## COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, ss.

SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT OF THE TRIAL COURT SUCR 2000-10975

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

-vs-

JURY TRIAL DAY TWO

JASON ROBINSON

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE: ROUSE, J

## APPEARANCES:

ROBERT TOCHKA, Esquire, Assistant District Attorney, for the Commonwealth

MICHAEL DOOLIN, Esquire, for Defendant Robinson
TIMOTHY FLAHERTY, Esquire, for Defendant Anderson

March 20, 2002 Boston, Massachusetts

Mary M. Wrighton Official Court Reporter

## INDEX

	TIW	<u>NESSES</u> :	PAGE
	EDW.	ARD LAUREANO	
		direct examination by Mr. Tochka cross examination by Mr. Doolin cross examination by Mr. Flaherty	148 166 176
		* * * *	
	EXH	IBITS:	
	No.	1 - aerial photograph marked and admitted	158
	No.	2 - photograph marked and admitted	163
	No.	<pre>3 - photograph marked and admitted</pre>	165
	No.	4 - photograph marked and admitted	167
	No.	5 - photograph marked and admitted	168
-	No.	6 - photograph marked and admitted	169
	No.	<pre>7 - photograph marked and admitted</pre>	170
	No.	<pre>8 - photograph marked and admitted</pre>	171

(Whereupon, the proceedings were reconvened at 9:20 o'clock a.m., without the jury.)

THE COURT: Alright. Let's turn to the motions that need attention. Mr. Flaherty, I'm a little puzzled, sir, why you filed today motions in limine after I have had several pretrial conferences in this matter asking whether there were any motions and, if so, that we could have resolved them prior to trial and, except for the amendment which you have given me pursuant to our discussion yesterday, I don't understand why I'm getting these for the first time.

MR. FLAHERTY: Well, the motion of crime scene photos and autopsy photos is duplicative with Mr. Tochka's -- excuse me, with Mr. Doolin's so the Court need not concern itself with that independently. The motion to redact plea agreement is also duplicative, need not concern itself with that. There was some discovery provided last week and that relates to the motion to exclude credit card receipts. The prior bad acts, the visitation and phone records from the house of correction --

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
,	2

THE COURT: Sir, I don't want to catalog these. I want to know why it was you didn't give them to me earlier.

MR. FLAHERTY: Because I received the discovery after the date for the motions in limine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's move on to the motions first. One concerns the photo arrays.

Mr. Tochka, is there any opposition to this, sir?

MR. TOCHKA: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

Your Honor, just for the record, and I want to

put it for the record, that discovery was turned

over, my brother had access to the discovery way

before the motions in limine.

THE COURT: There were no issues raised to me about discovery not being provided in a timely way so I'm going to move past that. The point still stands that these motions are well past the point when we could have, in due course, considered them and resolved them without taking up the jury's time. So let's move on to resolve the motions that we need to resolve at this time.

Let's begin with the motion concerning

1	photo arrays.
2	MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, with respect
3	to the motion as to photo arrays, I suggest it's
4	an issue as to the fact that I would be
5	attempting to get the photo arrays into evidence.
6	THE COURT: Okay. These are photo
7	arrays, Mr. Tochka, which you intend to show
. 8	various witnesses which include the photo or
9	photos of one or both of the defendants?
10	MR. TOCHKA: Of Tanzerius Anderson.
11	THE COURT: Just of Tanzerius Anderson?
12	MR. TOCHKA: Just of Tanzerius
13	Anderson.
14	THE COURT: These are so-called mug
15	shots?
16	MR. TOCHKA: Yes, Your Honor, they are.
17	THE COURT: Fine. Alright. Thank you.
18	Mr. Flaherty?
19	MR. FLAHERTY: As to the photo arrays,
20	Your Honor, I think the testimony will be that
21	Eddie Gauthier knew Tanzerius Anderson, met him
22	on several occasions prior to the event and, with
23	respect to the witness, Eddie Gauthier, I think
24	the mug shots are irrelevant and they may

1.0

prejudice the jury against Mr. Anderson in that it may cause them to infer some bad character of Mr. Anderson when his picture appears in a mug shot. There is no issue of identification, that Tanzerius Anderson is Tanzerius Anderson. He's known to the witnesses, Joleena Tate, Eddie Gauthier, Heather Coady, and those are the witnesses who select by identifying — by initialing his photograph in the mug shots, Mr. Anderson's photos.

This is not an identification case,

Your Honor, and I think in those circumstances

that, to admit this evidence, would be

prejudicial against Mr. Anderson.

THE COURT: For what purpose are you offering them, Mr. Tochka?

MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, I suggest that the evidence will show that in terms of identification as to Tanzerius Anderson, I would suggest that it's an issue only in the sense that the witnesses will testify they knew Jason Robinson, they grew up with Jason Robinson. As to Tanzerius Anderson, the testimony will be that when the witness approached — one of the

witnesses approached the detectives and had a Conversation, saying that Jason Robinson, who he knows, was with a person by the name of Tee who he did not know, he had only seen him a couple times before. At this point in time the detectives then did further investigation, got the license plate number of Tanzerius Anderson through the witness, then presented a photo array and showed it to the witness. The witness had only seen him approximately, I believe he said three times before.

THE COURT: What we are going to do is this, you will make the appropriate redactions with respect to the photo arrays. I will give a limiting instruction at the time that you are intending to introduce them, Mr. Tochka.

MR. TOCHKA: Yes.

THE COURT: At the time they are introduced as well as in the charge. The defendant's motion concerning credit card receipts, do you intend to introduce these, Mr. Tochka?

MR. TOCHKA: No, Your Honor, I don't.

THE COURT: Okay. So is there any

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

opposition to this motion, sir?

MR. TOCHKA: No, there is not. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Allowed without opposition. With respect to the motion to exclude visitation, telephone records maintained by the house of correction, do you intend to introduce evidence of this, sir?

MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, it all depends on the witnesses. In connection with this case, I provided both my brothers with visitation records. I'm not sure what the witnesses are going to say. There is one particular witness, Heather Coady, who this Court has heard from who, she now has an attorney, Mr. Freeman. Assuming that she is going to testify consistently with what she said in grand jury, I don't believe that I would be introducing them. Assuming that she begins to recant what she said in the grand jury, I would be introducing them for the fact that she was visiting both defendants after she testified before the grand jury, particularly Jason Robinson on a regular basis after she testified.

THE COURT: Let me make sure I

1	understand what you just said. There may not be
2	a need for you to introduce these. You will make
3	a determination in the course of the testimony of
4	
5	MR. TOCHKA: Yes.
6	THE COURT: But you will make no
7	mention of it in openings?
8	MR. TOCHKA: I had no intention of it.
9	THE COURT: Thank you very much. Mr.
10	Flaherty, I'm going to reserve this, sir, until
11	it becomes an issue, if it does, and before Mr.
12	Tochka does raise the issues in this motion, we
13	will all go to side bar and I'll hear you at that
14	time.
15	MR. FLAHERTY: Thank you.
16	THE COURT: That is reserved. Alright.
17	With respect to the plea agreement, have there
18	been any stipulations or agreements among counsel
19	concerning what portions of the plea agreement
20	should be redacted?
21	MR. TOCHKA: No, Your Honor, there have
22	not. I have looked at the plea agreement, I've
23	looked over the Champa case. I'm familiar with
24	the Champa case. As a matter of fact, I had seen

the plea agreement in the Champa case when it was drafted. At the time my recollection is that the plea agreement in Champa — unfortunately it's not in the decision by the SJC, the actual plea agreement, but that plea agreement spoke to the witness's obligation to testify truthfully and the like many more times than is referred to in this particular agreement. I suggest, as Champa says, the Court could give an instruction explaining that this — that the Commonwealth has no way of knowing one way or the other whether this witness is telling the truth or the like, or the instruction that's required in Champa.

I would suggest to the Court that it's kind of — bottom line, Your Honor, that it is not so repetitive in the agreement that it needs to be redacted and, on occasion — I know the last trial I had, none of it was redacted. I'm aware of another trial where it was redacted and when you looked at the agreement, when you looked at it, it didn't even make sense because, as a juror looking at this agreement afterwards, trying to figure out why particular words are missing, it kind of makes it look kind of

1	suggestive as to what's going on.
2	THE COURT: Well, you understand that
3	the Champa case says that you are not to
4	introduce this in the course of direct
5	examination of the witness.
6	MR. TOCHKA: The agreement itself?
7	THE COURT: Yes.
8	MR. TOCHKA: Yes.
9	THE COURT: And that only after cross
10	examination and on redirect, if that's
11	appropriate and necessary, would I consider the
12	introduction of this as an exhibit.
13	MR. TOCHKA: Correct. I understand
14	that.
15	THE COURT: But it is your intention to
16	use the content of this with Joleena Tate?
17	MR. TOCHKA: Yes.
18	THE COURT: During her testimony?
19	MR. TOCHKA: Yes.
20	THE COURT: And to what extent were you
21	proposing to elicit from her portions of the plea
22	agreement?
23	MR. TOCHKA: Simply that she, in
24	references to the truthfulness, that she

understands her obligation under this agreement to testify truthfully and that she understands if she should — if it's determined that she was not truthful, then the agreement is null and void and that's it. I would not repeat that a thousand times over.

THE COURT: Alright. Mr. Flaherty?

MR. FLAHERTY: I think that it's repeated -- Your Honor has seen the exhibit, the proposed exhibit. It's repeated several times in the exhibit itself. I would ask that the Commonwealth be precluded from referring to it, the truthfulness portion of the agreement, during its questioning of Ms. Tate and, further, I would request the limiting instruction that I contain in my motion that appears in United States versus Rollo Angiulo (phonetic spelling). That's contained on page two of my motion.

THE COURT: Well, let's back up a moment, Mr. Tochka. Because, as I understand the Champa case, sir, you may, on direct examination of Ms. Tate, elicit that she has entered into a plea agreement with the Commonwealth and that she generally understands her obligations as set

forth in the agreement. I do not understand the Champa case to say that you are also entitled to elicit expressly from Ms. Tate that her obligations under the agreement are to testify truthfully and, if I have misread the case in any way or limited it, I would be happy to have that pointed out to me.

MR. TOCHKA: I see the Court referring to it. It's on page 264 and I do have that. I understand the Court's position and the case law and I would stick to what the Court has just said, that the witness generally understands the obligations, although I'm not sure if the opinion spells it out because when you say to a witness that, you understand your obligations under the agreement, without the witness responding to what the witness's obligations are, it really won't make sense to a jury, if the Court follows what I'm getting at.

THE COURT: I do. I do. Off the record a minute.

(Whereupon, a discussion occurred off the record.)

THE COURT: In other words, the point

is that it is not — the case law says that the witness can testify she generally understands her obligations. There is no express reference here that that would include a specific reference by the witness that she understands her obligation is to testify truthfully.

Now, the issue is to what extent will the jury perceive your eliciting that from the

Now, the issue is to what extent will the jury perceive your eliciting that from the witness as a particular vouching for her credibility and suggesting to the jury the government knows something more about that than they are going to be able to evaluate in the courtroom. So because she is an important witness, we have to be very careful about that.

MR. TOCHKA: Right.

THE COURT: So I think what we're left with at this time is that you may say, get from her that there is a plea agreement, that she understands generally what her obligations are pursuant to it, that you may have much broader leeway, latitude on redirect.

MR. TOCHKA: That's fine.

going to be vigorous cross examination.

MR. TOCHKA: That's fine, Your Honor.

I understand the Court.

THE COURT: So I think that is the confines that we should probably stay within.

That's fine.

MR. TOCHKA:

THE COURT: Alright. With respect to redaction, there is no issue of the admission of this at this time and there may never be an issue of this. It would arise only upon the conclusion of direct examination, upon redirect examination at which time I will make the decision about which portions are to be redacted if counsel cannot agree and I will hear you further at that time, if necessary.

Mr. Flaherty, are you requesting a limiting instruction at the time Ms. Tate testifies or did you make reference to one in the course of the charge?

MR. FLAHERTY: I'd actually request it at the time Ms. Tate testifies and also in the final charge, Your Honor. I would contain an instruction in my proposed jury instructions for the Court, but I would also request one at the time Ms. Tate testifies because of, you know, the

1	issue of vouching.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Tochka, did you have
3	any is she your first witness, sir?
4	MR. TOCHKA: No, she's not.
5	THE COURT: She won't be on today?
6	MR. TOCHKA: I don't believe that she
7	will be.
8	THE COURT: Rather than take more time,
9	if you have any amendments to the limiting
10	instruction or anything else you want me to say,
11	you can give that to me tomorrow morning.
12	MR. TOCHKA: That's fine.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Alright.
14	Defendant's motion to require the prosecution to
15	elect theory of case prior to trial. Mr. Tochka
16	has said that he is proceeding on all three
17	theories of first degree murder, Mr. Flaherty.
18	MR. FLAHERTY: Your Honor, as to that,
19	I just identified it and ask the Court to
20	consider it. I understand Mr. Tochka's theory, I
21	understand the case law in this area. I think
22	it's most appropriate for the government to elect
23	a theory, if there is a specific theory that the
24	government is moving on. I understand they have

a right to move on separate theories.

I would just ask the Court, in its discretion, that at the close of the government's case to allow the defendants to test the weight of that evidence under the Lattimore standard as to both deliberate premeditation and extreme atrocity and cruelty. My understanding of the evidence as it exists right now is that there is a single wound which causes death and as to the deliberately premeditated malice aforethought, I think it's a real question for the Court to decide, but --

THE COURT: Well, certainly that can be part of your argument on a motion for required finding at the conclusion of the prosecution's case. I'm not requiring — they have a right to proceed on one, two or three theories of first degree murder at this time and we'll see whether there's any issues in that regard to be resolved at the conclusion of the plaintiff's case.

Defendant's motion regarding the crime scene and autopsy photographs. I had viewed the autopsy photographs last week. Mr. Tochka told me, I think, at that time that he may not use

1	them all. Have you made an election at this
2	time, sir?
3	MR. TOCHKA: I have, Your Honor, and
4	rather than take the Court's time while we're
5	going on the view, while we go on the view, I'll
6	talk with counsel and show them the photographs
. 7	and then we can deal with it that way.
8	THE COURT: Is that agreeable, counsel?
9	MR. DOOLIN: Yes, Your Honor.
10	MR. FLAHERTY: Yes, it is, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Alright. Defendant's
12	motion concerning the use of a three fifty-seven
13	magnum as a chalk. Mr. Tochka, what's your
14	intention with respect to that, sir?
15	MR. TOCHKA: Yes, Your Honor. I
16	alerted both counsel that the particular weapon
17	that was used in the case has not been located.
18	It's a three fifty-seven with a four inch barrel
19	that was stolen from Joleena Tate, the witness we
20	previously spoke of, her father's house about
21	forty-eight hours or so or seventy-two hours
22	before the particular murder in the case.
23	I would submit it's relevant in terms

of, for the jurors in this particular case,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

because one of the things the Commonwealth has to prove is the barrel length and the like of a particular gun, and I'd suggest that by showing them a similar gun, that would be evidence for the jury in order to make a decision in the case. Particularly, there's questions in terms of the defendant, how he had the gun, how he used the gun, how he positioned the gun and the like, and the expert in the case, Sergeant Vickers, it would assist him when he testifies as an expert ballistician in explaining to the jurors this particular weapon, how it fires, the trigger pattern on the weapon, the revolver aspect of the weapon, and a number of other things. assist in his explanation to the jurors. He is the only one that's THE COURT:

going to be handling it?

MR. TOCHKA: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FLAHERTY: Your Honor, the defendants strenuously object to the use of a three fifty-seven magnum as a chalk in the case. There has been, as Mr. Tochka correctly pointed out, no discovery of any weapon in the homicide.

Secondly, the ballistics evidence recovered at the scene of 89 Faneuil Street and also at autopsy of Mr. Yazbek cannot be identified or linked to a three fifty-seven magnum.

Thirdly, the cooperating witness for the government, this Joleena Tate, in my review of her prior statements and testimony before the grand jury, the best that she gives the government is that she believes possibly the weapon used was a three fifty-seven magnum stolen, allegedly stolen from New Hampshire sometime earlier, prior to the homicide.

There is absolutely no connection
between the homicide and a three fifty-seven
magnum. The pathologist will not be able to
testify, I expect, and has not rendered an
opinion based upon his observations of the
injuries to Mr. Yazbek at autopsy, that these
injuries are consistent with having been caused
by a three fifty-seven magnum, using three fiftyseven ammunition. In light of all of that
evidence, Your Honor, or, I should say, lack of
evidence, I think it's improper, prejudicial and
highly suggestive to allow the government to use

a firearm, a three fifty-seven firearm, to suggest that this is the murder weapon.

Number one, it's prejudicial and inflammatory to the defendant and, number two, I think that this argument links also with my motion in limine to exclude prior bad acts related to the burglary or the alleged burglary that took place in New Hampshire. Part of the government's theory in the case, they're trying to suggest or they will attempt to suggest through the cooperating witness that sometime prior to the homicide she and Tanzerius Anderson went to New Hampshire, while in New Hampshire they broke into her father's condominium, and during that break, stole a three fifty-seven magnum.

My understanding of the crime scene at the condominium in Conway, New Hampshire was that there were fingerprint prints and footprint impressions recovered. None could be linked to Mr. Anderson. I would suggest that the evidence of the break is unconnected to the homicide, the evidence of an alleged theft of the three fifty-seven magnum. Without any evidence connecting it

to the homicide, both of those events should be excluded in and of themselves and then the use of a three fifty-seven magnum as a demonstrative chalk before the jury is so overwhelmingly prejudicial to the defendant and lacks any probative value because really the lack of any connection between a three fifty-seven and the homicide, that I would ask this Court to preclude the government from the use of that during the trial of these indictments.

THE COURT: Thank you. Will there be a foundation laid, Mr. Tochka, concerning or through expert opinion that the three fifty-seven magnum was used in the murder of Mr. Yazbek?

MR. TOCHKA: Through an expert opinion. the expert opinion, the best an expert opinion would be able to say is that it's a high powered type of weapon that would have been used. In terms of the three fifty-seven magnum, it's seventy-two hours before, Tanzerius Anderson and Joleena Tate go to New Hampshire, about two miles away from the condominium of Joleena Tate's father, on that weekend that gun is stolen, Tanzerius Anderson checks into a hotel under his

own name, the gun is stolen at that weekend, and Joleena Tate will testify that she went up with Tanzerius Anderson, stole the gun with Tanzerius Anderson, and Tanzerius Anderson had possession of the gun.

Then what she'll testify is seventy-two hours later at the time of the homicide, when Tanzerius Anderson gets in to the car after having shot Yazbek, Iman Yazbek, and boasting about what he had just done, took a handgun out of his pocket which she'll testify is the handgun. Obviously, she can't testify it's the identical handgun but common sense would tell you it's the three fifty-seven that they had just stolen seventy-two hours before from her father's house. He takes the handgun out, hands it to Jason Robinson in the back seat. She'll testify that's the handgun that they had stolen from her father's house, that's the handgun used in the homicide. So I would suggest there is a clear connection.

THE COURT: Were you intending to reference this in your opening statement?

