identified the defendant.

THE COURT: The record reflects.

Q (BY MR. FREEMAN) When you went to is apartment, was anybody else there. I'm going to call him the defendant from now on. Was there anybody else there besides the defendant?

A No, it was just me and him.

Q Okay. Did he invite you in?

A Yeah.

Q And what was the initial conversation?

A Well, I always, you know, was really friendly when I walked into a client's house. So I was very friendly with him. I gave him a hug, you know, asked him how he was and all that, and we walked into his kitchen and we began talking, kind of about, what I offered and what I don't.

Q Okay. And during that conversation, was there any point at which you became concerned that he might want sexual services that you weren't willing to provide?

A Yeah. Not initially when I kind of described what it was that I did offer and that my, you know, operators, unfortunately, we're not always very up front. That's when I kind of realized that he was looking for something a bit more than what I was willing to offer.

Q And how did you deal with that?

A I described to him, you know, what I do offer. I asked him if he wanted to keep me. He said, No. I said then I do have to call my agency and let them know that this was going on and that they were going to try and kind of coax him into keeping me, you know, and that's what we did. We called my agency.

- **Q** Okay. Did you use your cell phone?
- A Yes. I did, yes.
- **Q** Was it on speakerphone?

A Yeah, I did put it on speakerphone at one point. Kind of at the beginning of the initial conversation. From the tapes that I had, it sounds like I took it off of speakerphone and that sounds about right to me. I usually would put it on speakerphone after they, you know, said what they needed to say to them, and it was more of a private conversation between me and her at that point.

- **Q** Okay. Do you remember the name of the dispatcher that was on the phone with you that night?
- A Daundrea Bryant. I never really met any of my operators so...
- **Q** Was that somebody that you had dealt with in that line of work?
 - A Yeah, she had booked calls for me before.
- **Q** Okay. So did you participate, or at least, listen in to the defendant's call with Daundrea?

A No, no, no. I never heard it until I was shown it later.

Q Okay. During that call, did it appear that she was able to convince him to keep you?

A Yes, uh-hum, yeah.

Q And did he indicate to you that he was willing to keep you?

A Yes.

Q Despite your representation that you would not provide any sexual services?

A Yes.

Q You mentioned earlier this sort of safety protocol that you had about asking for coffee. Can you explain a little bit more about that?

A Yes. So basically once I checked in and, you know, I let me company know that I was there, that I was with a client, that I collected my money and all that kind of stuff. They asked, would you like any coffee, which was code for, do you want me to call you in 10 or 15 minutes and check on you. And that night I did request coffee so...

Q Why is that?

A Because I felt uncomfortable. There was just something very off about the environment and just something not right.

Q Can you explain what was it about the environment that made you uncomfortable?

A I mean, there was like a full tent set up in the living room. He had already expressed what he was looking for and, you know, even though -- just because you're going to keep the girl in front of you, doesn't mean you're not going to try something later. So, you know, just for my own safety, I wanted to get that second call back.

Q Okay.

A Yeah.

Q You just said that he expressed what he was looking for. What did he say he wanted?

A He used the words "full-service," which was kind of the terminology that one would use for, like, a full -- like an escort, like a prostitute, I guess. That's the services that they provide.

Q Okay. So did you take his request for full-service to mean that he wanted sexual intercourse?

A Yes. Or any kind of sexual contact, you know, rather to touch me or to -- for me to touch him, something like that but, no.

Q Okay. Now, let's back up a little bit.

A Yeah.

Q When you first walked into the apartment,

describe what he's wearing? 1 2 He had on, like, a light pare of shorts. I 3 don't remember what color his shirt was. 4 0 Okay. Dressed casually? 5 Α Yeah, very casual. 6 Do you recall if he was drinking any alcohol? Q 7 I do recall him taking, like, a couple sips of Α 8 wine out of a glass, but nothing that would make me think 9 that he was, you know, overly intoxicated. 10 0 Okay. Did you drink any alcohol when you were 11 there? 12 Α No. 13 Q Had you drank any alcohol or taken any drugs 14 before you got to his unit? 15 No, I do not get intoxicated. I would never get 16 intoxicated doing that type of work that I was doing. 17 0 Okay. Have you been around people that are 18 intoxicated? 19 Α Oh, yeah. 20 0 Do you know some of the outward symptoms that 21 people display who are intoxicated? 22 Α Yeah, slurring, can't stand very well, kind of 23 doesn't make a lot of sense.

Rambling, that kind of thing.

24

25

Q

Α

Okay.

Q When you were in the defendant's unit, did he appear to be intoxicated to you?

A Not -- not like overly intoxicated. I can't really say that he was or wasn't, but not outwardly, like, blatantly.

Q Okay. I know it's hard to quantify, I'm not asking like how many drinks he had or something like that.

A Yeah.

Q But maybe on a scale of one to ten, one being completely sober, ten being like passed out drunk? Just give us an idea.

