IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND

STATE OF MARYLAND

VS.

Criminal Trial 07-1664X

KEITH A. WASHINGTON,

Defendant.

____/

REPORTER'S OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(Trial on the Merits)

Volume II of IX

Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Tuesday, February 12, 2008

BEFORE:

HONORABLE MICHAEL P. WHALEN, Associate Judge

APPEARANCES:

For the State of Maryland:

WILLIAM D. MOOMAU, ESQUIRE JOSEPH L. WRIGHT, ESQUIRE RAEMARIE ZANZUCCHI, ESQUIRE

For the Defendant:

VINCENT H. COHEN, JR., ESQUIRE MICHAEL STARR, ESQUIRE

Cindy S. Davis, RPR Official Court Reporter Post Office Box 401 Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20773

$\verb|TABLE| OF CONTENTS |$

	PAGE
Voir Dire Examination of the Jurors (Continued)	2-20
Motions in Limine	2-104
Afternoon Session	2-120
Motions in Limine (continued)	2-120

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Criminal trial 07-1664X, State
3	of Maryland versus Keith Washington.
4	MR. WRIGHT: Joseph Wright for the State.
5	MR. MOOMAU: William Moomau for the State, Your
6	Honor. Good morning.
7	MS. ZANZUCCHI: Raemarie Zanzucchi on behalf of the
8	State.
9	MR. COHEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Vincent H.
10	Cohen, Jr., on behalf of Keith Washington.
11	MR. STARR: And good morning. Michael Starr, also
12	on behalf of Mr. Washington. Mr. Washington is present.
13	THE COURT: I think we're going to have to take a
14	roll of the jury to see if anyone is missing.
15	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 2, juror number 3,
16	juror number 4, juror number 6, juror number 8.
17	THE COURT: Juror number 8. Go ahead.
18	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 14, juror number
19	16, juror number 17, juror number 18, juror number 19, juror
20	number 21, juror number 22.
21	THE COURT: Juror number 22.
22	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 23, juror number
23	25, juror number 27, juror number 32, juror number 33, juror
24	number 37, juror number 38, juror number 40, juror number 41,
25	juror number 44, juror number 48, juror number 49, juror

```
number 50, juror number 51, juror number 52, juror number 53.
 1
               THE COURT: Juror number 53.
 2
 3
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 55, juror number
     57, juror number 59, juror number 63, juror number 66, juror
 4
 5
     number 71.
                          Juror number 71.
 6
               THE COURT:
 7
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 72, juror number
 8
     73, juror number 77.
 9
               THE COURT: Juror number 77.
10
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 79, juror number
11
     80, juror number 88, juror number 91, juror number 92, juror
12
     number 94, juror number 95, juror number 96.
               THE COURT: Did they respond, number 96?
13
14
               THE DEPUTY CLERK:
                                  No.
15
               THE COURT: Juror number 96.
16
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 97, juror number
17
     98, juror number 100, juror number 101, juror number 102,
18
     juror number 106.
19
               THE COURT: Juror number 106.
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 107.
2.0
21
               UNKNOWN JUROR: They sent her back out to her car.
22
               THE COURT:
                           The security people?
23
               UNKNOWN JUROR:
                              Yes.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
25
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 109, juror number
```

```
110, juror number 111, juror number 112, juror number 114.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Juror number 114.
 3
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 115, juror number
     118, juror number 121, juror number 123, juror number 124,
 4
 5
     juror number 125, juror number 130, juror number 131, juror
 6
     number 132, juror number 137, juror number 143.
 7
               THE COURT:
                          Juror number 143.
 8
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 146, juror number
 9
     147, juror number 148.
10
               THE COURT: Juror number 148.
11
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 149, and juror
12
     number 150.
13
               THE COURT: Now, I saw two or three jurors come in
14
     a little bit late. Would you please give me your numbers so
15
     that we know that you're here.
               JUROR NO. 8: Number 8.
16
17
               THE COURT: Thank you. Somebody else came in late.
18
               JUROR NO. 150: Oh, 150.
19
               THE COURT: You came at the end. Okay. Counsel,
20
     wish to approach the bench.
21
               (Counsel approached the bench and the following
22
               ensued.)
23
               THE COURT: For the people who just came in, what
24
     are your juror numbers, please?
25
               JUROR NO. 22: Twenty-two.
```