MR. TOCHKA: In terms of that they

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

would have a similar handgun, yes, Your Honor, I would, and just for the record, I would not attempt to have the handgun admitted into evidence or to go to the jurors in terms of deliberations. It would only be a demonstration by the detective.

THE COURT: Well, I'll reserve this,
but you may reference in your opening statement.
and I will, prior to Detective Vickers taking the
stand, give you a final ruling as to whether it
can be displayed. Alright?

MR. TOCHKA: That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright. Prior bad acts.

MR. FLAHERTY: This is the motion, Your Honor, that's directed to the burglary and alleged theft of the firearm that occurred in Conway, New Hampshire. I would suggest that, number one, there's serious issues of credibility as to the cooperating witness that Mr. Anderson was present, had anything to do with it, or, in fact, that it had occurred or did occur at the time the Commonwealth suggests it occurred.

Beyond that, I would suggest that the admission of this type of evidence falls into the

category of prior bad act evidence and cannot be admitted for the purpose, under the Massachusetts rules of evidence and the Commonwealth case law, to show pattern of conduct, motive, absence of mistake, intent or the like. This is a separate criminal event that occurs in a separate jurisdiction that allegedly involves the theft of a firearm that, as I mentioned in my earlier argument, Your Honor, cannot be connected to the homicide in Boston.

I would suggest that this type of criminal conduct should not be admitted. It is highly prejudicial to the defendant. It will impeach his character, prejudice him in the eyes of the jury. There is no nexus between that and the events alleged in the indictment on March 27, 28, 2000 that involve the homicide, armed robbery, and then later intimidation of a witness and this is the type of evidence that should be excluded at this trial.

Now, the Commonwealth's theory of the case is that Tanzerius Anderson and Jason

Robinson acted in concert and committed an armed robbery and, through the course of that armed

robbery, committed a felony murder of Mr. Yazbek.
To allow Joleena Tate to testify to this
unconnected criminal conduct would, in a number
of ways, only prejudice the defendant and impeach
his character. It would contrast significantly
with his statements made to the police during an
interview that he subjected himself to, and is so
overwhelmingly prejudicial that I would ask the
Court to exclude it in light of its lack of
connection and lack of probative value to the
indictments which are the issues before this
inrv

THE COURT: Anything, Mr. Tochka? I'm sorry, Mr. Doolin. Any time you want to add anything --

MR. DOOLIN: Well, respectfully, Judge, I join in Mr. Flaherty's motions that he's brought before the Court today. I don't want to go back over his argument and I'll just rest on what Mr. Flaherty has said.

THE COURT: Alright. Thank you. Mr. Tochka?

MR. TOCHKA: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the Commonwealth would suggest it's

part and parcel, the New Hampshire incident, with the homicide. Even as Mr. Flaherty suggests, the defendant, when he's questioned by the police, initially tells the police that he had not been to New Hampshire in the area of North Conway, New Hampshire, never been up there before, contradicted by the fact that his name is on a receipt up there.

In terms of having a connection to the homicide, it's seventy—two hours before the robbery and the murder. It's also part and parcel because it also goes to in terms of how he came into possession of the gun, how she knows he came into possession of the gun, how she assisted him in getting that particular weapon, and then how that's connected then with this particular homicide. It also all goes to access, how he obtained the gun in the case. I suggest the question goes to the credibility of Joleena Tate before this jury and the jury should hear the whole transaction.

THE COURT: So you're offering this on identity, motive, knowledge?

MR. TOCHKA: Yes, exactly.

1.5

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: What's the difference, Mr. Flaherty, between your first motion and the second motion, sir?

MR. FLAHERTY: The second motion to exclude prior bad acts, Your Honor, relates to statements attributed to Tanzerius Anderson from Joleena Tate. She says that on one occasion several weeks, apparently, prior to this alleged house break and theft of a firearm, that she and Mr. Anderson were having a conversation in an automobile somewhere in Newton and Mr. Anderson made certain statements to her that he wanted to form some type of a criminal enterprise that she says he referred to as being called the commission, that in the course of whatever criminal activity that this group, the commission that she says he called it, would engage itself in, they would use females as bait. I think that that's the first set of statements.

The second set of statements that Ms.

Tate attributes to Mr. Anderson apparently

occurred during a ride home apparently from New

Hampshire when Mr. Anderson told her that he had

been involved in other criminal conduct such as

kidnapping and locking people in the trunk of an automobile. I would suggest that this evidence is highly irrelevant, overwhelmingly prejudicial, lacks any probative value whatsoever, will absolutely prejudice the defendant in the eyes of the jury, is improper character and prior bad act evidence, and really is just, you know, it's piling on that need not come into the case, that has no basis in relevance and/or probative value to the issues in the incident before this jury, and I would ask, most respectfully, that the Court exclude any reference to those two conversations that Joleena Tate says she had with Tanzerius Anderson.

MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, I suggest that it's highly relevant, goes to the whole motivation as to why everyone is in the courtroom on this particular case, because it explains why, basically to explain to a jury why a sixteen—year—old girl, associated with a nineteen—year—old male, all of a sudden on a Monday night says to the male, how about doing a robbery tonight.

It has no explanation as to why a sixteen—year—

old girl would say that to a nineteen-year-old man who she is dating at this point in time other than put in context the reason why she says that is because the defendant had made statements to her that he intended to start up a group called the commission and in order to do that he intended to do various things in terms of obtaining guns and the like.

She then, therefore, in order to curry favor with him, then suggested or there was a suggestion about how her father had guns. As a result of that, then it led to the motivation in terms of him talking about women can be used for bait, she is then saying on that particular night, how about doing a robbery. Without explaining why she's saying on that particular night, how about doing a robbery, the reason for that is because of the conversations she's had with him in the past about doing robberies, setting up individuals for robberies as a part of this group that he intended to form, it has no explanation.

And, Judge, you've heard repeatedly this morning, Joleena Tate's credibility, it's a

huge issue in this particular matter and to explain why a sixteen-year-old girl is saying that to a nineteen-year-old male, you have to put it in context. The only context is what she'll tell you, the context is because of the conversations she had with him that then resulted in her saying to him, how about doing a robbery tonight.

THE COURT: Other than these statements from Tate about the conversations she had with Anderson, you're not intending to elicit any information specifically to the commission of other crimes by these individuals, are you?

MR. TOCHKA: No, no.

THE COURT: Alright. Mr. Flaherty, anything more, sir?

MR. FLAHERTY: I would just rest on my argument, Your Honor, and suggest that it's highly prejudicial. Mr. Tochka offers this as a reason for what Ms. Tate did but I would suggest to this Court that Ms. Tate may have just as compelling reasons to give Mr. Tochka a reason as to why she did this.

THE COURT: Well, I do think that the

Commonwealth should be entitled to give some context to the statement by Tate to Anderson concerning the commission of the crimes at issue in this case. I do not want Tate to testify about any — the commission of any other specific crimes that they may have committed. I will give a limiting instruction if requested to do so at the time of the admission of this, Mr. Flaherty.

MR. FLAHERTY: If I understand your ruling, Your Honor, then you'll allow the government to elicit evidence that Joleena Tate and Tanzerius Anderson had a conversation regarding firearms in New Hampshire and exclude any mention of some type of supposed criminal enterprise he was talking about, according to Tate?

made apparently in Newton, according to Mr.

Tochka, but I'm going to permit him to elicit

from Tate the conversation or conversations she

had with Anderson about forming this commission,

so to speak, and using women as bait and whatever

the content of the conversation was, for the

purpose of giving some context to the background

1	for the commission of these crimes.
2	MR. FLAHERTY: And you're excluding the
3	stuff about kidnapping and locking people in
4	trunks?
5	THE COURT: I have no idea what, at
6	this point what the conversation is going to be
7	and testimony will be about that. I think
8	probably what we ought to do is have a brief voir
9	dire of Tate only on the specific that
10	specific matter.
11	Mr. Tochka, when is she coming on?
12	MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, I expect that
13	she will be testifying sometime tomorrow.
14	THE COURT: Well, at the end of the day
15	we'll arrange perhaps to have that so I know what
16	the full what her testimony will be on that
17	limited point.
18	MR. TOCHKA: That's fine.
19	THE COURT: It's not a far ranging voir
20	dire. It's only on the prior bad act motion.
21	MR. TOCHKA: That's fine.
22	THE COURT: Insofar as it relates to
23	those conversations between Tate and Anderson
24	about forming a commission.

1	MR. TOCHKA: That's fine.
2	THE COURT: Alright. So we will do a
3	short voir dire on that tomorrow.
4	MR. TOCHKA: She should be testifying
5	tomorrow. Hopefully she's being brought in
6	today, although I don't know if the habe went out
7	or not.
8	THE COURT: Where is she? In
9	Framingham?
10	MR. TOCHKA: No, she's in a juvenile
11	facility.
12	THE COURT: Alright. What was your
13	intention with respect to your opening statement?
14	MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, what I'd ask,
15	unless I misunderstood the Court, that I would be
16	able to get into the commission but not the
17	specific acts about kidnapping.
18	THE COURT: Yes, that's right.
19	MR. TOCHKA: So I will just refer to
20	how he wanted to set up a group in which he would
21	use women as bait but not specific acts, how he
22	said he kidnapped individuals.
23	THE COURT: Yes. And we'll flesh out
24	the full content of that when she comes in for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the voir dire. Alright.

Are you requesting a limiting instruction? If so, you can tell me tomorrow morning but I would give one at the time that she may give that testimony.

MR. FLAHERTY: I would, Your Honor, and I guess during the voir dire not only should we inquire into what she should say but also inquire under humane practice.

THE COURT: That's the first time I'm hearing it's a live issue at trial, Mr. Flaherty, but -- is it a live issue at trial?

MR. FLAHERTY: Well, I don't know, Your Honor. I don't know what she is going to testify to about the state of Mr. Anderson. I think the Court, sui sponte, must examine that as to any statements of a criminal defendant made to any person. We discussed it during the motion to suppress the statements given to the police and I suggested that at some point during the trial it may become a live issue.

THE COURT: Mr. Tochka, do you have anything you want to say about that?

> MR. TOCHKA: Yes, Your Honor. I'd

object to that. What Mr. Flaherty, in essence, is saying is that we should have a motion in limine for each one of the witnesses because each one of the three key Commonwealth witnesses, I suggest, are going to give statements allegedly made by Tanzerius Anderson and I suggest that there is no foundation for a motion in limine as to all those three witnesses.

MR. DOOLIN: Judge, may I just be heard respectfully? It goes into what Mr. Flaherty and Mr. Tochka have just been arguing before the Court about this decision about the commission. I've filed a previously denied motion to sever my client's case from that of Tanzerius Anderson and I renew that motion. Respectfully, this conversation as to the commission, I don't think that there is going to be any evidence that my client participated in that conversation or any evidence that links my client to any sort of conversation.

I won't belabor the arguments that I have already made to the Court in the last two weeks in the motions that I've filed but that's another piece of evidence that's going to come

1 in, I suppose in Mr. Tochka's opening and through 2 evidence in the case, of a group that my client 3 is going to be linked to and, respectfully, I move to sever my client's case from that of Mr. 5 Anderson. 6 THE COURT: Well, are you requesting a 7 limiting instruction? 8 MR. DOOLIN: I would be, Your Honor. 9 absolutely would be requesting a limiting 10 instruction but I do, even in requesting that 11 limiting instruction, I do move to sever my 12 client's case respectfully. 13 THE COURT: Well, we have heard 14 argument on that and I have denied that motion. 15 MR. DOOLIN: I bring it again based 16 upon that evidence that's going to come in about 17 the commission, linking my client to some sort of 18 a gang. 19 THE COURT: Well, i'm denying that 20 motion, sir. You may, of course, renew it again 21 if appropriate during the course of the trial. 22 Alright. Any other motions? 23 MR. FLAHERTY: There's just a 24

supplement to the motion in limine, Your Honor.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

What I have done is attached the reports, investigative reports relative to the handwriting exemplar, the sending of the items to the FBI, the analysis report of Mr. Duane and the Yankee Clipper hotel receipt and statement or a portion of a statement of Joleena Tate along with an affidavit of counsel I'd ask the Court to consider under Dauber and Lannigan.

I know the Court said this case is different from Hines because the defendant has not provided any expert testimony to say that this is reliable. I think that it is the proponent's obligation to satisfy for purposes of admissibility the factors under Dauber and adopted by Lannigan and the Court should consider that prior to the introduction of this evidence. This evidence relates to a signature that appears on a hotel receipt that will be attempted to corroborate the testimony that's expected from this cooperating witness and connect the defendant to what I'm calling prior bad act evidence in a different jurisdiction and then tangentially connect him to a suggestion that he had stolen the supposed murder weapon for the

indictments on March 27, 28.

So I would suggest that the obligation rests with the Commonwealth to satisfy this Court that the four factors under Dauber are met prior to admission and in my affidavit, my understanding is that the science or the supposed science of handwriting comparison will fail.

THE COURT: Alright. I have reviewed your affidavit and I don't think it furthers the motion, respectfully. There has to be something put before the Court to put at issue the matter at hand. You have, so to speak, challenged, you have raised in your motion that the Commonwealth should be precluded from introducing expert testimony relating to handwriting comparisons. You have proffered no expert, no excerpts from a deposition of an expert, no affidavit from an expert putting this in issue.

You also have not requested any kind of a hearing at which I could entertain and make some determinations and, respectfully, the affidavit you proffered which, by the way, is unsigned by you, assuming that you have a signed copy somewhere, has not advanced that issue and,

	·
1	in the Hines case, Judge Gertner's case, the
2	defendant proffered an expert who was then cross
3	examined by the government. There was some
4	evidence upon which Judge Gertner could make her
5	determination.
6	So there is really nothing before me
7	here today, and that's where the matter lies and
8	I think it's incumbent upon the party raising the
9	issue to put it before the Court in various ways,
10	and to join the issue with respect to that. I
11	will, however, continue to reserve.
12	When is Mr. Duane coming?
13	MR. TOCHKA: He should be coming
14	tonight, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Pardon?
16	MR. TOCHKA: He should be in at four
17	o'clock today.
18	THE COURT: When are you putting him
19	on?
20	MR. TOCHKA: I had intended to put him
21	on tomorrow. At the rate this trial is
22	proceeding, I think probably Friday.
23	THE COURT: About how long do you
24	expect his testimony to be?

1	MR. TOCHKA: No more than an hour.
2	THE COURT: Alright. Well, I will
3	continue to think about it but it's my position
4	that it's not enough just to file a Dauber
5	motion. There has to be something that is put
6	before the Court so that determinations can be
·7	made, and I also understand you're not cross
8	examining Mr. Duane at a voir dire or you're not
9	examining him in the first instance, so, for all
10	those reasons I'm not going to I'm going to
11	continue to reserve the motion. Alright.
12	Anything else we need to resolve?
13	Would counsel like to make a view opening?
14	MR. DOOLIN: I would.
15	THE COURT: Have you all agreed on the
16	locations that the jury is going to be seeing on
17	the view?
18	MR. TOCHKA: Yes, Your Honor, we have.
19	MR. FLAHERTY: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Can I just see counsel a
21	moment?
22	(Whereupon, a discussion occurred off
23	the record at side bar.)
24	THE COURT: The defendants each waive

their right to go on the view? 2 MR. DOOLIN: Right. 3 THE COURT: And everybody wants to make 4 a view opening? 5 MR. TOCHKA: Yes, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Okay. So we will start 7 momentarily. Thank you. 8 (Whereupon, the proceedings were 9 recessed at 10:00 o'clock a.m., and reconvened at 10 10:15 o'clock a.m.) 11 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd 12 like to welcome you back this morning. Before we 13 go on a view which is going to be to give you an 14 opportunity to see some locations about which 15 you'll be hearing in the course of the trial, 16 there are several preliminaries that we need to 17 do. 18 The first of those is to have the clerk 19 swear you in, this time as jurors who will hear 20 and decide the evidence in this case, and then he 21 is going to read to you the indictments. are the formal criminal charges the Commonwealth 22 23 has brought against each of these defendants.

And then I will be back with you to give you a

few more remarks and then we'll proceed to matters relating to the view.

Thank you again for your attention.

THE CLERK: Jurors, please rise.

(Whereupon, the jury was sworn and impaneled at 10:16 o'clock a.m.)

THE CLERK: I'd ask you please be seated. I'd draw your attention to the following indictments.

Indictment number 2000-10777-001:

"Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Suffolk ss., at the Superior Court, Department of the Trial

Court, for criminal business, begun and holden at the City of Boston within and for the County of Suffolk on the first Monday of July in the year of our Lord two thousand.

The jurors for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on their oath present that:

Tanzerius Anderson, on March 28, 2000, did assault and beat Iman Yazbek with intent to murder him and by such assault and beating did kill and murder Iman Yazbek.

As to 002: "The jurors for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on their oath

present that: Tanzerius Anderson on March 28, 2000, being armed with a dangerous weapon, to-wit, a handgun, did assault Iman Yazbek with intent to rob him and thereby did rob and steal from the person of the said Iman Yazbek money and personal property of said Iman Yazbek."

As to 003: "The jurors for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on their oath, present that: Tanzerius Anderson, on March 28, 2000, did unlawfully and knowingly have in his possession a firearm as defined by General Laws Chapter 140, Section 121, that is, a weapon from which a bullet can be discharged and of which the length of the barrel is less than sixteen inches, the said Tanzerius Anderson not being present in his residence or place of business, not having in effect a license to carry firearms issued under General Laws Chapter 140, Section 131 or 131F, and not complying with the provisions of General Laws 140, Section 129C and 131G."

004: "The jurors for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on their oath present that:

Tanzerius Anderson, on or about the week of March 28, 2000, did directly or indirectly willfully

endeavor by intimidation, force or express or implicit threats of force to influence, impede, obstruct, delay or otherwise interfere with Heather Coady furnishing information to a crime in an investigation relating to a violation of a criminal statute of the Commonwealth."

And 005: "The jurors for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on their oath, present that Tanzerius Anderson, on or about March 28, 2000, armed with a dangerous weapon, to-wit, a knife, did assault Iman Yazbek with intent to rob him and thereby did rob and steal from the person of the said Iman Yazbek money and personal property of the said Iman Yazbek."

Indictment number 2000-11975-001: "The jurors for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on their oath present that: Jason Robinson, on or about March 28, 2000, did assault and beat Iman Yazbek with intent to murder him and by such assault and beating did kill and murder Iman Yazbek."

002: "The jurors for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on their oath present that:

Jason Robinson, on or about March 28, 2000, being

armed with a dangerous weapon, to-wit, a knife, did assault Iman Yazbek with intent to rob him and thereby did rob and steal from the person of said Iman Yazbek money and personal property of the said Iman Yazbek."

of Massachusetts on their oath present that:

Jason Robinson, on or about March 28, 2000, being armed with a dangerous weapon, to-wit, a handgun, did assault Iman Yazbek with intent to rob him and thereby did rob and steal from the person of the said Iman Yazbek."