- A Maybe two or three.
- **Q** Okay.
- A He really didn't strike me as intoxicated.
- **Q** But drinking a little bit but not intoxicated?
- A Yeah.
- **Q** So you're there, you describe the services you're going to provide. You said there was a tent in the living room. Did you also see a very large aquarium?
 - A Yes, I did, yeah.
- **Q** Did you notice when you were in his unit any firearms, and when I say "firearms," handguns, rifles?

A No, that was usually something that I looked for right off the bat, and I never saw anything like that. I mean, once we were in the bedroom, I was more concerned

A Well, you know, we're talking, I'm kind of like, you know, trying to joke around and everything like lighten the mood because that was obviously just a very awkward phone call me and him just went through. Yeah --no, then I guess I began my show, so I started the striptease.

Q Okay. And where were you when you did that?

A He was laying on the bed and then I was on top of him.

Q Okay. And so were you physically touching him?

A I was like straddling him, you know, kind of like rubbing his chest and stuff like that, and, yeah, that's kind of the position.

Q Before you started doing this striptease, did you ever tell him any do's and don'ts or lay any ground rules?

A I mean, I made it very clear that during -- before the whole phone conversation with my operator had happened, that, like, I'm not going to touch you down there, you're not going to touch me down there. That's not going to happen.

Q Okay.

A So, I mean, I feel like I set the ground rules not in the bedroom but prior to that.

Q That was out in the kitchen?

A Yes, yeah.

Q Okay. And what happened as you started doing the striptease?

A You know, he's got his hands on my thighs and stuff like that, which, you know, is okay with me, that's fine. That's something that I'm okay with. And then his hands started to wander towards my genitals, I guess, and I pulled his hand back once and was like, no, we're not going to do that. And he seemed okay with it, and he was like, okay, whatever.

And, you know, just went on about the show and he proceeded to do it again. And I told him that I didn't want to have to warn him again, that please don't do that, like I don't want that. And then he got a little bit more aggressive and really grabbed me that time, you know, on my genitals, and then I pushed him off and let hem know that I was leaving.

Q Okay. Let me back up a little bit. When you started the striptease, was he still wearing the same clothes that he answered the door in?

A I took off his shirt, and I believe he took off his pants before he got onto the bed, so he was in his boxers.

- **Q** What color were the boxers?
- A Black.

1 So he's just wearing boxers, not wearing Q 2 anything else? 3 Α No. 4 0 Okay. And you describe you're sort of 5 straddling him, his hands on your thighs. The first time 6 he touches your genital area, what are your wearing at 7 that point? 8 I'm wearing a bra and my panties because I only had a dress on. So it was very quick to come off, I 9 10 guess. 11 0 Okay. Does he touch in your genital area over 12 your panties? 13 Yes, yeah. Α 14 Okay. And do you recall which hand he used to 0 15 do that and how he did that? 16 I don't really --Α 17 I don't want to embarrass you, but it's 0 18 important. 19 Α I don't recall which hand he used. 20 Q What did you tell him when he did that? 21 Α No, that's not allowed, that's against the 22 rules. 23 Do you recall telling him to watch his hands? Q 24 Α Yeah. 25 Q How long until he touched you the second time

He said, "No, you can't leave. You can't

1

25

Α

down there?

leave," and, you know, he's saying, "Effy, Effy, please wait, please wait." I put my dress on and he said, "Well, you can't leave," and I'm like, "Well, I'm leaving." And he said, "Well, you still have my money." And I said, "I don't care."

And I walked -- and I started to try and leave the door. He walked in front of the doorway, and I had to push past him.

- **Q** So you said you had his money, how much had he paid you?
 - A He paid me the 220 for the hour.
 - **Q** And that was in cash?
 - A Yes.
 - **Q** And what part of the unit did that take place?
 - A That happened in the kitchen.
 - **Q** Okay.
 - A Yeah.
- **Q** And before there was any striptease or anything, he pays you up front?
 - A Yeah, that's the way it works, yes.
- **Q** Okay. So then you go to leave and he says, You can't leave, you've got my money?
- A Yeah, and in my mind, you know, the show is pretty much halfway over anyway and you're inappropriate, so I don't care if that's your money, it's mine now.

1 And I was going to ask you, do you know about Q 2 how long you had been there when you got up to leave? 3 Α About half an hour. 4 0 And you said that he sort of stood in the 5 doorway, is this the doorway --6 Α To his bedroom. 7 Q Okay. 8 Α Yeah. 9 0 That leads out into the hall? 10 Α That leads out in the hallway to the kitchen 11 area toward the front door. 12 Did he physically block you from leaving his Q 13 bedroom? 14 He stood in front of the doorway and I pushed Α 15 past him. I wouldn't say he got physical with me. 16 0 So you didn't have to use a lot of force to get 17 by? 18 No. Α 19 Q What did you do once you got out of the bedroom? 20 Α I went straight for the door and then started to 21 go to my car and I began to call my agency and let them 22 know that this was not a safe place and I was leaving. 23 And you might have mentioned this, but before 24 you left his bedroom, did you put your dress back on? 25 Α Yeah, I did.