THE COURT: Thank you. 1 2. JUROR NO. 107: 107. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 JUROR NO. 106: 106. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. 6 JUROR NO. 148: 148. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 8 THE COURT: Again, any time you wish, 9 Mr. Washington is invited to the bench to participate in 10 anything having to do with voir dire and jury selection at 11 anytime. 12 We already have two notes. First is from juror 13 number 80. It was delivered to our bailiff. 14 MR. COHEN: 8-0, Your Honor? 15 Yes. It says, "I am a single parent, THE COURT: 16 with two children ages 10 and 8. Both are at home today 17 under the supervision of the teenager. My ten-year old has 18 bronchitis, and the eight-year old has a scheduled CT scan 19 tomorrow morning at Children's Hospital for a tumorous 2.0 cancer." 21 The other is from juror number 101. It's somewhat 22 of a lengthy note. It says, "Your Honor, I am juror 101. 23 have a back condition called" -- and I can't read it, but 24 it's a degenerative spinal nerve condition. "I am in 25 significant pain at this time, and I found sitting for

```
significant times yesterday only aggravates the condition.
 1
 2
     am currently in treatment and respectfully request to be" --
 3
     and I don't know what this word is, but I think it's excused
 4
     from this selection process, "in that I don't think I can
 5
     withstand the rigor of the selection process or the,"
 6
     something, "jury-seating conditions if selected.
 7
               So with regard to number 80, what would you
 8
     suggest, if anything?
 9
               MR. MOOMAU: Can I read that again, Your Honor?
10
               THE COURT: Yes.
11
               MR. STARR: Your Honor, another juror has arrived,
12
     number 143.
13
               THE COURT: For purposes of the record, apparently,
14
     juror number 96 is now present. And what was the next
15
     number?
16
               MR. STARR:
                           143.
17
               THE COURT: How were you notified of that?
18
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: The bailiff just passed up a
19
     note.
2.0
               THE COURT:
                          And 143 is present.
21
               MR. MOOMAU: You said we have another note?
22
               THE COURT: The one I read to you.
23
               MR. COHEN:
                           I'm sorry; 143 did show up, Your Honor?
24
                           Yes. Well, number one, what
               THE COURT:
25
     suggestions do you have about juror number 80, if any?
```

```
I have no objection to that juror
 1
               MR. MOOMAU:
     being excused. The child is going in for some kind of cancer
 2
     examination.
 3
 4
               MR. COHEN: No opposition, Your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: Juror number 80, as a result of her
 6
     child being scheduled for an CT scan for a cancerous tumor,
 7
     has been excused for cause by agreement of the parties.
 8
               Juror 101. What I suggest that we should do at
 9
     this point, and you tell me if you think otherwise -- how
10
     many jurors do we have to go?
11
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Seventy-three.
12
               THE COURT: Adding up 30 peremptories, plus 12
13
     more, which I believe are for the alternate
14
               MR. MOOMAU:
                            Thirty for --
15
               THE COURT: It's 20 and 10 is 30, right?
16
               MR. MOOMAU: It's not a life sentence.
17
               THE COURT: What are the peremptories you're
18
     saying?
19
               MR. MOOMAU: It's not life, I thought. It should
2.0
     be 10 and 5.
21
                          Well, 10 and 5, that makes -- I'm glad
               THE COURT:
22
     you brought that up.
23
               MR. MOOMAU: I looked yesterday.
24
               MR. COHEN: The defense gets 10?
25
               MR. MOOMAU:
                            Yes.
```

```
THE COURT: Fifteen, plus 5, plus 12, 27. Well,
 1
     that makes it better.
 2
 3
               What do you suggest, if anything, with juror number
     101?
 4
 5
               MR. MOOMAU: Yesterday was a hard day. It was a
 6
     hard day on us. Now, they sat most of the time.
 7
               MR. COHEN:
                          I don't know if you want to do any voir
 8
     dire to see what the issues are, to see if there are any
 9
     accommodations that can be made.
10
               THE COURT: Okay. Juror 101, would you please
11
     approach the bench.
12
               Did somebody else come in? Gentlemen, for your
13
     records, juror number 114 and 71 are now here.
14
               Sir, we received your note about your back pain.
15
     What's the specific term for it?
16
               JUROR NO. 101: Spondylolisthesis. It's a pinched
17
     nerve on the L-5. I could barely get up this morning to get
18
     down here.
19
               THE COURT: How long have you had it?
20
               JUROR NO. 101: The condition is getting worse, but
21
     the last six months it's gotten progressively worse.
22
               THE COURT: You're currently being treated for it?
23
               JUROR NO. 101: I am.
24
               THE COURT: Are you taking any medication?
25
               JUROR NO. 101: Yes. Prednisone, a steroid.
                                                             I'm
```

supposed to go back tomorrow for another one. It hasn't done 1 2 that good. It was a step down and it was doing all right. 3 Is there anything that we can do to THE COURT: 4 accommodate your back if we are able to work around this 5 problem to some extent? 6 I don't know. JUROR NO. 101: 7 THE COURT: What has your physician told you about 8 what you have to do to accommodate the pain or sitting or 9 standing? 10 JUROR NO. 101: As I was saying, he gave me, last 11 week, a step-down steroid, you know, from seven to six, six 12 to five, and I went down to one today. I was supposed to go 13 back tomorrow to see him. From sitting yesterday, I think I 14 aggravated it tremendously. So when I got up this morning, I almost couldn't move, basically. So that's where I am right 15 16 now. 17 MR. MOOMAU: Do you have a doctor's appointment 18 tomorrow, sir? 19 JUROR NO. 101: Yes, I do. 20 MR. MOOMAU: What time is that? JUROR NO. 101: I'm not sure. I think it's in the 21 22 morning, like ten o'clock or two o'clock. I'm not sure what 23 time it is, but it is tomorrow. 24 MR. MOOMAU: Do you think your pain would have been 25 aggravated or your condition would have been aggravated so