And 004" The jurors for the

Commonwealth of Massachusetts on their oath

present that: Jason Robinson, on or about March

28, 2000, did unlawfully and knowingly have in

his possession a firearm as defined by General

Laws, Chapter 140, Section 121, that is, a weapon

from which a bullet could be discharged and of

which the length of the barrel was less thana

sixteen inches, the said Jason Robinson not being

present in his residence or place of business,

not having in effect a license to carry firearms

we'll proceed to the Commonwealth's case and any testimony that time allows.

At this time we are going to -- I'm going to give the attorneys an opportunity to speak to you directly about things relating obviously to the view. They'll have a fuller opportunity after we return to talk about the case in general.

Thank you again for your anticipated cooperation. Mr. Tochka?

MR. TOCHKA: Thank you. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. What I'd like to do is show you an aerial photograph and this aerial photograph is the area in which we are going to basically be going out to. This is the Brighton section of Boston and, as Her Honor told you, I'd ask you just to stop, look and listen and where we are going to is, this is the Faneuil Development area in Brighton and we are going to go down an alleyway, a pathway that's on the corner of Goodenough Street and Faneuil Street. We are going to walk down that alleyway to the back of 89 Faneuil Street.

I'd ask you to pay particular close

attention to the back of the 89 Faneuil Street, the back entrance that leads to a hallway that goes out towards — there is a second entry to the building. I just ask you to take a note of those two entrances. I would ask you to note in the back of — the entry to the back of 89, there is a utility area, there's a fence there for trucks and dumpsters and the like.

I would also ask you to pay close attention to this area right here that's described as the play area and from there, I'd suggest that we'll go into -- I'll ask you to take note of the parking lot that exits onto Faneuil Street, and we'll go to the McKinley Park. I'd ask you to pay close attention to, there is a set of swings and a water fountain at that area. I ask you to take note of that. That's basically the area of the development that we'll be walking through and into the park.

From there, we'll go back on the bus and take a ride down to the corner of Market and Faneuil Street. I'd ask you to take note of the store which is on the righthand side and on the lefthand side is a car wash called Scrub-a-Dub.

I ask you to take note of that. We'll continue on the bus and go up Market Street and take a left on Beacon Street. The Faneuil Development, as you can see, borders Beacon Street and Faneuil. We'll go down Beacon Street and come back up Goodenough Street and, no longer on this particular area, we'll go up Faneuil and about a half a mile or a mile to the area of Oak Square.

Street. I will ask you to take note of a particular house on Dunboy Street. At that time we'll leave the house area, still staying on the bus, then we will go to the area of Rogers Park which is in Brighton approximately a half a mile to a mile away, staying on the bus. Moving on from Rogers Park, then we will come to the Charles River and go to the Arsenal Mall and there is a park as well at the Arsenal Mall.

We'll stay on the bus and I'll just point out a particular swing area and the like in the Arsenal Mall park as well. Then we will go back on the bus and come back here.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Doolin?

MR. DOOLIN: Thank you. Good morning, everybody. Today we are going to get on the bus and go over to an area of Brighton that's been called the Faneuil Development. When we go over to the Faneuil development, there's some things that it's very important to note. As Judge Rouse told you, it's important to stop, to look around, to follow what the lawyers are saying at the various buildings and houses and areas that you're going to see during the course of the time that we're out at this area.

We're going to take you from this area over here of McKinley playground, this is on Faneuil Street across from the development. We are going to lead you down an alley that is to the — on this side of 89 Faneuil Street. We're going to bring you specifically to the area of 89 Faneuil Street and also the area of 85 Faneuil Street which is right up this way from that, and you will be able to see. You will also be able to make observations and we'll point you to make observations of the different buildings that are in that area, houses, businesses and the like.

The Faneuil development, as you'll see,

is bordered by a number of different buildings.

There are buildings that are over here on the

Beacon Street side which we'll point you

attention to, and buildings that are down here on

Faneuil Street. That's 89 and there are a number

of other numbers, a number of other buildings as

you go down towards 85 that we'll be asking you

to make observations about.

Me'll specifically be asking you to make observations about an area that's called the play area. That is an area between the buildings that are on the Faneuil Street side and also the buildings that are over here on the Beacon Street side. After we have had a chance to look at all those different buildings that are in this area, and the things that are over here in the McKinley playground, McKinley Park area, then we'll get back on the bus.

When we get back on the bus, you will be taken to a couple of different locations that are in the Watertown, Brighton area. We won't be getting off the bus in those locations but you will be asked to make certain observations of some areas that are there.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, during the course of the time that we're out there, I'm going to ask you to stop, to look around, to pay attention to what everybody is directing you to, what the lawyers are directing you to specifically and to look at the different buildings, points of view, lighting, that is there, lighting that you may observe, different trees and things of that nature, specifically in the play area.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Flaherty?

MR. FLAHERTY: Thank you. morning. As I know all of you are very well aware, my name is Timothy Flaherty. I represent Tanzerius Anderson and I can think of no more solemn, sober, serious occasion for our meeting because this young man has been accused of murder. Her Honor has properly instructed you that it is very important and it is your obligation and duty to pay particular attention during this view and I won't belabor the points that we ask you to look at nor will I belabor the vantage points or sight lines that we'll direct your attention to, but let me just remind you to

1 keep in mind your viewpoints, your sight lines, 2 your vantage lines from this view. 3 When you return here in court, keep 4 those in your mind because when the witnesses 5 take the stand, this stand, and testify about 6 what they observed and what they heard, it will 7 be important for you to recall those sight lines, 8 those vantage points, and it will especially 9 important for you to know not only what was seen 10 or heard but what was not seen and not heard. 11 THE COURT: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. We are going to proceed down to 12 13 the bus now and the court officers will direct 14 you after they have been sworn by the clerk. 15 (Whereupon, the court officers were 16 sworn at 10:35 o'clock p.m.) 17 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, if 18 you would follow the court officers, please. 19 (Whereupon, the proceedings in court 20 were recessed to the view, during which the 21 following occurred:) 22 MR. TOCHKA: Once again, ladies and 23 gentlemen, good morning. I'd like you to take 24 note of a number of points of view here.

you'll take note of this particular driveway
which leads down to the end there which we are
going to walk in a second. If you take note by
the corner there's a sign that says Goodenough
Street and Faneuil Street. Across the street is
McKinley Park which you saw in the aerial
photograph, and I'd like you to take notice of 81
Faneuil which is right there as you turn left.

MR. DOOLIN: I'd ask you to take note, as we stand here on Faneuil Street of the proximity of the buildings to your right, 81

Faneuil, as relevant to the driveway that stands directly in front of us to our right. I'd ask that you make observations —

THE COURT: To your right or left?

MR. DOOLIN: I'm sorry, to the jury's right. I'd also ask you to make observations, if you would, of any houses that you see in the area on Faneuil Street, houses that you might observe in the vicinity of Goodenough Street.

I'd ask you make observations, if you would, of this angle as you stand here on Faneuil Street, of any buildings that are in the end of the driveway. I'd also ask, if you would, to

look, if you turn around and face the other way, the other direction that we have been facing on Faneuil Street and look down at the length of the development, how far down it goes, and the various objects and things that you see as you look down at the ground in front of 81 Faneuil Street, looking down Faneuil towards Market.

MR. FLAHERTY: For the record, Timothy Flaherty. Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to pay particular attention to the number of windows you see on each building and each location of the building with respect to the brick housing development, the proximity of the homes next to the driveway. I'd also ask you to pay particular attention to the location of any trees or shrubbery here and in the additional locations, and I would ask you, as you face the development, to pay attention to this section of the development, the architecture of the development.

MR. TOCHKA: What we are going to do now, ladies and gentlemen, is walk down this driveway. As we're walking down this driveway, I just ask you to pay attention to what will come into view as you're walking down this area.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you to stop now, just look at the direction we came down this driveway, look at the door. You see to my left the entranceway over there to 85.

I'd ask you to pay most attention to 89, the corner of this particular building right there to my left, the area there. I ask you to pay attention to the slope, how it slopes down. I'd ask you to pay attention to the grassy area right next to that bush. I'd also ask you to pay attention to this maintenance area, the fence, the dimensions of the fence and the like.

I'm going to ask you to pay attention, ladies and gentlemen, as you can see, the back of the development, you can see actually where that dog is right there which is going to be known as the play area. I'd ask you to take a look at the view you'd have from there.

After you've finished, after all the attorneys have talked to you, I'm going to ask you to step over close to that area, the corner where the gate is and to take a further look, but I'll wait for the other attorneys.

MR. DOOLIN: As you stand here to the

side of 89 Faneuil, I'm going to ask you to make particular observations of the windows that you see and the apartments above 89 Faneuil. I'm going to make — ask you to make observations of the windows that you might see over on the side of 85 Faneuil and the doorway of 85 Faneuil, the amount of storage in the building, the architecture of the building and the way it's set up, vis a vis the way we're standing here now.

I'm going to ask that you pay attention and make observations, if you would, to this area in back where this fence is, the size of the fence, to the distance between one side of the fence as you observe it and the other side of the fence. I'm going to ask you to make observations of the number of fences that there are and where they stand in relation to each other. I'm going to ask that you make observations generally of the area from the side of the fence to 89

Faneuil, the approximate distance between the two points.

I'm going to also ask that you make observations, if you would, as you look up towards Faneuil Street, the distance of the

driveway, the approximate distance from where we stand to where we began the journey up on the corner or up on the street in front of Faneuil Street.

MR. TOCHKA: I would ask the jurors to pay attention to the windows above 85 Faneuil, the windows above 89 Faneuil, the location of this wall and the wall of the development and the other wall of the development, the fence and the green siding between the chain links and I would ask you to pay particular attention to the distance from the interior of 89 Faneuil where that orange door is located, the door which appears open now and the shrub outside.

Ladies and gentlemen, at this point I'm going to ask you to stand by the fence over here, by the gate.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you pay attention to this particular walkway to my left to 284, the building there on my lefthand side. I'm going to ask you to pay attention to the first floor where you see the tree on my lefthand side, the first floor set of windows and what they would look onto. I'm going to ask you

to pay attention to the dimensions here, how the walkway, if you go down this way, actually the same path the two detectives have just walked. I ask you also to pay attention to the corner over there where the benches are. We're going to be walking over there shortly, the play area, and the dimensions actually of this whole particular area.

I would ask you now just to turn and face 89, if you would, just take a look at the view that you have of inside 89. We're going to walk in there in a second. If you could just take a look at the first floor of 89, the cages on the fences there and the front area of 89, the grassy area, the stairs leading up 89.

MR. DOOLIN: I'm going to ask that you make observations if you will of the building that's numbered 284 North Beacon. I'm going to ask that you make observations of the number of stories and the position of the windows of the first floor, second floor, third floor. I also ask that you make observations, if you would, to the area between 89 Faneuil and 284 North Beacon of different shrubbery that's in the area.

Observations as you stand here at the back of 89

Faneuil down to the area where you might see some benches, picnic tables and things of that nature.

I'm going to ask as you stand here in the back of 89 Faneuil to make observations of generally of what's in the hall. We'll be going into the hall to make further observations, but just as to how the door looks at 89 Faneuil Street and the different things that you observe in the doorway at 89 Faneuil.

I'm going to also ask that you make observations of the parking lot that is adjacent to 284 North Beacon Street.

MR. FLAHERTY: I would ask you to pay a particular attention to the sight lines of the windows above 282 and 284, 284 North Beacon, to 89 Faneuil, the sight lines from the picnic table and the play area we'll be going to, from the picnic table to 89, the relative locations of the pine tree and the shrubbery and, as you enter 89 Faneuil, I'd ask you to pay particular attention to the distance between the area and the grass near the shrubs to the interior of 89 where the

door or door jamb interior wall is located.

MR. TOCHKA: Ladies and gentlemen, what we're going to do now is, we're going to have you go in five at a time through the hallway here and just take notice as you go through the hallway, the doorways that you're walking through, the dimensions, the stairs to the second floor, and I'd ask you just to pay particular attention to the two exits that I talked about in the corner, this exit over here and there's one other exit to get out of the building on the other side.

MR. DOOLIN: I'm going to ask that you make observations of the inside, of the number of doors that you see, the stairs that you might see as you go into the hallway. I also ask that you make observations of a set of mailboxes that are in there and I'm going to ask that you make observations of the approximate dimensions of the hallway, how big it is, and also ask that you make observations, if you would, as you are going in there, of the approximate distances between the grassy area where the shrub is that you might observe in front of 89 Faneuil and the approximate distance to the inside hallway of 89

## Faneuil.

MR. FLAHERTY: I'd ask also that you pay particular attention to the wall inside, how it's designed, what it looks like and when you go through 89 to the other exit, I'd ask you just to take a moment to peek up and look at the windows above, the sight lines of the windows, and that's all for this location.

MR. TOCHKA: Let me add one thing. As you're walking through this particular door, could you please pay particular attention to the width of the doorway and, as you're walking through the door, there is a door immediately on your left, pay particular attention to that door immediately on your left.

So why don't we just take the first five?

A JUROR: Keep going through?

MR. TOCHKA: Keep going through the other way. Ladies and gentlemen, I'd ask you to pay particular attention to this particular door here and how this particular door leads to a maintenance room, and, as Mr. Flaherty said, the stairway going up here that leads to the second

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

If you just take note, if you take notice of that, if you take notice of that and of the window that's overlooking the second floor landing, and that's all I have inside. THE COURT: Are we going to go through, straight through? MR. TOCHKA: Yes. And if I can actually have the jurors come a little bit closer here? And I want to point out a few things here. One is, I wanted to point out this particular door. Two, I wanted to point out the stairway that leads up to the second floor and I wanted to point out the window on the second floor landing, and three, I just wanted -- I want the jurors to take particular notice of the dimensions of this particular hallway and the lighting conditions of

MR. DOOLIN: I'd ask that you pay attention to this area here.

this particular hallway.

MR. TOCHKA: I'd going to ask you to take note of this doorway on my lefthand side, and two, I'd ask you to take note of this particular small section next to the door.

Next, I'd ask you to take note of the

dimensions of the hallway, the lighting

conditions of the hallway, and finally, I'd ask

you to take note of the stairwell that leads up

to the second floor and I'd ask you to note the

window on the second floor landing.

MR. DOOLIN: I'd ask you to note also

opposite to the area we're standing in now near

the door to the area that we came in through at

opposite to the area we're standing in now near the door to the area that we came in through at the end of the stairs, the relative distances that you might observe. I also ask you to make observations of the type of doors that you see as we came in through the hallway.

MR. TOCHKA: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, what I'd ask you to do is walk down this way to the play area.

MR. FLAHERTY: Actually, before we go, if I could just remind the jurors, again the sight lines from the windows above this exit of 89 Faneuil. That's all.

MR. TOCHKA: Alright.

MR. DOOLIN: Also, you should look up from this exit of 89 Faneuil as to the relative distances, proximity of the various buildings that you see that are to the left and to the

right of this and the amount of windows that you might observe.

MR. TOCHKA: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you to take notice of a number of things here. First, there's a play area where Mr. Flaherty is standing right now. I'm going to ask you to pay attention to the view that you have of the play area, including the view to the back of the entire play area which is the area of the asphalt you're looking at right now. I'd ask you to take notice of the view to your left, again the maintenance fence, in particular to the section in between the maintenance fences, or one fence, the second in between, I'd ask you to pay attention to that.

I'd ask you to pay attention again to this particular tree here, the first set of windows there. I'd ask you to take notice, if you can see over here, these two buildings, the farther building, the building in back of the one — in back of this building here, the one in the back. I ask you to take notice of the particular building.

I ask you to take notice of across over

here, there's a building that's 280 and that's the building where the blue car is, that particular building, that's building number 280.

I'd ask you to take notice, if you turn around, do an about face, I'd just ask you to take notice of the stairs over here in the corner leading up to the parking lot area. I'd ask you to take notice of the pathways that we just walked down and I'd ask you to take notice of where it says 75 Faneuil, that doorway right there, and I think that's it.

MR. DOOLIN: I'm going to ask you to make observations of the relative dimensions of the play area. I'm going to ask you to make observations, if you would, of the picnic table you may observe and the proximity of that picnic table to the various buildings that you see that are within the scope of our vision. I'm going to ask that you make observations of 284 North Beacon, 282 North Beacon, 278 North Beacon, 280 North Beacon and their relative distances to the picnic table.

I'm going to ask that you make observations also, if you would, of 75 Faneuil,

make observations of the area of the doorway of 75 Faneuil, the proximity of 75 Faneuil Street to the parking lot, the proximity of that parking lot to 65 Faneuil, the building that you may observe on the other side of the lot.

I'm also going to ask that you make observations back towards the fence area, the distances between the fences as you may observe them, the number of fences that are there, and their relative proximity to 284 Faneuil and also their proximity to the picnic table that we have directed your attention to previously.

MR. FLAHERTY: At this location, I ask each juror to note the windows at 284, 280, the proximity to the picnic table and the pathways. I'd ask you, as Mr. Doolin did, to note the pathway leading from the exit we just left, 89 Faneuil, and how that pathway is laid out, and I would ask if each juror would please stand by the picnic table at some point and take note of the sight lines from the picnic table back to the first tier of 89 Faneuil, before we went into the hallway. Also note the green siding on the chain link fence again.

. 8

MR. TOCHKA: I apologize because I was listening to Mr. Flaherty. I ask you to look at the view from where you are right now by the bench, to the distance between those two particular fences.

Ladies and gentlemen, I just ask that you look from where you are at this bench here to the fence, those two particular fences, in particular, the area in between the fences.

What we're going to do now, we're going to walk down this pathway and walk up back to the back of 89, and I ask you just to pay attention to the distance that we travel and the view that you have.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'd ask you to look at the view that you have from this particular first floor apartment to where you are right now. Then we're going to continue walking.

I don't know if counsel has anything else to add.

MR. DOOLIN: Not only to look at the first floor but also the second floor, the third floor as well.

MR. TOCHKA: If we continue walking -Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to look at this

particular fence area here. Actually, if we can do it, maybe five at a time, with the Court's permission, I'd just ask you to look how -- I'm going to ask you, after defense counsel is finished, to look at the view you have going down this walkway to the pathway you walked down earlier.

MR. DOOLIN: I just ask you again to make observations of the distance between the fences, the amount of fences and their relative heights.

MR. FLAHERTY: I would ask you, as you go through, to touch the fence.

MR. TOCHKA: Ladies and gentlemen, what we're going to do now, we're just going to walk back down the pathway and walk up to the direction of the parking lot.

Ladies and gentlemen, at this point, number one, looking over here to my left, the two buildings in between the parking lot — or the parking lot in between the two buildings, the play area here, the view that you have from where you're standing is actually about where those people are walking through that particular play

area. I just ask you to turn around and look at the vantage point where you went in the hallway of 89 and came out and just look at that pathway that leads to where we are now.

MR. DOOLIN: I'm going to ask you to make observations of the building at 75 Faneuil again, the distance, the proximity of 75 Faneuil to the parking lot, the distance from 75 Faneuil to the building over near the side of the parking lot, the windows that you might observe that face onto the parking lot, and also make observations of the distance from the area of the picnic tables that we've observed there and the area of the parking lot between 75 and 55 Faneuil.

MR. FLAHERTY: As we stand here, I ask everyone again to note 75 Faneuil, note the number of windows in the housing development, note the relative sight line from each of those windows to the play area, to the pathways leading to and from 89, and to the entire perimeter of the entire housing development.