Did you have all your personal -- like your You said you called your dispatcher, do you know As I was walking out of the door to leave, that's when I was on the phone with her. She answered The area just outside his front door, can It's like here's the front door, and it's kind of like this little, like, weird turndown like this Okay. Is it like an outdoors -- it's outside his unit, but is it sort of a covered hallway? Yeah, it's a covered hallway and then a walkway THE COURT: Mr. Freeman, we're going to have to stop for a second. I'm going to ask the jury to step out for just a minute so we can discuss an issue. MR. FREEMAN: Okay. Do you want Ms. Elliott to

1 2 MR. FREEMAN: Okay. 3 4 5 6 like, seven o'clock. 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 down. 17 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 18 19 evening. 20 21 22 23 MR. FREEMAN: All right. 24 25 (The witness was excused.)

timing and the long day that the jury has had today. THE COURT: So my thought is we're not going to be able to complete this witness today? MR. FREEMAN: No, not unless we stay until, THE COURT: I was thinking that it would be a lengthy time and I wanted to find a good place for you to stop. So my thought was we invite the jury back in, perhaps a couple more questions and then I'm going to tell them that we're going to stop for the evening. MR. FREEMAN: Judge, it's fine. We've already broken, if you want to call it right now. I don't know that there's a better place to stop, that's fine. THE COURT: Okay. Then we'll have you step THE COURT: So we're going to stop for the I'm going to give -- the jury is going to come back -- you can go ahead. We're going to give -- I'm going to give the jury instructions, and then I'm going to have the jury back here at 8:30 tomorrow morning so... THE COURT: The witness can be excused.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. St George?

MR. ST. GEORGE: I'm fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I just didn't want to do that all in front of the jury. So we'll bring the jury back out.

(The jury entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Everybody be seated, please.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sorry for the interruption we just had. I needed to speak with the attorneys a little bit about scheduling and it's really a good time to stop for the evening. It's been a very long day.

So this is what's going to happen, you're going to go home, people are going to say to you, You were there all day. You must be on a jury. If you could tell them, yes, and I'll tell you all about it at the conclusion of the case.

Please don't discuss the case with anyone in any way you could consider, electronically, old school speaking, don't discuss the case in any way. Don't do any research about the case. Don't take a drive to any locations you've heard about. Keep an open mind and we will begin at 8:30 tomorrow morning.

If you would gather at the area by the elevator overlooking the atrium, we'll take you into the courtroom.

I generally have other matters at eight o'clock, so we'll bring you back. So if you could be here at 8:30, we'll resume testimony. Thanks so much.

(The jury left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything -- any issues we need to deal with right now?

MR. FREEMAN: Judge, just one concern.

Defendant mentioned in his opening statement that they
apparently have some recorded phone call with Ms. Elliott.

I don't know what his intention is, whether he intends to play it or not. Obviously, we don't have a copy. I would object to it being played unless we get a chance to hear it first. So just to bring that to the Court's attention. I don't know what they've got and I don't know what they're intentions are.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Wow. Your Honor, the recording that I mentioned is in discovery. It was one of the very first items that was ever given to me. We have a copy. We're more than welcome to return a copy back to the People if they need one, and I have no intentions of playing it unless I need it in order to impeach the witness.

THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. St George, what you're saying is the recording that you referenced was in discovery?

1 MR. ST. GEORGE: Yes, Your Honor. 2 MR. FREEMAN: All right. No worries, I thought 3 they that had something they made up on their own. 4 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So if we could 5 have Mr. St George back here about 8:20 tomorrow morning, 6 that would be great. We're going to start testimony at 7 8:30. 8 MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I have one other 9 question I was going to ask. Is it possible, I can't 10 foresee that we're going to spend the entirety of tomorrow 11 working with Ms. Elliott. Could we have an idea of who we 12 intend to call afterwards? 13 THE COURT: Do you have the next witness, 14 Mr. Freeman, after Ms. Elliott? 15 MR. FREEMAN: Let's see. I think I've got it up 16 right here. So probably we'll go to Agent Brennan, 17 Sergeant Muller, Sergeant Maines, I think we've got Agent 18 Lawcock as well for tomorrow. Possibly we'll get to Agent 19 Trimmer/Meyers. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks very much. We'll see 21 everyone back here tomorrow morning. 22 MR. MENGES: 8:30, Judge? 23 THE COURT: 8:20 for us. 24 MR. MENGES: 8:20. 25 (The proceedings concluded at 5:03 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

transcription of my stenotype notes taken in my capacity

as the Court Reporter for the First Judicial District

Court, County of Jefferson, State of Colorado.

The above and foregoing is a true and accurate

February, 2019.

*This is an electronically signed transcript.

RICHAEL M. SILVIA

Dated at Golden, Colorado this 10th day of

Registered Professional Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter

Colorado Realtime Certified Reporter