much yesterday if you could have sat in a padded chair during 1 2 the day? 3 JUROR NO. 101: That may have helped alleviate the 4 situation, certainly. But sitting on a wooden bench for five 5 hours was too much. It hit me hard when I got home. After 6 the two sessions of sitting on the bench, it was --7 MR. MOOMAU: It was a long day. 8 MR. COHEN: Sir, if you were given regular breaks, 9 would that help if you were able to stand up at different 10 intervals throughout --11 JUROR NO. 101: It possibly could. I just don't 12 want to be in a position where I'm a detriment to the State 13 or the defendant. I'm trying to do this. I'm just here to 14 do what I can. 15 THE COURT: I understand, sir. Let us talk about 16 it. 17 JUROR NO. 101: Okay, sure thing. 18 MR. MOOMAU: What I'm going to suggest, Your Honor. 19 I know he has a doctor's appointment tomorrow, but we worked 20 long and hard to get to the point we're at now. But what I 21 would suggest is that we let him sit in a padded chair, 22 either in the jury box or if we can get him a chair to sit 23 in. I think that would help. 24 MR. COHEN: We agree, Your Honor. There's also a

pad I saw in the media box. There's also a pad on the bench

25

in the media box. 1 THE COURT: Would you tell her to get a padded 2 3 chair for juror 101. 4 THE BAILIFF: I already put him in a padded chair. 5 THE COURT: If you wouldn't mind putting your 6 initials on this note. 7 So we are excusing number 80 and having 101 remain, 8 correct? 9 MR. COHEN: Correct. Did another juror come in, 10 Your Honor, while we were discussing --11 THE COURT: They're going to tell me. Who else is 12 here? So 77 is here and 53. 13 MR. COHEN: Your Honor, is 96 present? 14 THE COURT: Ninety-six is present. 15 MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, one thing I do want to 16 ask, and I didn't ask him, but I'm sure he'll come back up on 17 another question dealing with this issue. He has a doctor's 18 appointment. 19 THE COURT: You're talking about 101? 20 Yes. This is going into next week. MR. MOOMAU: 21 wasn't thinking about that when I mentioned the chair, but I 22 do want to maybe think about that issue, to see if he could 23 reschedule or go in the evening or something. 24 THE COURT: We also have a juror that had the child 25 support hearing today. That juror is here. And is she going

```
to give us some paperwork on it? Do you want me to call that
 1
 2.
     juror up?
 3
               MR. MOOMAU: Yes.
 4
               MR. COHEN: That's fine, Your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: Juror number 77.
 6
               (Juror number 77 approaches the bench and the
 7
               following ensued.)
 8
               THE COURT: Good morning. We remembered that you
 9
     have a court hearing today.
10
               JUROR NO. 77: It's not until 1:30.
11
               THE COURT: Do you have the paperwork with you?
12
               JUROR NO. 77: Yes.
13
               THE COURT: Do we have that so we can look at it,
14
     so we know who to call?
15
               JUROR NO. 77: Yes.
16
               THE COURT: Why don't you go get that, please.
17
               (Juror number 77 briefly leaves bench conference.)
18
               THE COURT:
                          There was also a student who was going
19
     to bring us in names for us to contact for her professors, I
2.0
     believe.
21
               Thank you. We are going to make a copy of this.
22
     Actually, we have two copies. This is different. I'm going
23
     to need a copy of this, please. We need to find out who the
2.4
     master is, call them and contact them for you.
25
               JUROR NO. 77: Thank you.
```

```
THE COURT: The last one was a student.
 1
 2
               MR. WRIGHT: Juror number 131.
 3
               THE COURT: Yes. Juror number 131. Juror number
     131.
 4
 5
               (Juror number 131 approaches the bench and the
 6
               following ensued.)
 7
               THE COURT: Juror number 131, we didn't forget.
 8
     Did you get me that contact information?
 9
               JUROR NO. 131: Yes. Do you want me to bring it
10
     up?
11
               THE COURT: Yes.
12
               MR. MOOMAU: Which number had the child support
13
     issue, Your Honor?
14
               THE COURT: I believe it was number 77.
15
               MR. MOOMAU: I would just be interested on that,
16
     how long she's been waiting to get her hearing and when it
17
     will be rescheduled to.
18
               JUROR NO. 131: All the e-mails and phone numbers
19
     are on that.
2.0
               THE COURT: Can we borrow this? We're going to
21
     give it back to you.
22
               JUROR NO. 131: Sure, that's fine.
23
               THE COURT: Can I write on this?
               JUROR NO. 131: Sure.
2.4
25
               THE COURT: Thank you. Do you want me to bring
```

```
that lady back up again and ask her about her child support
 1
 2
     case or do you want to wait? We have until 1:30.
 3
     hearing isn't until 1:30 in the afternoon. So if we have to
 4
     bring her back before then --
 5
                          The defense doesn't think it's
               MR. COHEN:
 6
     necessary, Your Honor, but we will defer to you.
 7
               MR. MOOMAU: I'll defer, Your Honor. Whatever you
 8
     want to do on that.
               THE COURT: Let's revisit it sometime around 1:30.
 9
10
     Maybe at the break we can contact the master or judge or
11
     whoever is handling it and see what the story is.
12
               I'm assuming that now we have all the jurors here
13
     that are remaining. I should start out by asking my
14
     question, if they overheard anything last evening from any
15
     news media account or what was portrayed in that, and then
16
     proceed to go from that point to the remainder of the
17
     questions.
18
               You both wanted me to start with the -- other than
19
     that, start with the question about the trial is anticipated
2.0
     to take five to seven days.
21
               MR. MOOMAU: I can see it going until Wednesday of
22
     next week.
23
               MR. COHEN: We prefer that to be asked --
24
               THE COURT: You want me to do that up front; is
25
     what I'm asking.
```