MR. TOCHKA: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd ask you to take notice of two additional things.

One is the parking lot from where we are right

now to the park, McKinley Park, to the basketball court that you can see there in the distance.

In terms of this building here on my left, 75 Faneuil, I ask you to pay particular notice to the apartment that is right above the bicycle here that's parked in the front, the windows right above which is where I'm pointing to right now, these particular windows which there's a stipulation to that being apartment 215.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to 75 Faneuil and I'm going to ask you to pay attention to how, again, just as you did with 89, the entrance, the two entrances, I'm going to ask you to pay attention to the entrance of 75 Faneuil here, how it comes out on the other side and the view that you have on the other side of the 75 Faneuil entrance to the 89 Faneuil entrance where we came out the back.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to pay attention, as you walk, to 89 Faneuil where we came out, the pathway that leads from where we are now to 89 Faneuil. I ask you to pay attention to the pathway leading from the street

of Faneuil Street and after we're finished, we're going to go in 71 Faneuil which is right here and we are going to go through 71 Faneuil to the other entrance, the second entrance that will come out onto the street of Faneuil Street.

MR. DOOLIN: I'm going to ask that you make observation of the fences that you might observe in the area and also make observations again of the windows and the apartments that are above this area and the back of 75 between 75 and 71 Faneuil.

MR. FLAHERTY: I'd ask you that you note the windows, the sight lines and the sound of both Mr. Tochka's and Mr. Doolin's voices as they speak to you.

MR. TOCHKA: Ladies and gentlemen, at this time we're going to walk from 71 Faneuil to the other side. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you to pay attention now, as you exit, in particular 71 Faneuil, if you just look, if you look at the pathway that leads here, I'll have you walk down, and how it leads us to the particular parking lot. That's all that I have.

MR. DOOLIN: I ask that you make

observations of the back of 71 Faneuil, the distance to the parking lot, the distance from that part of the parking lot closest to 71 Faneuil back towards the play area and I'm going to ask that you make observations, if you will, of the distance from the back of 71 Faneuil where we now stand to the last of the buildings in the development, the distance between the last of those buildings and the area of 71 Faneuil that we just came from.

MR. FLAHERTY: I'd ask all the jurors again, note the windows, note the sight lines, the distance from 89 Faneuil to this location where we are, the distance from this location where we're at to the very last building of the development.

MR. TOCHKA: Ladies and gentlemen, we're just going to go inside the parking lot.

I'm just going to ask you to look around, while you're inside the parking lot, of the views, the three sixty view, and then we're going to cross into the park.

At this point, ladies and gentlemen, all I want you to do is take notice of where that

1.5

bike is laying against that entrance, the distance to the parking lot. I just ask you to take notice again of that particular play area and the view that you have from the walkway from the play area and the stairs that we walked to come to this particular parking lot as well as the stairs we just walked up earlier. That's it.

MR. DOOLIN: I'm going to ask that you make observations of the distance from the picnic table, the area, the play area, to the entire distance of the parking lot, the part that's we're standing in now, the part that we've been in before. I'm going to also ask you to make observations of any lighting that you might see on the side of the buildings, the amount of lighting, and also to any lighting you might see, whether it's visible or not visible on Faneuil Street.

MR. FLAHERTY: I'd ask you to note the windows, the vantage points and sight lines from the windows.

MR. TOCHKA: Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to take note of the dimensions of the park, the basketball court area, the swings over

here to our left, the benches to my left, those
two benches behind that tree, and the view that
you have from where you are here to buildings
across the street, the Faneuil development, those
last two buildings on the corner, and that's it.

MR. DOOLIN: I'm going to ask you to make observations of the relative distance between the buildings on Faneuil and the development, not only the last two buildings but all the buildings that you observe. I'm going to also ask that you make observations of the distance between this area and the area where you see play apparatus that we'll be going to next, but then also to the distance between the area of the play apparatus and those houses that are over there backing up on Goodenough Street, make observations of the distances.

MR. FLAHERTY: I'd ask all the jurors to note the sight lines from the windows on the rear of each of those houses, half dozen or so houses facing into the parking lot -- I'm sorry, into the playground area and the benches by the swing set.

MR. TOCHKA: Ladies and gentlemen, at

this point what I'm going to ask you to do, we're just going to walk to where the benches are. I ask you to stand by the benches and just take notice of the particular area there. I believe it's a fountain that's broken off there. Pay attention to the fountain, and at that point I'm just going to ask you to go back on the bus.

What I'm going to ask you to do now, ladies and gentlemen, just turn around, I believe you can see the base of the fountain right where I'm standing here. If you can see the fountain and the bench there, if you can just look at the view that you have of the development from here, and the covering of the trees and the like.

MR. DOOLIN: I'm going to ask that you make observations of the area we're standing in now, the proximity of this area to the houses on Goodenough Street at the end and the view of the windows that you may observe on the back of those houses.

MR. FLAHERTY: Just the sight lines from the houses.

MR. TOCHKA: If you could just walk here back to the bus.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ladies and gentlemen, we're all set with the development and McKinney Park. now going to get on the bus and go down the I'm going to ask you to pay attention as we're going down the street to the distance from here to the corner where you see Store Twenty-Four on your righthand side which we'll stop, we'll point it out to you, and on your lefthand side you'll see the Scrub-a-Dub car wash, and then we're going to turn the corner, and as we turn the corner, you'll see a Dunkin Donuts on your righthand side. I ask you to pay attention Again, we'll point it all out, but just to that. in terms of the distance. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to take notice on your righthand side, there's a Store Twenty-Four, the parking lot, and there's a stipulation it goes onto Market Street. I ask you to take notice of, on your lefthand side, the Scrub-a-Dub here, to the particular stall, the particular first stall, the proximity between the Store Twenty-Four and the first stall of the Scrub-a-Dub.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to just

ask you to pay notice now to the Dunkin Donuts on your righthand side and to the intersection here of Market Street and North Beacon Street. We're going to take then a left and as we take a left, I'm going to point on the lefthand side to a dinette there called the Pig and Whistle.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, as you can see on your lefthand side, the diner, the Pig and Whistle, and if you'd just look at that in terms of proximity as we're coming around the block to the Faneuil development where we just came from.

I'd ask you also to take notice of the pay phones that are right in front of the Pig and Whistle there. As we pass it, you'll see them on the lefthand side right by where the newspaper stands are.

Ladies and gentlemen, what I'm going to ask you now to do is to pay attention to, actually, the scene on your lefthand side, the play area that we were just spending all the time in. If you can also look at 282, the building here on my righthand side, and 280 which is the building on the lefthand side, to the pathway that's in between those two. Particularly, I

want you to pay attention to the fact that 282, the pathway that is in between the two buildings, how it then loops into 282, into the courtyard area of 282. I want you to pay attention to the distance from there to the street.

MR. DOOLIN: I want you to make observations, if you would, as we drive by with the Faneuil development on our left, about the parking lot and the businesses that are next to the parking lot and the end of the Faneuil development after 282.

MR. FLAHERTY: And I would ask you to note as we pass on your left the sign that declares Fines Towing.

MR. TOCHKA: Ladies and gentlemen, I'll just make it brief. 280 is on your lefthand side, this building here, 282B, this building here, there is a pathway in between. The pathway leads to a courtyard which is in between, which is back, in back of 282 which is this little courtyard which you can see here. I'm going to ask you also just to pay attention to how this street over here, Vineland Street, the view you have of the street to 282.

I'm also going to ask -- we're going to leave here. We're going to go to Bigley Street -- I'm sorry, Dunboy Street so we're going to go up, take a left onto Goodenough Street which is the street that we pointed out when we first got off the bus. We're going to go right down the street to Faneuil Street. I'm just going to ask you to pay attention in terms of the distance from the Faneuil developments to the location that we're going now, Dunboy Street.

Ladies and gentlemen, I just want you to take a quick note, on your lefthand side, the Kiki's Market there. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you to take note of this particular house here on your lefthand side which is, we are now on Dunboy Street, being 74 and 76.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm just going to ask you to take note on your righthand side of this particular variety store, Brooks Variety

Street. We are now on Brooks Street, and of the phones that are in front of Brooks Variety Store.

Ladies and gentlemen, what I'm going to ask you to do is take notice of, on your righthand side, Rogers Park, on Howell. The

street on the other side, we're going to loop around. We'll be on the other side.

MR. DOOLIN: I'm going to ask that you make observations, if you would, as you look out the window, of the area of Rogers Park, to look at any apparatus that you might see within the park. I'd ask you that you look at the proximity of the houses that ring the park.

MR. TOCHKA: I believe what we're going to do, we're going to go down the street here, take a right which will be the school on the lefthand side, then we'll loop around to come to the other side of the park.

Ladies and gentlemen, I just want to point out the other side of Rogers Park, in particular the baseball diamond area here, and that's it. Ladies and gentlemen, what we're doing right now is just to give you a view of the perspective from Rogers Park to Dunboy Street, there's Kiki's Market so we come back to Kiki's Market, so I just ask you to pay attention in terms of the distance from Kiki's Market to Dunboy Street where we went, where the house was that I also showed you and Rogers Park which was

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

up the street. And at this point we're going to go now to Watertown and to the Arsenal Mall.

Ladies and gentlemen, I just want to point out that we are now in Watertown. now in the Arsenal Park. I just wanted to point out the swing sets on your righthand side.

I'm just going to ask you to take notice on your lefthand side there's a restaurant. As you can see from the sign, it's called Wadi's Restaurant in Watertown.

MR. FLAHERTY: I'd also ask you to note that it's also a nightclub, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. TOCHKA: And that's it, ladies and gentlemen. We're back to the courthouse.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take the luncheon recess now so if you want, you do not have to return to the courthouse. You may go take your lunch. Just be back, please, at the jury room by quarter past two. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the proceedings were recessed on the bus at 1:15 o'clock p.m., and reconvened in the courtroom at 2:25 o'clock p.m,.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, thank 1 2 you very much for your attention this morning. 3 We will be right with you to begin the trial 4 formally. Yes? 5 (Whereupon, the following discussion 6 occurred at side bar:) 7 MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, in terms of 8 sequestration, Mr. Flaherty asked me if I had any 9 objection to his client's mother in the 10 courtroom. She is a tangential witness. 11 I don't have any objection to that and there is 12 no objection from both counsel for the victim's 13 family to be in the courtroom as well. And the 14 third was Alan Tate. He is the father of Joleena 15 Tate that, once he testifies, that he be allowed 16 to stay. It's agreed that he would be allowed to 17 remain for his daughter's testimony after he testified. 18 19 THE COURT: For the record, I am 20 allowing Sergeant Detective Coleman to assist you 21 at counsel table. 22 MR. TOCHKA: Thank you, Your Honor. 23 (Whereupon, the discussion at side bar 24 was concluded.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen,
before we listen to opening statements, I want to
take a few moments to explain some matters to you
which will hopefully assist you in understanding
the trial as we proceed. I want to begin with
the indictments which the clerk read to you
before we went on the view this morning. Those
are the formal criminal charges that the
Commonwealth makes.

In this case there are several indictments, several charges against these two defendants. Essentially, those indictments against each defendant are charging them with the crime of first degree murder, there are two counts of armed robbery, there is, with respect to defendant Tanzerius Anderson, a charge of intimidation of a witness, a charge of unlawful possession of a firearm. With respect to defendant Anderson, he also has an unlawful possession of a firearm charge as well as the armed robbery and the first degree murder charge.

Now, it is important you understand that these indictments are the manner by which the Commonwealth informs an individual that he or

she is being charged with the commission of a crime. It is not any evidence of either one of these defendants' guilt or any basis from which you can infer their guilt. It's the formal charge that lets the person know the crime that he or she is being accused of committing.

It will be up to the Commonwealth in the course of the trial to prove the guilt of each defendant on these charges beyond a reasonable doubt and the defendants, like anyone charged with a crime, are presumed innocent until proven guilty. At no time do they have any burden or responsibility to prove anything, to say anything, to put on any evidence, to take the stand.

When I've completed my remarks, you are going to listen to the opening statements or statement of the Commonwealth and then the defendants have an opportunity if they would like to make a statement through their attorneys but they are not required to do it. Now, the purpose of opening statements is to give you a preview of coming events, essentially laying out for you the evidence that the Commonwealth hopes to put

before you. It's really alerting you to the substance of the case and what you'll be hearing throughout the course of the trial by way of witnesses' testimony and the exhibits. Exhibits can be anything, an item of physical evidence, a document, medical record, photograph, anything of that sort.

Now, after the Commonwealth has concluded its statement, the defendants, as I said, through their attorneys are given a similar opportunity but keep in mind there is no obligation on them at any time to make a statement or to do anything in this case.

After the opening statement or statements have been made, the Commonwealth goes first in its presentation of the evidence. There will be witnesses called. Any of them, of course, are subject to be cross examined by defense counsel. There will also, as I indicated, be exhibits introduced. At the conclusion of the Commonwealth's case, each defendant is given an opportunity if he would like to call witnesses and to introduce exhibits but is under no requirement of any kind to do

that.

At the end of all of the evidence, after you have heard all the witnesses and all the exhibits have been put before you, the attorneys get their second opportunity to address you directly. At that time it's called closing argument. It is called that because the attorneys get to summarize the evidence, characterize it in a way that's favorable to their client, pull it together, in other words, and urge upon you certain conclusions and judgments they hope you will draw.

Now, it is very important you listen carefully to everything that goes on. Keep in mind that with respect to the opening statements and closing arguments made by the lawyers that that does not --- those events do not in any way constitute evidence. Evidence in this case is going to come in through what the witnesses tell you, their actual answers, together with any exhibits.

After the arguments have concluded, it is my job to explain to you the law which applies to the case. I will be explaining to you what

the elements of each one of these crimes is, in other words, what the Commonwealth has to do to prove the defendants guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, what we mean by the standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, and some other matters about which you'll need to know in order for you to render your verdict.

When I am done, it becomes your turn to go to the jury room, to carefully consider and compare all of the evidence, sort through it, and to determine whether the Commonwealth has, on each one of these indictments, proven the defendants' guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Your verdict must be based solely on the evidence, that is, what is given to you here in the courtroom, assisted by whatever observations you made on the view this morning. It is impermissible for you to consider anything other than what has been given to you here through the witnesses and the exhibits.

It is very important that you keep an open mind until you get to the jury room because until I tell you to go decide the case, it is not ready for your judgment and that is because you

need to have all the evidence put before you, the arguments made, as well as my instructions on the law before you can proceed to render your verdict.

The job of the attorneys is to present the case on behalf of their clients. Mine is to make sure that there is a fair and orderly trial and, as we proceed throughout the trial, I'm going to be giving you some additional instructions which will hopefully assist you in understanding what's going on.

At the conclusion of the opening statements I'm going to have distributed to you some materials, paper and pencils. The reason I'm doing that is to give you an opportunity to take notes if you would like to do so of the evidence. You may use those notes at the end of the case when you're deliberating to recall any testimony or evidence, to assist you in remembering what was said or what was done in the courtroom.

You are not required to take notes and if you don't, please don't feel that your memory is any less good than the juror who has taken

notes or that you are not as qualified to render a verdict as the juror who has, and if you do decide to take notes, please don't feel that you have a verbatim transcript or that you are in a superior position to decide the case. It's really an individual matter and that's the purpose for taking notes, it is simply to help you recall what was done during the trial because there will be no typed transcript to give you at the end.

Again, we want to thank you for your continued attention. We are at this time going to listen to the opening statement which will be made on behalf of the Commonwealth by Mr. Tochka.

MR. TOCHKA: Thank you. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Let me reintroduce myself. My name is Bob Tochka and I'm an assistant district attorney and I represent the people of Suffolk County. It is my responsibility to present to you the evidence against Tanzerius Anderson and Jason Robinson, both charged with the first degree murder of Iman Yazbek in March of the year 2000. It is my job at this time to give you an overview, what I

1.6

suggest is the evidence that you will be hearing in connection with this case.

We just came back from the view and, as you recall, when we got off the bus we walked down that driveway. Back in March, 2000, March 28 of 2000, Iman Yazbek drove down that driveway and never drove back and never came back because back in March of the year 2000, Tanzerius

Anderson, armed with a three fifty-seven magnum, along with his good life-long friend, Jason Robinson, during the course of robbing this thirty-five year old man, put the gun to his face, virtually point blank, a three fifty-seven, pulled the trigger, and basically annihilated the right side of Iman Yazbek's face, and then they fled.

night? How did it lead up to that particular incident? Well, this is what I'd suggest is the evidence you are going to hear. On that night Edward Laureano, about four o'clock in the morning, a man who worked out in Gloucester, he has his family who lives in Brighton in the development on the second floor of 89 Faneuil,

the first building that we went into, he came home that night because he was separated from his wife and his job is, basically he would leave work, get off of work, come home, relieve his wife so that she then could go to work in the morning because he worked at night.

As he's walking down that driveway, just as you did today, as he turned the corner, he noticed a man and a car. The car was parked right in front of that building, right in front of the door. There was a man, he saw legs sticking out against the wall. He thought it was a set-up. Edward Laureano looked around. He went in back where he thought the first place was that someone might be hiding to do something to him. He went in the back of the area where that dumpster is, the fence, and he's looking around.

Marine and is about -- you'll hear that he is an Ex-Marine and he was very concerned as to what he saw. He didn't know if it was a set-up. He didn't know what was going on. He didn't see anybody, so he walked a little bit closer and as he got upon the body, he saw the body of Iman

Yazbek laying there on his back, one arm on his chest, the other hand out, a pool of blood going down the driveway, going down the slant that I pointed out at the beginning when we were at the view. He looked around some more, concerned that something was going to happen, concerned that now he was really — that the killers were right . around the corner.

He then walked -- he didn't want\* to go into that side of the building because he didn't know what would be in that hallway, but that was the hallway that he had to go in, that's the hallway where his children were upstairs, so instead of going in that hallway, he walked in the path going down and looped around and came in the back way, the other way that we walked out. As he's walking in, he's checking, he's looking, he's trying to be careful, he's looking through the walls, he's looking past the wall.

As he gets to the first floor landing by that little door on the lefthand side that I pointed out to you, he looked at the stairs up top, he looked at that window that I pointed out to you to look at on the second floor because

he's looking for a reflection. He wants to see, because as he's looking up the stairs, he can see the reflection of the second floor landing. He wants to see if there's anybody there that is going to do something to him. He doesn't see anything. Slowly he goes up inside. First thing he does when he gets inside that house is he checks on each one of his children, he goes in the room of each child and checks to make sure that that child is safe. He then called the police.

The police come on the scene. You'll hear from the police officers who got there the same time as the EMT's. When the EMT's arrived, they looked at the body of Iman Yazbek. They did a quick pulse. They knew that the man was dead. You'll hear that then Sergeant Coleman who is sitting with me at the table arrived on scene. They do a canvass. They do an investigation. They knock on doors, They ask people if you saw anything. They talk to various people. They look around, they look at Iman Yazbek, going through his pockets.

At this point in time, when Sergeant

Coleman is on that particular crime scene, you'll learn that they did not know that the man had been shot because all they saw was his face peeled off. They didn't know what could have caused that, that severe damage to somebody's face. It wasn't until the medical examiner arrived on scene and the medical examiner turns the body over that they see an exit bullet wound in the side of his neck, two inches below the ear.

So the bullet had gone through his face, you'll learn from the medical examiner, at point blank range, an inch below the right eye, went through his face, down through his palate as if the person is holding the gun in this fashion, down through the roof of his mouth. It then went through his upper jaw, shattering his upper jaw, going into and hitting his lower jaw bone. The bullet then ricocheted back and out his neck and it wasn't until the time when the medical examiner is on scene and they see the hole in the back that they determine that this was a gunshot wound.

They also, when they're on scene now,

check, after they've taken the photographs, check to see for identification on the individual.

There is no wallet on him. There is no identification. There's no money on him. There is nothing on him to identify who he is. The police then continue their search. They look for ballistics evidence, to see if there's any shell casings or the like.

that when a revolver is fired, sort of like a western gun with a cylinder, when a revolver is fired, the bullet comes out and the shell remains inside that revolver. When a semiautomatic gun is fired, you will learn that sort of like — the semiautomatics are similar to what the police officers use, that when that gun is fired with a square handle, the shell casing shoots out, the bullet comes out the barrel and the shell casings kick out. There are no shell casings at the scene. There's no shell casing, suggesting that a revolver was used in this case.

They continue the investigation and they talk to a number of individuals. They talk to a Heather Coady because an individual says

Heather Coady — they knocked on doors and an individual says, yes, at about twelve o'clock on March 27 I heard a loud bang and you'll hear that many individuals that the police questioned that night said, I heard a loud bang, I went back to be sleep. One particular lady says, I heard a loud bang, I looked out and I saw Heather Coady with another individual. You'll hear that the police then go and talk to Heather Coady and she is reluctant, she does not want to talk to the police, she does not want to go to the station with the police, she does not want to cooperate at all with the police.

The police continue their investigation and they speak to, about seventy—two hours later, and that morning actually, they speak to also Eddie Gauthier. Eddie Gauthier says, I was out there in the area of the play area, the area that we were today, I didn't see anything. There is this loud bang. What happens then is about seventy—two hours later, Eddie Gauthier, who lived in the development for eighteen years, who knows Heather Coady, who knows Jason Robinson, and is good friends with Jason Robinson, who had

recently been introduced by Jason Robinson to an individual that Jason Robinson referred to as Tee, and referred to him as his cousin.

Eddie Gauthier contacts the police. He goes himself to the police station, to the D-14 Brighton police station. He's twenty-three years old. He goes with his mother to the police. Station. Sergeant Coleman is called on the phone that there is an individual that wants to talk to the police. Sergeant Coleman tells the D-14 police officers, bring him down. I'll come over to the homicide unit, bring him down to the homicide unit and we'll interview him. He comes, Eddie Gauthier, and he goes with his mother to the homicide unit and this is what he tells the police.

He says, that night on March 27 I was in my apartment and I was with Heather Coady, I was with Jason Robinson, and I was with a person I know as Tee, and I was also with a person I know as Joleena. Joleena, you'll hear, lives on Dunboy Street, 74 and 76, that red building that we went to. He said in his statement, and he'll tell you, Joleena Tate, I've known her then about

three years, she lives not in the development, she lives up in the area of Oak Square. That is the Dunboy Street area.

He says that night at some point in time Tanzerius Anderson, who you'll hear at that point was nineteen years old, going on twenty,

Joleena Tate is sixteen years old, about to turn seventeen, that Joleena Tate and Tanzerius

Anderson left, they left the development.

Shortly Tanzerius Anderson came back. At some point while Tanzerius Anderson comes back to

Eddie Gauthier's apartment, that's 215, the building above where the bicycle was that I pointed out in the corner by the parking lot, they come back to his apartment. In the apartment is Heather Coady, Jason Robinson, Tee, and Eddie Gauthier.

At some point Tee says, I have to use the phone. Eddie Gauthier's phone does not work so they suggest to him, go to the Pig and Whistle around the corner and use the phone that's over there. As he's leaving, Jason Robinson says to him; hurry up, hurry up, if you want to meet somebody. Tanzerius Anderson leaves. At some

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

point Eddie -- Heather Coady then leaves as well and she goes to that area next to the play area. One of the buildings across at 282, I believe it is, she goes into her house. She's seventeen years old.

Eddie Gauthier comes outside to the play area and this is late into the evening now, and he's sitting at the table at the play area. Heather Coady comes out and they're sitting there and as they're sitting there, and they'll tell you that they are smoking marijuana as they're sitting there, Eddie Gauthier turns because he hears a noise, he hears a banging and clanking noise and it sounds like someone is up against the fence area. He turns, he looks, he sees Jason Robinson, in the dead of night, going back and forth in that little area between those two spaces, between the dumpster and where the trucks are in that fenced-in area that we went into. He's going back and forth.

He's getting kind of concerned, Eddie

Gauthier, at this point, what's going on here.

You'll hear then shortly after that Eddie

Gauthier hears a whistle. Now, he is in the play

area and he turns and he turns and looks and he sees the person who's whistling and it's Joleena Tate. Now, Joleena Tate had already gone home. She doesn't live in the development. He's looking at her. She whistles and then she walks down that pathway from 89, down the pathway, and she sees in the play area Heather Coady. Heather Coady whistles back. Joleena says to Heather Coady, where have you been, Heather, I've been waiting for you, I've been looking for you, words to that effect. Heather says, what are you talking about. She starts looking toward Joleena.

Now, eleven thirty is important because that's approximately the time when all this is starting to transpire, because eleven thirty was the same number that was placed in the pager just hours before while Jason Robinson, Heather Coady and Eddie Gauthier were in the apartment, Eddie Gauthier's apartment. About nine thirty, ten o'clock a pager goes off and Heather is holding onto the pager and you'll hear that Heather regularly is the girlfriend of Jason Robinson and it's Jason's pager, they share the pager. You'll

hear the reason why Heather uses that pager at times and you'll hear at times it is because of the fact that she would sell drugs. She would sell marijuana, that would be a number that she would use for people to page her.

The pager goes off. She looks at the pager, says, eleven thirty. She yells out to Jason who is in the other room, Jason, Jason, does eleven thirty mean anything to you? He says, oh, yeah, yeah, and then he walks out of the apartment. Shortly after he had walked out, Eddie Gauthier walked out and then Heather walked out. Then they go into the play area, Eddie and Heather go into the play area. They hear the banging back and forth and this man, Jason Robinson, clanging back and forth between the fences. They hear the whistles, Joleena coming down the walkway, Heather walking towards Joleena.

As they go towards that walkway, you'll hear that what happened next is that there is a loud bang and you'll hear from the person who lives at the building, right where that tree is that I told you to look at on the first floor,

and his name is Oscar Vega, and he'll tell you that before the shot went off he was working on his computer. He was going to Framingham State. He looked out the window and he saw Heather meet up with Joleena right by where that tree was. He saw Heather was walking in the direction of 89 and then meeting up with some girl and started walking back towards the play area, consistent with what Eddie will tell you, and what Heather will tell you. He'll say while those two girls were walking in the direction of the play area he heard a bang and that bang came from the area of 89 Faneuil Street.

Eddie will tell you next what he saw as he is in the play area. He's walking away because now something is going on, something is going on here and Eddie knows it because he's seen Jason going back and forth, running back and forth, banging the fence. He hears Joleena whistle to Heather and Joleena, she had just left the development hours before and talks about, something about, oh, I'm supposed to meet you, where have you been. He starts walking. He hears the bang. He turns, he sees, after the

bang, thirty seconds or so, he sees Tanzerius

Anderson and Jason Robinson running out of the

back entrance of 89, not the entrance where you

went, where we first went but you walked through

the hallway and you came to the other side of the

building. They're at the other side running

away, having cut through that hallway. He then

sees Jason Robinson and Tanzerius Anderson enter

the parking lot and they get into a car and

Joleena Tate gets into the car and the three take

off.

You'll hear that during this taped interview when Sergeant Coleman talked to Eddie Gauthier, he says to Eddie Gauthier, did you know a person by the name of Iman Yazbek, and Eddie Gauthier says no, so what Sergeant Coleman does is, he shows Eddie Gauthier a picture, a photo picture, a picture that's taken for a registration, a registration for a car, a license, a driver's license, a blow-up. He shows it to Eddie Gauthier, do you know this guy.

Eddie Gauthier is twenty-three years old. He's with his mother. The first time he sees the picture, because at that point it wasn't

out there in the public in terms of who had been shot, he sees the picture of Iman Yazbek, twenty-three years old with his mother, and is flooding with tears, uncontrollably crying, as he sees that picture, so much so that the sergeant has to go into another room to get him a tissue box and can hear the crying down the hallway.

As he continues to sob, Sergeant

Coleman asks him, why are you crying? Eddie

Gauthier says, I didn't know that that's the man,
I know him as Yaz, I know him as a man who lived
in Watertown, I know him as the man that when I

was fourteen or fifteen years old, that he would

come into the development because he had a

landscaping business and that he would hire the

little kids and give the kids a chance to make a

buck, that he'd hire his brother, that he was a

nice guy. He'd also been good to him. I didn't

know that was the guy.

What happens next? They said -- Eddie Gauthier then goes home after the taped statement and at this point in time the police now start to look for Joleena Tate in order to question her.

And you'll hear from Joleena Tate and you'll hear

from Heather Coady and this is what you'll hear from Joleena Tate. You'll hear that she met Tanzerius Anderson back in February of the year 2000. She was sixteen going on seventeen, he was nineteen going on twenty, that she was, in essence, infatuated with him. He was a good looking guy, he was handsome, he had a job, he got up regular hours and you'll hear from Joleena Tate that she had been — you'll hear from Joleena Tate in terms of what she thought about Tanzerius Anderson, how she just became head over heels over him.

with him a couple of times, they talked and he talked about, boasting or whatever, but he talked about, you know, I have plans, I have plans, and I have plans to start up a group, a gang, I'm going to call it the commission, the plan, what I'm going to do, we'll get some guns, we'll rob some drug dealers, we'll have some kids in different schools, each high school. I'm going to have a gang, the commission will have jackets and stuff.

And here's a sixteen-year-old girl

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

infatuated. It's like how this man has his act together, he knows what's going on. She says, fine, I know where there is a gun. He says, really? Where is there a gun? Well, she says, I know my father has a gun up in New Hampshire. says, do you think we can get it? Well, yeah, we can maybe go up to New Hampshire, he has a condominium up there. So they plan it and they go up to New Hampshire, and this is days before the murder. They drive up to New Hampshire, drive up to Conway, New Hampshire. They break into her father's house. They steal her father's three fifty-seven magnum.

They then check into a hotel that night and you'll hear that Tanzerius Anderson checked in and then came in the car and said, I think I made a mistake. She said, what are you talking about. He said, I signed my own name, maybe I shouldn't have done that because, you see, he had been very careful up to that point in time because she'll tell you that when he went to New Hampshire with her, he had a change of shoes because he was concerned about footprints, he had gloves, he had a bracelet that says, Tanzerius

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Anderson and before they went into the house he took the bracelet off and put it into his pocket. He had a flashlight with him going up there. He had a glass cutter in order to break in. He had a crowbar. He was all set, but he made a mistake, signed his name.

On the way back home from New Hampshire, he continued to talk about this group and, you know, we could really do stuff, a girl would be good for this group because a girl could set up guys, a girl would be good bait to get a guy. She's sixteen years old. She then sees him that Tuesday night, she sees him at Eddie Gauthier's apartment and she says to him -- when he says to her, I'm leaving, I'm going to work tomorrow, Tanzerius Anderson says, I'm going to work tomorrow, she says, why don't you stay. He says, no, I got to get up early. She says, well, what about doing a robbery like you talked about. He says, sure, you have somebody in mind? I know this guy.

The sixteen-year-old girl trying to keep this man in that particular apartment with her that night. Well, who? Well, the guy, I

know Iman Yazbek, he's a nice guy, always has a lot of money on him, he's a landscaper, he would be an easy person because he would give up the money, he wouldn't put up a fight, I can get him to — I can get him to pick me up and take me to a restaurant. Oh, not a bad idea. So Tanzerius Anderson then calls out to Jason Robinson who is in the room and at Eddie Gauthier's apartment and says to Eddie Gauthier — and says to Jason Robinson, they're lifelong friends, they have known each other since kindergarten, Tanzerius Anderson and Jason Robinson. Tanzerius Anderson says to Jason Robinson, are you down for a robbery? Jason says sure.

So Joleena will tell you that then she and Jason Robinson go to her house. She calls up Iman Yazbek. Iman Yazbek says, I'm at a restaurant, Wadi's. She says, I'm having trouble with my parents, I'm having trouble, how about if we meet, can you pick me up. He says, yeah, sure, I'll pick you up.

You'll hear that Iman Yazbek helped out kids in the neighborhood, helped out his family.

You'll find that Iman Yazbek had a landscaping

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

business, that he came to this country thirteen years ago back in 2000, that he started his own business, that he was having his brothers come over from Lebanon to help him out, that he hadn't seen his brother for thirteen years and his brother had just come four months before his murder. One came and the other brother was on his way, was in Florida visiting some friends, about to come up to see his older brother, Iman Yazbek, and that while he was in Florida he heard that his brother was murdered, never got to see his brother. You'll hear all about Iman Yazbek. He then says, sure, I'm at a restaurant here, I'll just bring you over to the restaurant. says, fine.

She then sets it up and she will tell you, she will tell you that she set it up. She will tell you that she is the one who asked Tanzerius Anderson if he wanted to do a robbery, she was the one who suggested the location and she was the one who brought him there, and you'll hear why she is saying those things and you'll hear the agreement that she has in connection with this case, and you'll hear that the

Commonwealth, in exchange for her testimony, is recommending that she be sent to state prison after she testifies for up to ten years.

She then meets up with Iman Yazbek.

She talks to him. She's at the restaurant. She uses his cell phone while at the restaurant. She pages the pager that Heather Coady has, Jason Robinson's girlfriend, eleven thirty. She'll tell you that then she brought Iman Yazbek back by saying, can you drop me off at my girlfriend's house, and he said, yes, and he brought her down that driveway. She'll tell you that she got out of the car, got out of the door. The deal was that they were supposed to be waiting in the hallway.

You'll hear that Jason Robinson lived in that building, that hallway has no apartment in it. You saw the other apartments in the other buildings. That building, there is no apartment. There is a maintenance area there. She gets out of the car. Where are they? They're not around, Jason and Tanzerius. The deal was, she'll tell you, that she was going to say, once they came and grabbed Iman, that she was going to say, oh,

my God, it's a robbery, and she was going to take off so that when she talked to Iman later on, she would say to him, geez, I don't know what the heck just happened, geez, you got robbed, but it didn't work like that because she went into the hallway, she knocked on that door, the door, the first door that I pointed out when you go into that hallway. She knocked on the door, She knows that that's a dummy door. She knows it doesn't go to anything. She knows it's a maintenance area, but they are not in the hallway.

She thinks it's not going to happen so she walks out and as she walks out, as Iman Yazbek is about to leave, these two defendants come from behind the dumpster, come from behind the fences and, as they come from behind the fences, Tanzerius Anderson grabs Iman Yazbek on one side, Jason grabs him on the other side.

Joleena starts saying, Heather, Heather, I was trying to meet you and starts walking off quickly, and meets up with Heather Coady.

You'll hear that as she's walking with Heather Coady she hears a loud bang. She runs.

She sees Jason and Tanzerius running from the building. She gets into a car, Tanzerius Anderson's car, she gets into the passenger's side, Tanzerius gets into the driver's side and Jason Robinson gets into the back seat and there is a conversation that takes place during this ride and you'll hear that discussion, that conversation.

What happened, Joleena says, what happened, this was not supposed to be a shooting, the man was supposed to give his money up, the man who would just give you anything, his shirt off his back, would have given up his money, what happened. Tanzerius Anderson says, I got my body for the summer, he's murked, you'll hear the word "murked" means murdered. I got my body for the summer, he's murked. They drive around, they drive through Brighton. They go into Allston and they're driving.

Tanzerius Anderson takes out the gun and she sees the gun and she recognizes the gun. It's her father's gun. He takes the gun and he hands it to his friend, Jason Robinson, and as they're driving to a location, Tanzerius Anderson

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comes upon a fenced in area, pulls the car into
the fenced area, it's like a business, commercial
slash residential area in Allston, he gets out of
the car, gets the gun from Jason and hides it
underneath a bobcat, a piece of equipment, gets
back in the car. They go on the turnpike and as
they're going onto the turnpike, Jason loses his
watch. Jason loses his watch and he's thinking,
I could have lost it in that struggle.

So they go back. The decision is made by Tanzerius Anderson and Jason Robinson, we have to go back. So they go back to the Faneuil development and they go back and they see Heather Coady and they see Eddie Gauthier who are in that park by that water fountain, by those benches in the McKinley Park. The three of them, Jason Robinson, Joleena Tate and Tanzerius Anderson get out of the car, go to the park. Tanzerius Anderson makes a comment to Heather how he got rid of it, suggesting the gun. Tanzerius Anderson says to Heather Coady, you need to go look for a watch, Jason lost a watch. Heather Coady says, what type of watch. Jason Robinson says, it's a Timberland, it's a Timberland watch.

23

24

So you'll hear what happens then is that they get into the car, Joleena Tate, Tanzerius Anderson, Jason Robinson. Inside the car, Tanzerius Anderson is saying to Joleena Tate, this nineteen-year-old man is saying to Joleena Tate, you know, they're going to find your prints, they're going to find that you were in that restaurant, you got to have a story, you got to come up with a story, stick to a story, say that you just saw the guy at the restaurant, he dropped you off and that's it. Remember, remember, Joleena, they have no witnesses, they don't have a weapon, the police have no witnesses, they have no weapon, stick to the story. Jason Robinson says, you can do it, just stick to the story.

They then drive, they drive back to a place in Allston, Tanzerius Anderson gets the gun from underneath that bobcat, gets back in the car, and once again hands off the gun to Jason Robinson. Joleena Tate then has them drop her off over at that red building on the top of Dunboy Street. She gets out and she goes into the building and she sees Eddie Gauthier and

1.2

Heather Coady. It's her house, it's Joleena's house but Eddie Gauthier and Heather Coady are there. She'll tell you and they'll tell you that Heather Coady made a comment to her, Joleena, we went back looking for the watch, that man's face is blown off, I almost stepped on his body, you guys are in big trouble, you guys better get out of here.

The next morning the Boston Police find the body, hours upon hours upon hours, Iman Yazbek's body lay in the back of that driveway. They find the body. They have Eddie Gauthier in seventy-two hours. Eddie Gauthier tells them what happened. They start looking for Joleena Tate. Joleena Tate leaves. She takes off. She's afraid. She knows her involvement. She takes off. She takes off because she gets a call from a friend who says, the police are going to be coming and looking for you, they're going to ask you some questions.