MR. MOOMAU: May as well. Then we'll know what 1 2 we're dealing with. 3 MR. WRIGHT: I think the language should be an 4 additional five to seven days. 5 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to say the trial will 6 take five to seven days, and let them judge whatever they 7 think that is. 8 MR. MOOMAU: You mean five to seven days 9 including -- as far as trial days, it will be Wednesday, 10 Thursday, Friday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, at least, 11 right? 12 We don't have to agree on the number of MR. STARR: 13 days but at least through Wednesday. 14 MR. MOOMAU: Excluding Monday. 15 (Counsel returned to trial tables and the following 16 ensued.) 17 THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen. 18 Welcome back. I'm sure you're very pleased to be here. 19 I need to start off this morning by asking you if, at anytime 20 after you left Upper Marlboro and returned home for the 21 evening, if any of you, at any time during that period, heard 22 any news media account whatsoever of the case in which you are in the process of being selected for a juror. 23 24 So if there are any members of this prospective 25 jury panel who heard anything or saw anything on television

about this case, or who may have been exposed to any 1 2 conversation about this case from any source, or who may have 3 read anything about this case, please stand. Yes, sir, if you would approach the bench. 4 5 (Counsel approached the bench and the following 6 ensued.) 7 THE BAILIFF: Number 106. 8 THE COURT: Good morning. Yes, sir, you are juror 9 number 106? 10 JUROR NO. 106: Yes. 11 THE COURT: What is it that you heard or saw? 12 JUROR NO. 106: I did see some family members of 13 mine yesterday and walked into a table-talk. They were 14 talking at the table. And, initially, I did not know where 15 it was going or what they were talking about, you know, but 16 by the time I realized what was -- there was something said 17 that I think would have made me prejudicial in this case. 18 THE COURT: What was said? 19 JUROR NO. 106: It was, more or less, that they 20 were referring to the defendant, this case, the defendant, 21 where it was about three different situations that he's been, 22 vou know --23 THE COURT: And you -- three different matters that 24 you were made aware of that may or may not be --25 JUROR NO. 106: You see why I do have such a

problem with it, because yesterday, when I came here, I was 1 2 open minded and I still am. 3 But my father, before he punished me, one of his quotes were only a fool will never learn from his mistakes. 4 5 Last night I applied that quote to what I heard. I could not 6 just get over it. 7 THE COURT: What specifically did you hear, sir? 8 JUROR NO. 106: That the defendant, I mean, he had 9 shot somebody, then shot two more people, and then struggled 10 with a real estate agent after all of this. 11 THE COURT: And as a result of what you heard last 12 evening about this and other matters, from what you are 13 saying, you are saying that you could not sit as a juror 14 fairly and impartially and deliberate on this case; is that 15 what you're saying? 16 JUROR NO. 106: Yes, I do think so. 17 THE COURT: You think so what? 18 JUROR NO. 106: I think that I could not. 19 in my bringing up, this was one of my father's favorite 20 quotes before he punish me, only a fool will never learn from 21 his mistakes. 22 Thank you, sir. You can have a seat. THE COURT: 23 MR. WRIGHT: Cause. 24 MR. COHEN: Agree. 25 THE COURT: Now, do you want me to have him sit

```
until the end of the day -- I'm afraid that he may talk to
 1
 2
     other jurors.
 3
               Then juror number 106 is excused for cause by
     agreement of parties.
 4
 5
               Juror number 106, you're free to go, sir.
                                                           Thank
 6
     you.
 7
               THE DEPUTY CLERK:
                                  There's one in the restroom.
 8
     Also, you need to ask number 16 about the witness he might
 9
     know.
10
               THE COURT: We had juror number 16 yesterday.
11
     said he might or might not know one of the witnesses.
12
     Somebody was going to get the address for us.
13
               MR. MOOMAU: Robert Baker.
14
               MR. COHEN: We have it, Your Honor.
15
               MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, juror number 80, the one
16
     who has the CT scan tomorrow for cancer, are we going to
17
     excuse her now?
18
               THE COURT: You want me to?
19
               MR. COHEN: I think we should.
20
                          Juror number 80, you're excused, ma'am,
               THE COURT:
21
     from jury service. Thank you very much for bringing that to
22
     our attention. By agreement of the parties.
               Juror number 16. Good morning, sir. How are you
23
24
     this morning? We were reminded that you had indicated to us
25
     that you may know one of the witnesses in this case whose
```

```
name is Robert Baker. I'm going to show you the address of
 1
 2.
     that particular person, and if you could tell us whether you
 3
     recognize that address and you think that may be the address
 4
     of the person you know.
 5
               JUROR NO. 16: No, I don't remember where he live
 6
     at.
 7
                          You do not remember where he lives at?
               THE COURT:
 8
               JUROR NO. 16: I don't remember where he live at.
 9
               MR. COHEN:
                          I can proffer to the Court that that's
10
     about 70 or 80 miles outside of the District of Columbia.
11
               THE COURT: How are you acquainted with Mr. Baker?
12
               JUROR NO. 16: Well, when you said Robert Baker, I
     knew him as Reggie Baker.
13
14
               THE COURT: But how were you acquainted with him?
15
               JUROR NO. 16: I knew him from a long time.
16
     him as Reggie but --
17
               THE COURT: Did he live in this area?
18
               JUROR NO. 16: Upper Marlboro. Yeah, I think he
19
     did.
           I think he did.
2.0
               THE COURT: And when I say this area, I mean did he
21
     live in Maryland?
22
               JUROR NO. 16: Right.
23
               THE COURT: Did he live locally in Prince George's
24
     County?
25
               JUROR NO. 16: Not off-hand. Only because I know
```

```
he said he lived in Marlboro.
 1
 2.
               THE COURT: How long ago was this?
 3
               JUROR NO. 16: This was about two, three or four
 4
     years ago. I ain't seen him since.
 5
               THE COURT: How well did you know him?
               JUROR NO. 16: I knew him good. He was close to
 6
 7
     the family.
 8
               THE COURT: Did you learn or were you aware that he
 9
     may have moved out of Marlboro in the last three or four
10
     years?
11
               JUROR NO. 16: I ain't seen him since. I know he
12
     lived here. I don't know what part.
13
               MR. COHEN: I believe you described him as an
14
     African-American male, correct?
15
               JUROR NO. 16: Yes.
16
               MR. COHEN: Okay. That's it.
17
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
18
               (Juror number 16 returns to the panel.)
19
               MR. COHEN: Your Honor, just for the record --
20
     Court's indulgence. Your Honor, it's our belief that Robert
21
     Baker is white. He's not African-American. If that helps
2.2
     the Court.
23
               MR. MOOMAU: Baker is a fairly common name.
2.4
               MR. COHEN: It's not even the same first name.
25
               MR. MOOMAU: I'm not going to move to strike based
```