So that Thursday when she gets that phone call -- earlier in the morning on that Thursday, hours before she got the phone call, the shooting happened, Monday and Tuesday night,

Thursday, we are into Thursday now, she gets a phone call in the morning from Tanzerius Anderson and Tanzerius Anderson says to her, Joleena, we have to meet, we have to get Eddie, we have to get Heather, we have to all meet. He says to her, I'll meet you down the street at Brooks Street. They pick the location. They are going to meet at Brooks variety store, the place where we stopped at the bottom of Brooks Street after going to the red building.

They meet in front of Brooks variety, they make phone calls, they are going to hook up with Heather. They go around down the street. They go to the Brighton development, Faneuil development. They see Heather Coady. Heather is with Jason. They get into the car. Now, in the car it's Tanzerius Anderson, Jason Robinson, Heather Coady and Joleena Tate. They drive to the Store Twenty-Four around the corner, stop the car. Tanzerius says to Heather, you got to go get Eddie. Heather Coady, who is seventeen, who is the girlfriend of Jason Robinson who is nineteen, says, okay, and gets out of the car, walks down the street, contacts Eddie Gauthier.

Eddie comes out, they want to talk to you.

Now, Eddie is terrified now because, you see, Eddie has already talked to the police. Eddie has already been — this is Thursday morning. Eddie has already gone that Wednesday night into Thursday morning, has already been to the police station, has already given the police a statement. Now he's concerned for his safety because now Heather is saying they want to talk to you. So he walks down the street, tells his mom to call the police.

He goes down the street and as they're going down the street, Heather Coady and Eddie Gauthier, they see the car, Tanzerius Anderson's car. It leaves Store Twenty-Four and it goes into the Scrub-a-Dub, that first stall there, so Eddie walks with Heather Coady to the Scrub-a-Dub. Heather Coady gets into the car, Tanzerius Anderson and Jason Robinson get out of the car and they meet with Eddie. What are you telling the police, says Tanzerius Anderson, what did you talk to the police about, have you told the police anything? No, I told them I didn't know anything, told them I don't know anything. Good.

Stick to that story.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Eddie Gauthier says now that he knows the person who's been murdered, I heard that they got -- that there was no identification on the body. Tanzerius Anderson says, yeah, we got rid of that, we got rid of the wallet, the ID, we got rid of the gun. Eddie Gauthier says, I knew the guy, he was a landscaper, I worked with him. Tanzerius Anderson says, oh, you went to the cops? Eddie Gauthier says, he wasn't a cop. Well, when we had him in the back, he kept saying police, police, police. It was please, please, please with his accent, but this man says that he was saying police, police, police. He said, I thought he was a cop, I thought he was calling for back-up.

They then get into the car and

Tanzerius Anderson drives to a Burger King. As

he's driving that car he continues to say, look

out, look out in the rear view mirror. Eddie is

sitting there in the back seat scared as a ghost.

They go into the Burger King. The only one that

eats is this man, Tanzerius Anderson. They then

go to Vineland Street, that street that is across

. 9

from the development that we pointed out after we went to the Pig and Whistle. They stop there.

Heather Coady jumps out, goes to her house, more conversation by Tanzerius Anderson and Jason

Robinson, I heard that you maybe told a reporter about what you might have seen. Tanzerius

Anderson says, I saw it in the paper, you're talking, you're talking to the press, you're talking to the newspapers. Eddie Gauthier says, I told them nothing, I told them the same thing I told the police, I don't know anything.

He's already told the police earlier
that morning in a taped statement about what he
knew but he's not going to tell them what he's
told the police. They then say, okay, you're all
set. Eddie Gauthier gets out of the car.
Tanzerius Anderson says, we'll meet you tonight
at eight, eight thirty. Eddie Gauthier goes back
home, calls up Sergeant Coleman. Sergeant
Coleman says, look, you shouldn't stick around
that development any longer. Eddie Gauthier
then, for his safety, leaves the development.
Eddie Gauthier's mother who lived in that
development for years and years, for her safety,

.22

is then transferred out of the development.

What happens then is, the car is driven with Tanzerius Anderson and Jason Robinson to Dunboy Street to drop off Joleena Tate and to drop off Heather Coady. They then drop them off. After they drop off Heather Coady and Joleena Tate, these two defendants leave. Heather Coady and Joleena Tate go into the house. As they go into the house, at some point in time there is a phone call. It's from a girl named Veronica. She tells Joleena Tate, I just spoke with the police, the police just interviewed me. They have your name.

Joleena Tate now is afraid. She calls up — they page Jason Robinson and Tanzerius Anderson calls back, what's up, what's going on, I just dropped you off, what's happening. The police are going to come, we need to talk, we need to talk. Alright, alright, we'll be over. No, I'm afraid they are going to come here any time now. Alright, alright, where do you want to meet? How about Amy's house? Tanzerius Anderson says, no, no, she's still in school. They agree upon a meeting place, Rogers Park, the park that

. 8

we went to. Heather Coady and Joleena Tate go to Rogers Park waiting for Tanzerius Anderson and Jason Robinson. Forty-five minutes or so later the car drives up, Tanzerius Anderson's car. They get into the car.

Eventually they drive to the Arsenal Mall. Joleena Tate is saying to Tanzerius Anderson, I'm leaving. He says, just stick to the story, stick to the story, if you've got to go, alright, but stick to the story, and if anyone asks you, I don't know you.

They go to the Arsenal Mall. They're sitting on the swings, Tanzerius Anderson and Joleena Tate, Jason Robinson and his girlfriend, Heather Coady. There's more questions about what happened. He tells her about what he did. He tells her, I had the gun at his neck, Iman Yazbek is calling for help, no, no, no, begging them, begging them for his life, please, no, he's saying to them, I know people in the development, I'm not a bad man, please, please don't, he's saying to them, and he's shot in the face.

The investigation then continues. Now

1 Joleena is on the run and the police are looking 2 for her. They eventually find her and you'll 3 hear where they found here and you'll hear how 4 her father, Alan Tate, how her father who is her 5 legal guardian, had been from January until 6 March. At that point in time they had had a 7 falling out and he'll tell you the reason they 8 had the falling out and he will tell you how he 9 had moved her from school to school to school. 10 He moved her from Edison, he moved her to St. 11 Andrews, I believe it was, in Allston, he moved 12 her to Mount St. Joseph's, another high school in 13 Brighton, and then he moved her to take her out 14 of Boston, moved her to Maine where he paid 15 twenty thousand dollars in tuition to get her out 16 of the city, and you'll hear that she was 17 expelled in Maine from Fryberg Academy and that 18 January before the March murder when she was 19 expelled, her father had said to her, we're 20 through, I'm not dealing with you any more, 21 you're not my daughter, words to that effect, you 22 can't go on like this, you're not my daughter. 23

years old, no school, she wasn't going to school,

in January and February, doesn't have her father, doesn't have the person, the only person that was really looking out for her during her lifetime, and she meets up with this man.

father will tell you that after the shooting, as he regularly goes up to the condominium, he went up to the condominium, he found that his gun was missing. The police contact him, the Boston Police. He knew now the police were looking for his daughter. He engaged in a search for his daughter. He's a private investigator. He will tell you he had investigators out there searching for his daughter. When his daughter was finally found, he'll tell you that then he then brought her forward.

Now, the police had Eddie Gauthier who is not very good friends with Joleena Tate, who just is an associate, who is telling the same story that Joleena Tate is telling. Now, the next person they talk to is Heather Coady and you'll hear that Heather Coady is questioned and she's brought before a grand jury and you'll hear that Heather Coady does not want to testify, does

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

not want to get involved, does not want to say anything. Remember, I told you from the beginning of the opening statement that Heather Coady, I had said, was very reluctant from the beginning because she is Jason Robinson's girlfriend. She loves him, she does not want to say anything.

Months have gone by since this incident. She then tells the police what she She then says to the police, same story, the same facts you will hear from Eddie Gauthier and from Joleena Tate. She adds something, though. She also adds that that night she, too, had a conversation, a conversation with Jason Robinson out by the play area and she'll tell you that Jason Robinson, before this shooting took place, asked her for a knife and she'll tell you that she said to Jason Robinson, no, I'm not going to give you a knife, you're going to do something stupid. He says, no, it's only for show, just give me the knife, it's only for show, and she'll tell you that she gave him a knife that night and she'll tell you what she added, that after the shot went off, after Jason

Robinson and Tanzerius Anderson are running through that park, after the shot and after Iman Yazbek lay on that ground, she ran up to Jason, she gave him a kiss, and she said, I love you, and he told her go inside, get in the house. And you'll hear that she was reluctant to testify then before the grand jury, and I suggest that you'll hear that she is reluctant to talk to you here on that witness stand because she still is the girlfriend of Jason Robinson.

You'll hear that the investigation continued and the police asked Joleena Tate, where did you get the gun, where did the gun come from, and she admitted, I stole it from my father, I went up there with Tanzerius Anderson.

Where did you go up there? Joleena Tate, I went up to the Yankee Clipper motel. You'll hear from Sergeant Coleman that he then drove up to Conway, New Hampshire, checked the Yankee Clipper hotel and checked the receipts, saw the name corroborating what Joleena Tate had said,

Tanzerius Anderson, corroborating that weekend, the same weekend that Alan Tate will tell you !

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

his apartment. That Yankee Clipper hotel is two to three miles away from where his condominium is located.

And then you'll hear the police state and question Tanzerius Anderson. You'll hear You'll hear he had his storv Tanzerius Anderson. He thought he had individuals that were going to corroborate what he was going to say. He had no reason to run because he had nobody Andisoliss pointing him out as far as he knows. you'll hear the police questioned him and they's questioned him about New Hampshire and they asked him, have you ever gone to New Hampshire and this was -- they asked him this in April, a week or two after the murder. No -- oh, yeah, I went there, I went to Manchester, New Hampshire. You'll hear how far away Manchester is from the What did you do in Manchester? I went Conway. to look for my uncle. Who's your uncle? Uncle Frank, I just went up there looking for my uncle. Did you see him? No, I didn't know where Ta lives, I didn't have a cell phone, he didn't have a phone, and so, you know, we just decided to To come back.

. .......

IH-

1

:a 👸

5. 四里,**王** 

Well, who did you go up there with? I went up there with my good friend, Jonathan, Jonathan Simms. So you're up in Manchester, and what did you do then? Well, we were tired so we got a hotel room. You'll hear that Manchester is nowhere near North Conway. And then what did you do after that? Well, then we came home. So you go up to Manchester for your uncle who you don't see, get a hotel room with your friend, Jonathan, and then you came back? Sure, that's what we did.

Well, Jonathan was outside when they're questioning the defendant so you will hear from Detective Traylor, they brought Jonathan in.

Jonathan, did you ever go up to New Hampshire?

Yeah, we went up there, I went up there with

Tanzerius. What did you go up to New Hampshire

for? I went up, his uncle or his cousin, we went

up to see his Uncle Frank. Did you see him?

Yeah, we saw him, we were there an hour and a

half with him, we spent a hour and a half. Did

you ever stay at a hotel with him when you went

up there that time or any time? No, I never

stayed in a hotel with Tanzerius.

You'll hear from Joleena Tate they went up to North Conway, they went up there together, he signed in at the hotel in North Conway.

You'll hear, after all the evidence is said and done, ladies and gentlemen, that while there was a series of attempts to cover up this crime by Tanzerius Anderson and Jason Robinson, even to the point where Tanzerius Anderson made a comment to Jason Robinson, is Heather going to stick to the story, do we need to do something to Heather, is she going to snitch, Jason says, no, that's my girl, she's not going to snitch, she's going to be fine. Tanzerius says, alright, if you're vouching for her.

Then Tanzerius Anderson, just to seal the bargain with Heather, says to Heather Coady, there's that guy in the newspaper that I heard about is snitching, he's a big shot guy, he's out there snitching on Bulger, you know what I'd do to that guy in the newspapers, if I ever caught somebody that snitched, if I ever saw that guy, I'd kill him. That's intimidation, letting Heather Coady know what he's thinking about should anyone directly or indirectly say

something about him.

Ladies and gentlemen, that, in sum ——
and I appreciate your attention and I apologize
for the time but it's an important case. It's
important for all parties in connection with this
case and that, in sum and substance, is what I
expect the evidence is that you will receive and
after you've heard all the evidence and, based on
the evidence, the testimony of Heather Coady,
Eddie Gauthier, Joleena Tate, based upon the
corroboration of the evidence that you'll hear
from a handwriting expert, an FBI handwriting
expert that says the writing on that receipt in
the Yankee Clipper Hotel is ——

THE COURT: Move on, sir.

MR. TOCHKA: Based on your observations as well of that handwriting, you can compare the handwriting yourself and observe it, based upon all that evidence, I would ask you to find this man, Tanzerius Anderson, guilty of the murder of Iman Yazbek along with Jason Robinson. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. DOOLIN: May we approach?

(Whereupon, the following discussion occurred at side bar:)

MR. DOOLIN: Judge, respectfully I object to certain things that were said during my brother's opening. Certain of these things, I would suggest to the Court, inflamed the jury and at this time, even after the government's opening, that Susan Gauthier was moved out of the development for her own safety, that hour after hour Mr. Yazbek lay there on the ground, that one of the Yazbek brothers came from Florida and never got to see his brother, and descriptions of the side of the face being ripped off, that he was begging for his life.

Respectfully, based on those things, I move for a mistrial at this point in time. This is the type of rhetoric, I would submit, that is impermissible. I would suggest to the Court that any of these different elements is impermissible, that, taken together and added up in totality, are grounds for a mistrial at this point.

MR. FLAHERTY: On behalf of Tanzerius Anderson, I join, Your Honor. I also note that in addition --

THE COURT: Try to keep your voice down as much as you can. Thank you.

MR. FLAHERTY: I join in his objections and in his motion and I also mention that in addition there was also mention of Edwin Gauthier being in fear for his safety based upon his actions also contributing to this element of inflammatory rhetoric before the jury and I also object to the mention in the opening of any FBI document examiner and I join in Mr. Doolin's motion.

THE COURT: Mr. Tochka?

MR. TOCHKA: With respect to the FBI expert, I apologize. I didn't know I should not get into it. I quickly turned --

THE COURT: It was ultimate opinion to which I interjected, but you did move on.

MR. TOCHKA: As to Edwin Gauthier,

that's the testimony in terms of what he was
doing at that particular time. That's really -I think the jury should be able to hear in terms
of what was going on in his mind. In terms of
the fear of the mother, the mother was moved,
what I understand from the defense is that they

are going to put this on Eddie Gauthier as the person who actually shot the victim. Well, if he's the actual person who shot the victim, his mother being moved out of the development, the fact that he's concerned for his safety, I suggest is very relevant to his credibility in connection with this case.

As to the description of the side of the face being torn off, the Court has seen those pictures. I don't know how else to describe what those pictures depict other than what the witnesses have described it, as if the side of his face were blown off. Those are the facts of the case and, gruesome as they might be, it's the facts of the case.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Anything more?

MR. DOOLIN: Judge, in going through

Mr. Tochka's point about them being moved out of

the development for her fear of their safety,

again that is the government vouching for the

credibility of this witness and vouching for

Eddie Gauthier's truthfulness. Respectfully, I

would suggest that that's improper.

THE COURT: Alright. I'm denying the

motion for a mistrial. Is there any request for a curative instruction?

 $\label{eq:mr.def} \mbox{MR. DOOLIN:} \quad \mbox{I would be asking for a} \\ \mbox{curative instruction.}$ 

MR. DOOLIN: To address these issues that have been brought out about what happened in the hallway, about him begging for his life,

about the injuries, about Gauthier --

THE COURT: Which would be what?

THE COURT: No, sir. I'm not going to go into any individual points that you made. Is there something else that you are proposing? I'm not addressing myself to the evidence or the proposed evidence. Was there some broader concept that you wished me to convey to the jury?

MR. FLAHERTY: On behalf of Mr.

Anderson, I would ask that you specifically
address each of these points that we have brought
up with you and explain to the jury that that
rhetoric or the mentions are the prosecutor's
view of the evidence and they are not to be
prejudiced or swayed or biased one way or the
other as a result of that. It's simply a
statement, not the evidence.

THE COURT: I'm not giving those instructions. I've already instructed the jury that opening statements are not evidence, that they are not in any way — they are not in any way to base the verdicts on the openings or closings, but I will reiterate that. Is there anything you want to say?

MR. TOCHKA: No.

(Whereupon, the discussion at side bar was concluded.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to move next to the opening statements that are going to be made on behalf of each defendant. Before we do that, I just want to remind you what I had said about the role of opening statements before we listened to the Commonwealth's and that was that what the attorneys say in the course of the opening statements, and this goes for closing arguments as well, is not evidence. Evidence is going to be presented to you through the actual answers given by the witnesses and the exhibits and it is going to be up to you as members of the jury at the end of the case to decide what the evidence

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

was and whether to give any weight or consideration to it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Flaherty?

MR. FLAHERTY: Your Honor,
respectfully, on behalf of Mr. Anderson at this
stage of the proceeding, I'll reserve his right
to open.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Doolin? MR. DOOLIN: Good afternoon. What was just said in that opening statement is not evidence. That's what Judge Rouse just told you. The evidence that you'll hear over the course of the next several days is going to come in to you from several different forms. It's going to be from people who come through that door, who come through the bar enclosure, and who come up to this witness stand and take an oath, who raise their right hand and take an oath that they're supposed to tell the truth about their knowledge of what happened and what didn't happen at that time. It will come in the form of evidence, of photographs that come in front of you, of pieces of evidence that you'll have a chance to take a look at and feel when you go back into the jury

room at the end of all of the evidence in this case.

Evidence is what you, the jury, judge to be evidence. You'll have a chance to listen to what these witnesses say. You'll have a chance to look at tangible evidence that comes in front of you because the fifteen of you who sit here in front of me are embarking on one of the most important experiences of your life. You're going to be the jurors, the triers of fact in the case of Tanzerius Anderson and Jason Robinson, my client.

Now, you've heard Judge Rouse and she has given you a precharge. Our clients are presumed to be innocent. The burden of proof in this case rests squarely on the Commonwealth and you, the jury, have to find the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, the highest standard of proof in the American legal system.

THE COURT: Mr. Doolin, opening statement, please.

MR. DOOLIN: Yes. You're going to hear evidence over the course of the next several days from various witnesses because on March 27 of the

year, 2000, there were some people who gathered over in the Faneuil development. You've had a chance to go to the Faneuil development. You went there this morning. You have had a chance to look around. You've had a chance to see the layout.

What you're going to hear from the witnesses who testify over the next several days is this, that at about three forty-five or four o'clock that morning, an individual by the name of Edward Laureano came to 89 Faneuil Street.

When he came to 89 Faneuil Street, he was the first person to see Iman Yazbek who lay dead right outside the stairs of 89 Faneuil Street.

The testimony that you're going to hear is that Mr. Laureano, as any good citizen would, called the police.

The Boston Police responded to the scene. The first officer who was there was Officer Rouvalis from the Brighton Police Department. At about this time some EMT's arrived, other police officers began to come to the scene at three forty-five, four o'clock. As four o'clock became four thirty, various members

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of the Boston Police Department came to the scene, specialized units. Sergeant Coleman from the homicide unit came. He came about five ten or five fifteen. You're also going to hear that Detective Traylor also arrived and you're going to hear about specialized people from the Boston Police Department, a photographer, a lighting truck, and things of that nature that came in.

At some point in time there were a good number of officers who were on the scene that began to do what is called canvass the area, to go through 89 and to bang on some doors, to go across the street to the area of North Beacon, to that first apartment house, and bang on the doors over there, to look for witnesses. One of the things that you're going to hear about is the police investigation in this case, the things that they did and the things that they didn't do because as that morning unfolded, they began to talk to some people. The investigation began to take shape. You're going to hear about a crime You're going to hear about evidence of scene. what happened at that crime scene, what was done and what wasn't done.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The evidence that you're going to hear is that the police officers, within the first six to eight hours, ascertained a certain amount of witnesses, some people who had heard things, who had seen things, who had some evidence, individuals by the name of Oscar Vega, Joanne Constable, Eddie Gauthier, Heather Coady, ascertained that day by Detective Paul Mahoney as.

You're going to hear that at the beginning of this investigation the person who was seen outside that night, the person who was seen in that play area was an individual by the name of Heather Coady, that Oscar Vega had seen her, that Joanne Constable had seen her. going to hear that Eddie Gauthier was an individual who was ascertained by the police within hours after this incident happened. Gauthier, Heather Coady, both interviewed by the police. You've heard the government give their opening in this case. You will hear the evidence of this case as it begins to unfold for, in the early morning hours of March 27 of the year 2000, the people who were ascertained were Eddie

143

Gauthier and Heather Coady.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

As the day unfolded, as the days unfolded, as the twenty-eighth became the twentyninth, as the twenty-ninth became the thirtieth, there was another individual who was ascertained by some other members, by the police department, for the police had begun to investigate Mr. Yazbek, where he had been that day, who he associated with, who he was friendly with. no mistake about it, Iman Yazbek was thirty-five years old. On the night in question of March the twenty-seventh into the early morning hours of March the twenty-eighth, he was out with a sixteen-year-old girl. They were over in Wadi's Restaurant over in Watertown. That sixteen-yearold girl was Joleena Tate.

The testimony that you're going to hear is that, as the police began to investigate where Mr. Yazbek had been that night, the name that kept coming up was Joleena Tate. Joleena Tate was very friendly with Heather Coady. Joleena Tate, who Heather Coady calls her cousin, is very friendly with her, went to school together. Heather Coady also happens to be very friendly

with an individual by the name of Eddie Gauthier.
You're going to hear evidence, independent
evidence that Heather Coady was out there that
night in that play area.

You're going to hear independent evidence that the police went back to what Mr. Yazbek had been doing that night on March 27, independent evidence from the people who were at Wadi's Restaurant, who had seen Joleena Tate with Mr. Yazbek that night, a cigarette lighter that Ms. Tate had left at Wadi's Restaurant. Ms. Tate had been in that car that was driven to the back of 89 Faneuil Street that night. Independent evidence from witnesses uninvolved in anything about Joleena Tate, about Eddie Gauthier, about Heather Coady.

What you won't hear over the course of the next several days is independent evidence about Jason Robinson. Over the course of the next several days you will get to see forensic evidence, hear about forensic evidence, see that tangible evidence that comes into a courtroom, evidence that you can touch, photographs that you can look at, things that you can take back with

you when you go into that jury room, forensic evidence, ballistic evidence, fingerprint evidence, procedures that were done as to ballistics, procedures that were done as to fingerprints, procedures that were not done as to fingerprinting and ballistics, criminologists from the Boston Police crime lab who will come in, who will talk about the things that they analyzed and the things that they didn't analyze during the course of this investigation.

Because over the next several days when you hear about this forensic evidence, these forensic tests that were done, you will hear one thing and one thing only about Jason Robinson, that not one iota of forensic evidence in the case connects him to anything, connects him to the death of Mr. Yazbek, connects him to a gun, connects him to any sort of robbery, because there is none. The reason why there is no forensic evidence in the case against Jason Robinson is because the police have the wrong man here today.

What you're going to hear over the course of the next several days is evidence,

. 8

believable evidence, forensic evidence, that there is no link between Jason Robinson and this crime.

I'm going to ask you at this point in time to keep an open mind about all this, to evaluate it as it comes in, to keep an open mind until after you've heard the jury instructions of Judge Rouse, until you have heard the arguments of all the attorneys, to pay attention to all of the evidence that comes in because you are the judges of that evidence, and that evidence shows that Jason Robinson was not involved in this crime. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Would you call your first witness, please, Mr. Tochka?

MR. TOCHKA: Thank you, Your Honor.

Edward Laureano. May I proceed, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TOCHKA: Thank you.

22

23

24

## EDWARD LAUREANO, called as a witness, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 3 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. TOCHKA: 6 Sir, can you please introduce yourself? 7 My name is Edward Laureano. 8 Could you spell your last name, please, for the 9 record? 10 Last name is L-a-u-r-e-a-n-o. 11 THE COURT: Now, Mr. Laureano, I'm 12 going to ask, sir, if you would move closer to 13 the microphone. It would help us hear you. 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. 15 BY MR. TOCHKA: 16 17 And, sir, can you tell the jurors, what's your 18 occupation? 19 I'm an assembler for an Inplant (phonetic 20 spelling). 21 You're an assembler for what? 22 I-M Inplant Company in Gloucester. A 23 How long have you been performing that work?

Been there for two years now.

Can you tell the jurors, do you have any military 2 service? 3 I served in the United States Marine Corps for 4 six years. 5 Q And are you married? 6 Yes, I am. 7 And. where does your wife live? 8 Α My wife lives in Brighton. 9 Q Where particularly in Brighton? 10 89 Faneuil Street, Brighton. 11 Q. How long has she lived there? 12 She's been there since '98. Α 13 Do you have any children? Q 14 Α I have seven. 15 How many? Q 16 Α Seven. 17 Seven children, and how many children -- are they 18 all your children? 19 I have three biological children and four Α 20 stepchildren. 21 And the four stepchildren are your wife's? 22 They are my wife's, yes. Α 23 And where do your seven children live? Q 24 They also reside at 89 Faneuil Street.

Q Now, back in the year 2000, particular in March 2 27 of 2000, were you working that evening -- what 3 were your hours that evening? 4 Α I was on the second shift which was from three in 5 the afternoon until one thirty at night. 6 Q And where did you work? 7 I worked for Avery Assembly Conductors in Α 8 Gloucester. 9 What would you do when you got off work? 10 At the time we had an open window for overtime so Α 11 I was working twelve hour shifts so I worked from 12 three to three and then go straight home. 13 Q And straight home being --14 To 89 Faneuil Street. Α And when you'd go to Faneuil Street, was your 15 Q 16 wife working at that time? 17 At that time my wife was working for CompUSA, she Α 18 had the morning shift. 19 So you'd go home. What would you do? 20 Α I'd go home and get a couple hours of sleep, then 21 she'd go to work and my smallest child was three 22 so I would take care of him for most of the 23 morning. 24 Q Now, can you tell us on this particular night,

	I	
1		March 27 I'm sorry, March 27 going into March
2	5	28, do you remember arriving on the twenty-eighth
3	-	back in the development?
4	А	Yes, I do.
5	Q	And about what time did you get there?
6	A	It had to between three thirty or four. It's
7		roughly a forty-five minute drive from Gloucester
8		when there is no traffic.
9	Q	And where did you park your car?
10	A	I parked my car on Faneuil Street towards
11	,	Goodenough Street because the immediate parking
12		area in front of the complex is usually full at
13		that time.
14	Q	Now, when you got out of your car, which way were
15		you going to enter the house?
16	A	I had made it a habit to take when you're
17		coming from the direction of where I parked, the
18		first thing that you'll come up with is either a
19		driveway on your left that leads to 89 Faneuil or
20		the open court area which is further down also on
21		the left. I had made it a habit to always walk
22		down the driveway.
23	Q	And did you do that on this particular evening?
24	A	Yes, I did.

1	Q	Early morning, and as you did that, what were the
2		lighting conditions as you're walking down that
3		driveway?
4	A	The lighting conditions were there but they
5		weren't the best. It was sufficient.
6	Q	Now, as you walked down the driveway, do you have
7		to turn the corner at some point?
8	Α .	Yes.
9	Q	And you turned the corner for what reason?
10	Α	89 Faneuil is to the immediate right at the
11		bottom of that driveway.
12	Q	When you did that on that particular occasion,
13		did you make any observations?
14	A	I noticed there was a vehicle at the end of the
15		driveway.
16	Q	And can you tell us which direction that vehicle
17		was facing?
18	, A	The vehicle was facing towards the building.
19	Q	And was there anyone in that vehicle?
20	A	As I came upon the vehicle, there was no one in
21		the vehicle.
22	Q	What did you next see?
23	A	As I come around the corner at the bottom of the
24		driveway, I see the person laying with his feet

1 towards me, laying on his right side. 2 And what are you thinking at this time? Q. 3 Right now I'm thinking, who else was around me, 4 was this a set-up. First thing I did was look 5 around. There's a dumpster to the left. There's 6 a fenced in area where the maintenance people 7 keep their truck. 8 Why did you look around that area? Q 9 MR. FLAHERTY: Objection. 10 THE COURT: Overruled. Having been raised in Boston, I'm kind of 11 12 cautious when certain situations just arise. 13 MR. FLAHERTY: Objection, motion to 14 strike. 15 THE COURT: Allowed. 16 BY MR. TOCHKA: 17 I was asking why you looked at that particular 18 area and the dumpster. 19 The dumpster and the area that I said was fenced 20 in is a darkened area. Someone over there, you 21 wouldn't be able to see. 22 And did you look on this occasion that morning? Yes, I did. 23 24 And did you see anybody?

1	A	No.
2	Q	What did you do next?
3	А	I walked around the left side of the vehicle.
4		After I looked around my immediate area, started
5		walking towards the person.
6	Q	And how close did you get to the person?
7	A	I'd say I got within about five feet before I
8		noticed the right side of that individual's face
9		was severely wounded.
10	Q	And when you say severely wounded, what do you
11		mean?
12	Α	His face was distorted. You couldn't exactly
13		tell what had happened to him but it wasn't
14		attached to his face as a normal face would be.
15		It was a serious wound. You could tell it was a
16		wound.
17	Q	Could you observe anything around the body?
18	A	Around the body there seemed to be a trail of
19	·	what I perceived to be blood. It looked somewhat
20		dry which led me to believe that
21		MR. DOOLIN: I object.
22	BY M	R. TOCHKA:
23	Q	Not what you believe, sir. When you saw the
24		trail of blood and where was the trail of

1		blood?
2	Α	The trail of blood was streaming or in a sense
3		streaming from where the individual was lying.
4	Q	And when you say streaming, in what direction is
5		it going?
6	A	It's going back towards the driveway.
7	Q	Now, did you attempt to what did you do when
8		you saw this individual?
9	A	Once I saw the individual, once I saw the wound,
10		my first initial reaction was going to go and try
11		to help him but the more I looked around, the
12		more it appeared there was nothing I could do for
13		him.
14	Q	What did you do next?
15	A	Next I walked around the building towards the
16		other entrance and went upstairs to check on my
17		family.
18	Q	Can you describe when you went into the hallway,
19		into the back entrance, why didn't you go into
20		that front entrance?
21		MR. FLAHERTY: Objection.
22		MR. DOOLIN: Judge, I object.
23		THE COURT: Another question, sir,
21		nloaso

## BY MR. TOCHKA: 2 Which entrance did you go into, sir? Q. I took the other entrance around the building. 3 4 Was the entrance where you saw the body, was that 5 blocked in any fashion? 6 The door to the entrance was closed. There was a 7 set of keys on the steps there and I just didn't 8 want to walk through that area so I went around 9 the back. 10 And so what area then did you go into? 11 I went around the building to what is basically Α the front of the building. 12 13 and as you go into the front of the building, you Q 14 entered that first landing? 15 Α Yes. 16 And can you describe the lighting conditions in Q 17 that hallway as you entered in there? 18 Once you get in the lighting conditions weren't 19 the best. The lights were kind of dim, yellowish, in fact. 20 21 What did you do next? Q. 22 Α I cautiously went up the stairs. 23 Q What do you mean by cautiously went up the 24 stairs?

- 1 A The ladder well spirals up in the building and
  2 when you come around the corner there are certain
  3 blind spots.
  - Q So what did you do?

- I walked in the building, made sure there was no one in that immediate area where the ladder starts, then I made my way slowly up the building, making sure no one else was in the hall.
- 10 Q Then what did you do?
- 11 A I went in my home, went in all my children's

  12 rooms, made sure all my kids were okay, woke up

  13 my wife, made sure she was okay, and then I

  14 called the authorities.
- 15 Q And at some point in time, sir, did the authorities come?
- 17 A Yes, they did.
- 18 Q And did you go downstairs and identify yourself 19 to the police?
- 20 A Yes, I did.
- 21 Q Sir, let me show you this aerial photograph and 22 ask if -- have you seen this before?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q And it's fair to say that I showed you this at

1		some point?
2	A	Yes, you did.
3	Q	And, sir, is that a relatively or is that a
4		fair and accurate representation as to the
5	,	Faneuil development, the buildings as they
6		appeared back in the year 2000?
7	A	Yes, it is.
8		. MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, if I could
9		have this marked as an exhibit?
10		MR. DOOLIN: No objection.
11		MR. FLAHERTY: No objection, Your
12		Honor.
13		THE COURT: No objection, it shall be
14	·	marked.
15		(Exhibit No. 1, being an aerial
16		photograph, as described above, was marked and
17		admitted into evidence.)
18		MR. TOCHKA: And with the Court's
19		permission, if I could have the witness step to
20		the diagram?
21		THE COURT: You may. You may step
22		down, sir.
23		MR. TOCHKA: If I can just move this a
24		little bit closer for the jury?

1		THE COURT: Yes.
2	BY I	MR. TOCHKA:
3	Q	And, sir, I'm going to ask you, facing the
4		jurors, not blocking the view of the photograph,
5		and if you could take the pointer, sir.
6		Are you familiar with the orientation
7		of Faneuil Street, Faneuil Street being in this
8		area, Goodenough being in this area, and the park
9		being here?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Okay. Now, can you tell us, looking at that
12		diagram and the aerial photograph, where
13		approximately did you park the car?
14	А	I parked the car approximately on the side of
15		Faneuil Street.
16	Q	Okay. And that's the area of Goodenough Street?
17	A	Just past Goodenough Street.
18	Q	And when you say you walked down the driveway,
19		which driveway? Can you point that out?
20	Α	I'm going in this direction to my apartment.
21	Q	That's heading towards the direct
22	Α	Towards 89 Faneuil which is back here so when you
23	· ·	come across on the sidewalk, here's the driveway
24		which is on your left which is the first thing

you hit. Here's the open courtyard I was talking 2 about. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Laureano, I'm going to 4 have to ask you to keep your voice up, please. 5 I'm sorry. THE WITNESS: The second 6 way to get to the building is the open courtyard 7 I was speaking about so, force of habit, the 8 driveway would come up, first I'd walk down 9 there, walk down the driveway to 89 Faneuil. 10 BY MR. TOCHKA: 11 Now, can you point out in that diagram where the 12 car was that you saw that was parked? 13 The car that I had was parked right about here. 14 And is there an arrow there that points saying 15 the direction of 89? 16 That's 89 Faneuil right there. 17 And the body was how close to the car 18 approximately? I'd say within ten feet to the car. 19 Α 20 And when you said that you went around the 21 building, which direction did you go to the other 22 side of the building? 23 Once I found the person there, I walked this way 24 and around toward the front of the building, came

1		in through this direction.
2	Q	And when you said that you looked, prior to
3		going in that direction, you looked in the area
4		of the dumpsters, and where is that area that you
5		were looking for?
6	A	The area of the dumpsters, right here which,
7		there is no lighting back there and this is the
8		fenced off area I was talking about where the
9		maintenance truck is kept.
10	Q	Thank you, sir. You can resume the stand.
11	A	(Complying.)
12		MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, may we
13		approach side bar?
14		THE COURT: Approach?
15		MR. TOCHKA: Yes. May we approach side
16		bar?
17		THE COURT: Yes.
18		(Whereupon, the following discussion
19		occurred at side bar:)
20	-	MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, in terms of
21		the motion the defense had in terms of the
22	,	photograph, these are two photographs that the
23		Commonwealth would seek to introduce.
24		THE COURT: Any objections to these?

1		MR. FLAHERTY: These are the crime
2		scene photos, somewhat duplicative, I think, for
3		the purpose of establishing the location of the
4		body. Maybe the one that shows more of the scene
5		with the car and the address depicting 89 Faneuil
6		Street is probably best admitted into evidence.
7		MR. TOCHKA: I'm seeking to introduce
8		both of them into evidence, Your Honor.
9		THE COURT: As long as he can establish
10		they are a fair and accurate representation of
11		what he saw, any objection to those is overruled.
12		They are neither too graphic nor inflammatory and
13		I think they are probative.
14		(Whereupon, the discussion at side bar
15		was concluded.)
16	BY M	IR. TOCHKA:
17	Q	Mr. Laureano, let me show you, first off, this
18		photograph and ask if you recognize what that's a
19		photograph of.
20	A	It's a photograph of the situation, the way I
21		came upon it.
22	Q	And is that a photograph of the car that you saw
23		in the back of 89?
24	A	Yes, it is.

1	Q	And does that also show the body of the
2		individual that you saw?
3	Α	Yes, it does.
4	Q	Now, is it on that particular photograph, that
5		body at this time is covered with a yellow
6		blanket.
7		Was it covered in the yellow blanket
8		when you saw it?
9	Α.	No, it wasn't.
10	Q	Other than that, is that a fair and accurate
11	-	representation as to the relationship from the
12		car to the body and, other than the yellow
13		blanket, is that a fair and accurate
14		representation?
15	A	Yes, it is.
16		MR. TOCHKA: I move to introduce this
17		photograph into evidence.
18		THE COURT: Whatever objections there
19		are are overruled. It may be marked and
20		admitted.
21		(Exhibit No. 2, being a photograph, as
22		described above, was marked and admitted into
23		evidence.)
24		MP MOCHEN. Your Honor IIId agk to

1	publish this to the jurors.
2	THE COURT: You may. Give it to the
3	court officer.
4	MR. TOCHKA: Did Your Honor want me to
5	continue with questioning or wait until the
6	photograph
7	THE COURT: I would appreciate it if
8	you would continue. Thank you.
9	BY MR. TOCHKA:
10	Q Sir, let me show you this second photograph and
11	ask if you can identify that photograph.
12	A It's a photograph of the individual that I found
13	that night.
14	Q And is that a photograph of the individual
15	without the yellow blanket on him?
16	A Yes, it is.
17	Q And does that photograph fairly and accurately
18	depict the individual that you saw in the early
19	morning hours of March 28 of the year 2000?
20	A Yes, it does.
21	MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, I move to
22	introduce this photograph into evidence.
23	THE COURT: Any objection?
24	MR. FLAHERTY: Same objection, Your

1	Honor.
2	THE COURT: Is that an objection, sir?
3	MR. FLAHERTY: Yes.
4	THE COURT: It's overruled. Thank you.
5	It may be marked and admitted.
6	(Exhibit No. 3, being a photograph, as
7	described above, was marked and admitted into
8	evidence.)
9	BY MR. TOCHKA:
10	Q And, sir, showing you does that show the
11	facial trauma that you observed on that evening?
12	A Yes, it does.
13	Q And does that show the pool of blood that you
14	observed on that evening?
15	A Yes, it does.
16	MR. TOCHKA: Your Honor, I move to
17	introduce this item to have this photograph
18	published.
19	THE COURT: You may.
20	MR. TOCHKA: Thank you, Mr. Laureano.
21	Nothing else.
22	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr.
23	Doolin?
24	MR. DOOLIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Street?