1 on that.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to ask one question before I do the five to seven day trial, just so I don't forget about it. You had asked me to ask "does any member of the jury panel live or work near the area in which the incident occurred?" Then I'll go into the five to seven day. Then we'll give them one easy one.

MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, we were speaking yesterday, after we finished, and we had agreed amongst ourselves -- of course, the Court has to approve it -- that we would give openings tomorrow. That's what we would like.

THE COURT: That's fine with me. You have much more to do than the Court. I'm just trying to --

MR. MOOMAU: Get through it. Thank you.

THE COURT: Alright, ladies and gentlemen. Again, thank you very much for your patience. As you can see, this is a very deliberative type of process, and we have to follow all these things as best as we can, based on the number of jurors that are anticipated for every case.

We're going to proceed again with the voir dire, and we have a number of other questions to ask. We do not believe that they will be as extensive as the first few that we have asked already.

As I mentioned to you, Mr. Washington resides at 1513 Shellford Lane in Accokeek, Prince George's County,

```
Maryland. And my next question to you is, is there any
 1
     member of this prospective jury panel who may work or live
 2
 3
     near the area in which this incident took place, which is
 4
     1513 Shellford Lane in Accokeek, Prince George's County,
 5
     Maryland? If there is a positive answer, if you would please
 6
     stand.
 7
               Your juror number, please, sir?
               JUROR NO. 123: Number 123.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: And how far away or how close are you
10
     to that address, sir?
11
               JUROR NO. 123: Approximately half a mile.
12
               THE COURT: And that is a residence address or work
13
     address of yours?
14
               JUROR NO. 123: Residence.
15
               THE COURT: Would the fact that you live near where
16
     the incident is alleged to have taken place in any way impair
17
     your ability to serve as a juror and render a fair and
18
     impartial verdict in this case?
19
               JUROR NO. 123: No, sir.
20
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Your juror number,
21
     sir?
22
               JUROR NO. 112: Number 112.
23
               THE COURT: And approximately how far away do you
24
     believe that you either work or live with regard to the
25
     address I just gave you?
```

```
JUROR NO. 112: Less than half a mile.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Less than a half mile.
                                                   Is that a
 3
     residence?
               JUROR NO. 112: Residence.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
 6
     ability to serve as a juror and fairly and impartially
 7
     deliberate on this case based only on the evidence?
 8
               JUROR NO. 112: No, it wouldn't.
 9
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Your juror number,
10
     please?
11
               JUROR NO. 33: Number 33.
12
               THE COURT: Sir, how far away would you say you are
13
     from 1513.
14
               JUROR NO. 33: Approximately five miles.
15
               THE COURT: Is that a residence?
16
               JUROR NO. 33: Yes, sir.
17
               THE COURT: Would the fact that you live near the
18
     place where the incident is alleged to have taken place in
19
     any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case
2.0
     and render a fair and impartial verdict based only on the
21
     evidence?
22
               JUROR NO. 33: No, sir.
23
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. The Court
24
     sees no other affirmative responses to that question.
25
               Now, ladies and gentlemen, this case may take
```

between five and seven days to try. Is there any member of this prospective jury panel who has been excused during that time period by the jury commissioner for Prince George's County? The Court sees no affirmative response.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you a question. I'm going to ask it to you twice. There are a couple of different parts to it, and that's why I'm going to ask it to you the first time without a response, and then the second time, if anyone has a positive answer to it, please stand, and we will again go through the process that we followed yesterday, that you are now familiar with.