## 1 CROSS EXAMINATION 2 BY MR. DOOLIN: 3 Mr. Laureano, I think you testified that on the night in question you parked your car somewhere 5 out here on Faneuil Street, is that right? 6 That's correct. Α 7 Q And you're familiar with this area, is that 8 right? 9 Yes, I am. 10 Now, the area where you parked your car, was that 11 at the corner of Goodenough Street? 12 To be honest with you, I don't recall if it was 13 the corner but I do recall it was on that side. 14 And you're familiar with that area up on Faneuil 15 Street where you parked that night, is that 16 right? 17 Yes, I am. 18 Is it fair to say that there is a house that's on 19 the corner here of Faneuil Street and Goodenough 20 Street? 21 Yes, it is. 22 And is it also fair that there is another house 23 that is also right next to that house on Faneuil

Is that right?

1	A	That's correct.
2	Q	And it's also fair to say that the alley that you
3		went down is right next to that house? Is that
4		correct?
5	A	Yes, it is.
6	Q	Now, I show you this photograph, sir. Are you
7		familiar with the area that's depicted there?
8	A	That is the driveway I was referring to.
9	Q	And is that a fair and accurate representation of
10		the way that that driveway looked?
11	А	Yes.
12		MR. DOOLIN: I'd offer this into
13		evidence, Your Honor.
14		MR. TOCHKA: No objection.
15		THE COURT: It shall be marked and
16		admitted.
17		(Exhibit No. 4, being a photograph, was
18		marked and admitted into evidence.)
19	BY M	R. DOOLIN:
20	Q	And I show you this photograph. Are you familiar
21	·	with what's depicted in that photograph?
22	A	Yes, I'm familiar with that.
23	Q	And what does that depict?
24	Α	That depicts the back of 89 Faneuil at the bottom

```
1
         of the driveway.
 2
         Okay. And is that a fair and accurate
    Q
 3
         representation of the way that that area looked
 4
         that night?
 5
    A
         The way the area looked, yes.
 6
         Okay. And is it also fair to say that there is
    Q
 7
         another building that is to the -- that's
 8
         adjacent to 89 Faneuil?
 9
         It's part of the complex, yes.
10
        Is that 85 Faneuil?
11
         I'm not familiar with the particular numbers, to
         be honest with you.
12
13
         But that's also a separate building, is that
    Q
14
         correct?
15
         Yes, it is.
16
                    MR. DOOLIN: I'd offer this into
17
         evidence, Your Honor.
18
                    MR. TOCHKA: No objection.
19
                    (Exhibit No. 5, being a photograph, as
20
         described above, was marked and admitted into
         evidence.)
21
22
    BY MR. DOOLIN:
         I show you this photograph. Are you familiar
23
24
         with what's depicted in that photograph?
```

```
Α
          Yes, I am.
 2
          What's depicted in that photograph?
     Q
 3
          It's the rear entrance to 89 Faneuil.
 4
     Q
          And is that a fair and accurate representation of
 5
          that area?
 6
          Yes, it is.
 7
                    MR. DOOLIN: I'd offer that into
 8
          evidence as well, Your Honor.
 9
                    MR. TOCHKA: No objection.
10
                    (Exhibit No. 6, being a photograph, as
11
          described above, was marked and admitted into
12
          evidence.)
13
    BY MR. DOOLIN:
14
          Showing you the last exhibit which is now Exhibit
15
          6, the door to 89 Faneuil Street, have you -- you
16
         have gone through that door on many occasions, is
17
          that correct?
18
         Yes, I have.
    Α
19
    Q
         Is it fair to say that that is somewhat of a
20
         heavy door?
21
    Α
         Very.
22
    Q
         Very heavy door. Is that what you said?
23
    Α
         Yes, sir.
24
         Thank you. Showing you this photograph, are you
    Q
```

```
familiar with what that depicts?
         Looks like the interior of 89 Faneuil.
 2
 3
         Is that inside the hallway of 89 Faneuil Street?
 4
         Yes.
 5
         Is that a fair and accurate representation of
    Q
 6
         that area?
 7
         Yes.
 8
                    MR. DOOLIN: I'd offer that into
 9
         evidence as well, Your Honor.
10
                    MR. TOCHKA: No objection.
11
                    (Exhibit No. 7, being a photograph, as
12
         described above, was marked and admitted into
13
         evidence.)
14
    BY MR. DOOLIN:
15
         You testified that you also came to an area where
16
         there is dumpsters, is that correct?
17
         Yes.
18
   . Q
         Is that what is depicted in that photograph?
19
    Α
         That is the dumpster I was referring to.
20
         Is that a fair and accurate representation of the
21
         way that that looks in the daylight?
22
    Α
         Yes.
23
                    MR. DOOLIN: I would offer this
24
         photograph as well, Your Honor.
```

1		MR. TOCHKA: No objection.
2		THE COURT: It shall be marked.
3		(Exhibit No. 8, being a photograph, as
4		described above, was marked and admitted into
5		evidence.)
6		MR. DOOLIN: I would ask that these
7		photographs as a set be published to the jury,
8		Your Honor.
9		THE COURT: They may be.
10	BY M	R. DOOLIN:
11	Q	Mr. Laureano, I think you said you came there
12		sometime at three forty-five?
13	Α	The window I gave was three thirty, three forty-
14		five. I can't give you the exact time.
15	Q	Your testimony was that as you came down that
16		alley that's next to 89 Faneuil was that alley
17		dark that night?
18	A	Somewhat, yes. There are only position lights on
19		the building.
20	Q	When you say there are position lights on the
21		building, is it fair to say that the only
22		lighting that's in that area is from lights that
23		are built into the building?
24	Α	True.

24

Α

Yes.

- Q And your testimony is that when you came back 2 here to the area at 89 Faneuil, that at some point you checked over by where the dumpsters 3 are. Is that correct? 5 I glanced over there, yes. I didn't physically Α 6 walk over there. I just looked over there. 7 And I think you said on direct examination with Q. 8 Mr. Tochka that that area was very dark. Is that 9 correct? 10 Α True. 11 And it's fair to say that as a result of that 12 area being dark, that it was somewhat difficult 13 for you to ascertain what was in that area, is 14 that correct? 15 Α Yes. 16 Now, it's your testimony that at some point you 17 came upon the body of Mr. Yazbek, is that 18 correct? 19 Yes, I did. Α 20 Q And your testimony, I think, was that you made 21 certain observations of the position of the body compared to 89 Faneuil Street, is that right? 22
  - MR. DOOLIN: May I see Exhibit 2 and 3,

```
1
          please?
    BY MR. DOOLIN:
 2
 3
          Sir, it's your testimony, is it not, that the
 4
         body of Mr. Yazbek was in the position that it is
 5
          in in this photograph which is Exhibit 3?
 6
          that right?
 7
    Α
         Yes.
 8
         It's fair to say that his feet were towards the
 9
         driveway, is that correct?
10
    Α
         Yes, it is.
11
         And that he was not on the steps, is that
12
         correct?
13
         No, he was not.
14
         And that the door was closed, is that right?
15
         Yes, it was.
    Α
16
         And you testified that you saw certain objects on
17
         the stairs, is that correct?
         I remember seeing a set of keys.
18
    Α
19
         A set of keys. Did you remember seeing any other
20
         objects on the stairs that night?
21
         Nothing that jumps out of my recall, no.
22
         And it's fair to say that you observed a car that
23
         was within several feet of where Mr. Yazbek was,
24
         is that correct?
```

Α Yes. And it is fair to say that that car was in the 2 3 driveway, is that right? 4 Yes, it is. That it was faced in towards 89 Faneuil, is that 5 6 correct? 7 Yes, it is. 8 And did you make any observations of any 9 newspapers in the area? 10 Newspapers, no. Α 11 Okay. And your testimony is that when you went 12 inside the house after checking on the welfare of 13 your family, that you phoned the police, is that 14 right? 15 Yes, I did. Α 16 Now, sir, when you phoned the police did you 17 speak to the police at some point later that 18 morning? 19 Once the authorities showed up, I came back down 20 and identified myself as the person that had 21 called. 22 Were you ever interviewed by police detectives 23 that day?

Later that morning they came up to the apartment

```
1
         and interviewed me.
 2
         Was that apartment 256?
 3
    Α
         Yes.
         Did the police officer take notes during the
 5
         conversation? The detectives?
 6
         I believe so, yes.
         Did they also interview your wife?
    Q
 8
         I believe so.
 9
         What is your wife's name?
10
    Α
         Janet.
11
         Same last name?
12
    Α
         Yes.
13
         Janet Laureano?
14
   Α
         Yes, um-hum.
15
         And did the police take notes while they were
16
         interviewing her as well?
17
    Α
         I'm not sure. I don't recall that. I recall
18
         them interviewing me.
19
         Sir, at any point in time did you observe a
20
         Timberland watch in the area where the car was or
21
         in the area of the back of 89 Faneuil Street?
22
         A Timberland watch?
23
         Yes...
```

No, I didn't.

1		MR. DOOLIN: I don't have any further
2		questions.
3		THE COURT: Thank you.
4		MR. FLAHERTY: May I inquire?
5		THE COURT: Yes.
6		
7		CROSS EXAMINATION
8	BY M	IR. FLAHERTY:
9	Q	Good afternoon, sir. My name is Timothy
10		Flaherty. I represent Tanzerius Anderson.
11		I have a couple of questions. If you
12		don't understand them, just tell me and I'll try
13		and rephrase. Okay?
14	A	Yes, sir.
15	Q	You got to 89 Faneuil Street sometime between
16		three thirty and four a.m., correct?
17	Α	Roughly.
18	Q	And you had worked a twelve hour shift?
19	Α	Yes, sir.
20	Q	Were you tired when you arrived, sir?
21	Α	Yes, I was.
22	Q	When you made observations in the area of 89
23		Faneuil Street, it's fair to say that during your
24		direct testimony you mentioned being concerned

1		somewhat?
2	А	What you're referring to is when I saw the
3		individual?
4	Q	Right.
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And that's when you checked other locations back
7		there, right?
8	A	Yes.
9,	Q	And, in fact, before you went into 89 Faneuil
10		Street, you walked down the pathway and came up
11		the rear entrance, right?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	Now, when you first got to 89 Faneuil Street, you
14		saw the gray Buick Skylark, right?
15	A	Yes, I did.
16	Q	You saw the gentleman depicted in the photograph
17		with his feet extending back towards the alley,
18		correct?
19	A	Yes, sir.
20	Q	And is it your testimony, sir, you never saw a
21		copy of a Wall Street Journal in the area of 89
22		Faneuil Street?
23	Α	To be honest with you, the car was the first
24		thing that got my attention. The individual was

Q Is it fair to say, sir, that at the time you were 1 2 outside and you had made the observations you 3 made such as the keys, is it fair to say that, 4 based on your heightened awareness, you would 5 have seen the newspaper if it was there at the 6 time? 7 I should have seen the newspaper. The only 8 thing, the keys caught my attention because they 9 were in my direct line, where I was looking at 10 the gentleman. 11 You didn't leave the newspaper there, right, sir? 12 Α No, I didn't. 13 Now, on March 27 or 28, you were not living at 89 14 Faneuil, is that right? 15 That's correct. Α 16 You were living in Roslindale, correct? 17 I was living in Roslindale. Now, how long had your wife, Janet, lived at 89 18 19 Faneuil Street prior to March 27, 2000? 20 She had been there since '98. 21 And how much time had you spent there between 1998 and March of 2000? 22 23 She kept her own residence and I kept mine up

until the time she got the job at CompUSA which

1 was maybe four months prior to that. 2 And on a weekly basis, sir, how often would you Q go to the Faneuil development? 3 4 Α I'd say almost every day. Now, when you went inside -- well, incidentally 5 6 let me just say, did you touch the automobile at 7 all? 8 No, sir. 9 Q Did you touch the gentleman who was lying on the 10 ground outside? 11 No, sir. Α 12 And did you touch any other item in the area? 13 I touched nothing. Α But you walked through that area, right? 14 Q I got as close as the curb. 15 16 What time that morning did it stop raining? 17 That observation, I can't honestly say because 18 when I found the gentleman it wasn't raining. I 19 got upstairs, called the authorities. After that 20 I stayed with my family. 21 When you directed the police's attention to you, 22 was it raining at this point? 23 It was starting to drizzle, yes, it was. 24 And it continued drizzling throughout the

```
morning, right?
 2
     Α
          It was a bad morning, yes, it was.
 3
          In fact, rained pretty heavily, is that fair to
 4
          say?
 5
          Moderate, yes.
     Α
 6
          When you went inside and you went upstairs, sir,
 7
          first you checked on your family, right?
 8
          Yes.
     Α
 9
          And then at this point you placed a call
10
          reporting what you had seen, right --
11
     Α
         Yes.
12
          -- to the police? Now, is there a phone at 89
13
         Faneuil Street?
14
         Yes, there is.
    Α
15
         And you called from your cell phone, correct?
    Q
16
         Yes, I did.
17
    Q
         And your cell phone number at that time was 617-
18
         821-6007, right?
19
         Yes, it was.
20
         So at about four thirty or whatever time it was,
21
         four o'clock in the morning, after checking on
22
         your family, you decided to use your cell phone
23
         instead of using the phone in the apartment?
24
         I didn't make any distinctions between my cell
```

1		phone or the phone in the house, to be honest
2		with you.
3	Q	There is no question in your mind that you used
4		the cell phone, is that right?
5	A	I did use the cell phone. I don't have that
6		number any more so, to be honest with you, I
7		don't even remember the number at the time but I
8		made no distinctions whether to use the cell
9		phone or the house phone.
10	Q	And when you were back outside at 89 Faneuil,
11		you never saw a Timberland watch?
12	A	I did not see a watch.
13	Q	And the discoveries that you made that morning
14		caused you to look in the dumpster area because
15.		you were concerned, I think, something along
16		those lines, right?
17	A	I glanced in that area. I did not walk towards
18		that area.
19	Q	Were you concerned because of the people that
20		live in the housing development, sir?
21	A	To be totally honest with you, I do not live in
2 2		the greatest neighborhood, no.
23	Q	Well, you have been there, I guess, daily now
24		since 1998, right?

	]	
1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Do you know Eddie Gauthier?
3	A	No.
4	Q	Do you know Duane Johnson?
5	A	No, I do not.
6	Q	Do you know Derrick Japolis (phonetic spelling)?
7	. A	No.
8		MR. FLAHERTY: No further questions,
9		Your Honor.
10		THE COURT: Anything more, Mr. Tochka?
11		MR. TOCHKA: Nothing, Your Honor.
12		Thank you.
13		THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir.
14		You may step down. Thank you.
15	٠	THE COURT: May I see counsel, please?
16		(Whereupon, a discussion occurred off
17		the record at side bar.)
18		THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we
19		are going to adjourn for the day and we will pick
20		up tomorrow at nine o'clock. When you come in
21		tomorrow, you will be reporting to the jury room
22		and the schedule tomorrow will be nine until
23		about four with, of course, a luncheon recess.
24		Before you go there are a couple of

instructions I need to give you. The first involves your notes. Please place them in the envelope, leave them on your seat. They will be undisturbed until tomorrow. No one uses these notes in any manner except you so they will be kept secure.

Secondly, you are not to discuss this case with anyone or allow anyone to talk to you about it. That includes not only any trial participants but also any family or friends, anyone else with whom you might come into contact, anyone on the jury. It also includes other members of the jury. So it means anyone. I know it might be tempting to respond to questions, perhaps, from those who want to know what's going on in the case but you must and you have an obligation to answer that you are instructed by the judge not to talk about the case.

The reasons for this are several. The first is that, as I pointed out yesterday, it is very important that you keep an open mind throughout the case until you've heard everything and have been sent to the jury room to decide it.

Discussing it can cause you to make premature judgments about the case before you have been given an opportunity to consider all the evidence. Secondly, the judgments or opinions of others could influence your own independent judgment before you have fully formed yours and have heard all the case. And, finally, it may be that such discussions would give you information or ideas about matters relating to the case which doesn't come in through the witnesses or the exhibits or doesn't come from observations that you yourself have made on the view.

So it is very, very important that you observe these instructions. We're counting on each of you to be fair and impartial in considering the evidence and in rendering your verdict and to do so only on the evidence and the legal instructions I give you at the end of the case. When you come in tomorrow, we'll be asking you on the record whether or not you have complied with these instructions.

So we want to thank you again for your attention. Hopefully you will have a good evening. We'll see you tomorrow at nine o'clock.

1 (Whereupon, the jury was escorted from the courtroom at 4:20 o'clock p.m.) 2 3 (Whereupon, the following discussion occurred at side bar:) 4 THE COURT: We just received this note 6 form the juror which says as follows: Her Honor 7 should know that upon returning from lunch, I 8 used the restroom. I believe I may have shared 9 the restroom with this witness - that may be Mr. Laureano. I used the urinal and after washing my 10 11 hands, I believe this witness entered the restroom. I was exiting the restroom and he 12 exited the bathroom stall. I did not speak to 13 14 him or have any contact with him. I don't know 15 if this affects my ability to serve. I hope it 16 does not exclude me from my duty as a juror. 17 Sincerely, Christopher Meeuwisse. 18 He's in seat number two. I just want to confirm what he said here. 19 20 (Whereupon, juror number 11-3 in seat number two was brought to side bar.) 21 22 THE COURT: I just read the note and, 23 as I understand what it says, it is that you just 24 happened to be in the --

1	THE JUROR: There is a restroom
2	outside. We came back from lunch. Before I went
3	to the jury room, I went to use the restroom. I
4	knew there only was the one, and I used the
5	urinal and I started to wash my hands. As I was
6	washing my hands, I then dried them. As I was
7	throwing away the paper towel, a gentleman came
8	out of the restroom stall. I believe it may have
9	been him. I don't know if it was or
10	THE COURT: But you exchanged
11	THE JUROR: Nothing at all. I just
12	didn't want it to become an issue later.
13	THE COURT: We appreciate your bringing
14	that to our attention but I think the note and
15	what you said is self-explanatory so thank you
16	very much. We'll see you tomorrow at nine.
17	(Whereupon, the juror was escorted from
18	the courtroom.)
19	THE COURT: Mark this for
20	identification.
21	(Exhibit A, being a juror note, was
22	marked for identification.)
23	(Whereupon, the proceedings were
24	adjourned at 4:25 o'clock p.m.)

## CERTIFICATE

I, Mary M. Wrighton, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript, pages 1 through 188, is a complete, accurate and true record of my stenographic notes as taken by me in the aforementioned matter to the best of my skill and ability.

Mary M. Wrighton