Has any member of this prospective jury panel, any member of their immediate family or close personal friend ever been employed by any federal, state or local law enforcement agency, or by a firm or agency that represents or provides services to persons charged with committing a crime, or by any other institution connected to the criminal justice system?

Again, has any member of this prospective jury panel, member of their immediate family or close personal friend ever been employed by any federal, state or local law enforcement agency, or by any firm or agency that represents or provides services to persons charged with committing a crime, or any other institution connected to the criminal justice system? If you have a yes answer, please stand.

```
Not meaning to point, we'll start on my left and,
 1
     yes, ma'am, first one. What's your juror number, please?
 2
 3
               JUROR NO. 2: Number 2.
 4
               THE COURT: And what is your response to that
 5
     question, ma'am?
 6
               JUROR NO. 2: My cousin is a police officer for
 7
     Bowie.
 8
               THE COURT: Would your cousin's occupation in any
 9
     way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case and
10
     render a fair and impartial verdict?
11
               JUROR NO. 2: No.
12
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, sir, your
13
     number, please?
14
               JUROR NO. 3: Juror number 3, sir.
15
               THE COURT: Yes, sir.
16
               JUROR NO. 3: About a year ago I served as a bail
17
     enforcement agent for a security company.
18
               THE COURT: Where is that located, please?
19
               JUROR NO. 3: That's located in southern Maryland.
20
               THE COURT: Would your occupation formerly in that
21
     capacity in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror
22
     in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict?
23
               JUROR NO. 3: No, Your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am, your number,
25
     please?
```

```
JUROR NO. 6: Number 6. I work for DHS, Department
 1
 2
     of Homeland Security.
 3
               THE COURT: With the federal government or state?
 4
               JUROR NO. 6: Federal government.
 5
               THE COURT: Would your occupation in that capacity
 6
     in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this
 7
     case and render a fair and impartial verdict?
 8
               JUROR NO. 6: No, sir.
 9
               THE COURT: Thank you very much. Starting again
10
     from my immediate left and hating to point, yes, ma'am, your
11
     number?
               JUROR NO. 17: Juror number 17. I was employed by
12
13
     Laurel Police Department in Maryland in 1986 to 2006, police
14
     officer, detective and corporal. And I currently work at the
15
     Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission for two years.
16
               THE COURT: Would your occupation formerly and
17
     currently as a police officer --
18
               JUROR NO. 17: I'm not police officer now.
19
     civilian investigator.
2.0
               THE COURT: Civilian investigator. Would those
21
     occupations in any way impair your ability to serve as a
22
     juror in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict
23
     based only on the evidence?
2.4
               JUROR NO. 17: No, it would not.
25
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate it.
```

```
Yes, your juror number, please?
 1
               JUROR NO. 19: Juror number 19. I have two sons
 2
 3
     that's police officers, one in the District of Columbia and
 4
     one in Seattle, Washington.
 5
               THE COURT: Would your sons' occupation in any way
 6
     impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case and
 7
     render a fair and impartial verdict?
               JUROR NO. 19: No.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Thank you. Sir, your number, please?
10
               JUROR NO. 23: Number 23. My daughter works as a
11
     contract agent for the Court Services and Offender
12
     Supervision Agency.
13
               THE COURT: In which jurisdiction, sir?
14
               JUROR NO. 23:
                              In the District of Columbia.
15
               THE COURT: Would her occupation in any way impair
16
     your ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a
17
     fair and impartial verdict?
18
               JUROR NO. 23: No, sir, it would not.
19
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Again, not meaning to
20
     point, yes, ma'am, your number, please?
21
               JUROR NO. 44: Forty-four.
22
               THE COURT: I'm trying to start at the same spot.
23
               JUROR NO. 51: Fifty-one.
2.4
               THE COURT: And what is your response, please?
25
               JUROR NO. 51: My cousin was chief of police in New
```

1 Jersey. 2 THE COURT: Would the former occupation of your 3 cousin as a police officer, police chief in New Jersey in any 4 way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case and 5 render a fair and impartial verdict? 6 JUROR NO. 51: No. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am? 8 JUROR NO. 52: Number 52. Both my mother and my 9 sister were employed with the Cape Coral, Florida, police 10 department for many years. 11 THE COURT: Would that in any way impair your 12 ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair 13 and impartial verdict? 14 JUROR NO. 52: No, sir. 15 THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, ma'am, now I am 16 pointing at you. I'm sorry. 17 JUROR NO. 44: Juror number 44. 18 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. 19 JUROR NO. 44: I formerly worked for Homeland 20 Security, Customs and Border Protection, federal. 21 THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your 22 ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair 23 and impartial verdict? 2.4 JUROR NO. 44: No. 25 THE COURT: Thank you. Sir, right next.

```
JUROR NO. 48: Number 48. I was a Prince George's
 1
 2
     County police officer.
 3
               THE COURT: For how long, sir.
               JUROR NO. 48: Five months.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
 6
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
 7
     and impartial verdict?
 8
               JUROR NO. 48: No, sir.
 9
               THE COURT: Thank you. The very next row, and I
10
     believe it's you, ma'am.
11
               JUROR NO. 55: Number 55. My sister is presently
12
     employed with the district government, the trial board for
13
     the District of Columbia.
14
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
15
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
16
     and impartial verdict?
17
               JUROR NO. 55: No, sir.
18
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, sir?
19
               JUROR NO. 57: I'm currently a corrections officer
20
     and have been for 17 years.
21
               THE COURT: Is this in Prince George's?
22
               JUROR NO. 57: No, sir.
23
               THE COURT: What location?
2.4
               JUROR NO. 57: Calvert County.
25
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
```

ability to serve as a juror in this case an render a fair and 1 2 impartial verdict based only on the evidence? 3 JUROR NO. 57: No, sir. 4 (Court reporter indicates juror did not identify 5 juror number.) 6 THE COURT: What was your juror number, sir? 7 JUROR NO. 57: Fifty-seven. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am, I think -- when 9 you get old, your depth perception isn't very good and I 10 can't tell who --11 JUROR NO. 79: I'm 79, juror 79. My husband was 12 formerly employed in the attorney general's office, in the 13 crime victims unit, in the State of Ohio. He has left that 14 position. 15 THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your 16 ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair 17 and impartial verdict? 18 JUROR NO. 79: No, it would not. 19 THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am. 20 JUROR NO. 77: I'm juror number 77. I'm currently 21 employed with pretrial services in Washington, D.C., and was 22 a probation parole officer. 23 THE COURT: Would that in any way impair your 24 ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair 25 and impartial verdict?

JUROR NO. 79: No, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Again, all the way 3 to my left. Yes, sir, your number, please? 4 JUROR NO. 63: Juror number 63. I'm currently 5 employed at TSA, a federal contractor, Department of Homeland 6 Security. 7 THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your 8 ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair 9 and impartial verdict? 10 JUROR NO. 63: No, sir. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, sir. 12 JUROR NO. 66: Number 66. I had various jobs 13 working with police and federal marshals in the 14 psychotherapies, and I worked in maximum security forensics 15 for several years. I also worked for Arlington County as a 16 crisis therapist, and I worked with police at that point. I 17 also have two best friends that are police and a cousin who 18 is police. 19 THE COURT: Would your occupations in any of those 20 capacities and your relationship with any of the police 21 officers with whom you interacted at the time in any way 22 impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case and 23 render a fair and impartial verdict based only on the 2.4 evidence? 25 JUROR NO. 66: I don't think so.

```
THE COURT: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it.
 1
                                                              All
 2
     the way -- I think it's the back row. Yes, ma'am, your
 3
     number?
 4
               JUROR NO. 88: Juror number 88. My husband is a
 5
     contractor for Homeland Security currently, and I have a
 6
     cousin in the State of Florida that works for the FBI.
 7
               THE COURT: Would that in any way impair your
 8
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
 9
     and impartial verdict?
10
               JUROR NO. 88: No, it wouldn't.
11
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, ma'am?
               JUROR NO. 91: Juror number 91. I currently work
12
13
     in a law firm in Washington, D.C.
14
               THE COURT: What's the name of the law firm?
15
               JUROR NO. 91: Beveridge and Diamond, P.C.
16
               THE COURT: Do they do criminal work?
17
                              They do criminal work.
               JUROR NO. 91:
18
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
19
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
2.0
     and impartial verdict?
21
               JUROR NO. 91:
                             No.
22
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, ma'am?
23
               JUROR NO. 92: Juror number 92. I have a nephew
24
     who was formerly a police officer in the District of
25
     Columbia.
```

```
THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
 1
 2
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
 3
     and impartial verdict?
 4
               JUROR NO. 92: No. sir.
 5
                           Thank you, ma'am. Yes, ma'am?
               THE COURT:
 6
               JUROR NO. 107: Juror number 107. I'm a former
 7
     employee of the Department of Homeland Security, Customs and
 8
     Border Protection, and my mother's fiance is currently a D.C.
 9
     cop.
10
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
11
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
12
     and impartial verdict?
13
               JUROR NO. 107: No.
14
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, ma'am, at the
15
     very end.
16
               JUROR NO. 109: I'm 109. I was formerly employed
17
     with the FBI and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C.
18
     Circuit, and I have a cousin who is a police detective in
19
     Washington, D.C.
2.0
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
21
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
22
     and impartial verdict?
               JUROR NO. 109: No, sir.
23
24
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. I'll start
25
     with you, sir. Your number, please?
```

```
JUROR NO. 115: I'm 115. My uncle is a D.C. police
 1
 2
     officer.
 3
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
 4
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
 5
     and impartial verdict?
 6
               JUROR NO. 115: No.
 7
               THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am?
 8
               JUROR NO. 111: Number 111. My cousin is a state
 9
     trooper in the State of Indiana.
10
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
11
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
12
     and impartial verdict?
13
               JUROR NO. 111: No, sir.
14
                          Thank you. Yes, ma'am?
               THE COURT:
15
               JUROR NO. 110: Number 110. My cousin used to be
16
     chief of police for P. G. County, and his two son-in-laws are
17
     also police and his three daughters also. One works for
18
     vice.
19
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
20
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
21
     and impartial verdict?
22
               JUROR NO. 110: No, sir.
23
                           Thank you. Yes, ma'am?
               THE COURT:
24
               JUROR NO. 118: Juror number 118. My cousin is a
25
     retired policeman, and my sister is an ex-federal police.
```

THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your 1 ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair 2 3 and impartial verdict? 4 JUROR NO. 118: No, sir. 5 THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. I guess it would be 6 you, sir. 7 JUROR NO. 146: My father is a retired DEA agent 8 and also worked for the Justice Department, and I work for 9 the Department of Defense. 10 THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your 11 ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair 12 and impartial verdict? 13 JUROR NO. 146: No. 14 MR. STARR: Juror number, Judge? 15 JUROR NO. 146: I'm 146. 16 MR. STARR: Thank you. 17 Yes, sir, your number, please? THE COURT: 18 JUROR NO. 149: Juror number 149. My father is a 19 retired FBI agent, and I have a cousin who works for the 2.0 State Department as a police officer, and I am currently 21 employed with the Internal Revenue Service. 22 Would that fact in any way impair your THE COURT: 23 ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair 2.4 and impartial verdict? I'm not just talking about the IRS 25 now.

```
JUROR NO. 149: No, Your Honor.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. Yes,
 3
     ma'am?
 4
               JUROR NO. 96: Juror number 96. My mother and my
 5
     uncle used to work for P. G. police.
 6
               THE COURT: In what capacity, ma'am?
 7
               JUROR NO. 96: Police officer.
 8
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
 9
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
10
     and impartial verdict based only on the evidence?
11
               JUROR NO. 96: No.
12
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. The Court
13
     sees no other affirmative responses. The next question,
14
     ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to take your response at the
15
     bench.
16
               Has any member of this prospective jury panel,
17
     member of your immediate family or close, personal friend
18
     ever made a formal or informal complaint against a police
19
     officer? If so, please stand.
2.0
               Counsel, if you would approach the bench, please.
21
               (Counsel approached the bench and the following
22
               ensued.)
               THE BAILIFF: Number 146.
23
24
               THE COURT: Good morning, sir. You're juror number
25
     146?
```

JUROR NO. 146: Yes. Back in 1995, my best friend 1 2 was assaulted by the P. G. County Police Department. 3 THE COURT: And that individual made a complaint 4 that you are aware of? 5 JUROR NO. 146: Yeah, he sued them. 6 THE COURT: Do you recall what the outcome was? 7 JUROR NO. 146: They settled out of court. He got a lump sum payment. I'm not sure about how much. 8 9 THE COURT: Do you believe the matter was fairly 10 and appropriately handled by either the investigating 11 authorities or court authorities in the matter? 12 JUROR NO. 146: I can't say it was handled the best 13 way, because I know the Court tries to put -- it was five of 14 them in the car, who all had the same story, but then 15 everybody tried to say that it happened before he met them, 16 and why he be driving down the street with a broken jaw. 17 THE COURT: I have to put it in the context of what 18 I can understand. Are you talking about --19 JUROR NO. 146: I think it was unfair. 20 THE COURT: And why do you believe it was unfair? 21 JUROR NO. 146: Because just the way it went down. 22 He had five witnesses who saw it happened, and then the officer tried to say that he had nothing to do with it and 23 24 that it happened -- when he pulled him over in the car, his 25 jaw was already broke. But why would you be driving your car

with five people in it if your jaw is broke? 1 2 THE COURT: Based on what you know about that 3 incident and what happened to your friend and all of the 4 considerations about it, could what you know or what your experiences were with regard to what happened to your friend, 5 could that in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror 6 7 in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict based 8 only on the evidence? 9 JUROR NO. 146: No, I don't think so. 10 THE COURT: When you say you don't think so --11 JUROR NO. 146: No. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. THE BAILIFF: And number 8. 13 14 THE COURT: Yes, sir, you are juror number 8? 15 JUROR NO. 8: Yes. 16 THE COURT: What was your response to that 17 question? 18 JUROR NO. 8: I wanted to respond in the 19 affirmative. I had a friend and myself, approximately four 20 to five years ago, get pulled over by the Montgomery County 21 Police Department in Takoma Park, Maryland. They pulled us 22 over for slow stopping -- I'm using their words -- at a stop 23 sign. When they pulled us out of the car, approximately five

to six police cars surrounded our car. Two police officers

came, pulled us out, frisked us down, and robbed us.

24

25

THE COURT: And did what? 1 2 JUROR NO. 8: They robbed us. They stole my 3 friend's wallet and they took \$20 out of my back pocket. 4 THE COURT: Did anyone ever report -- did you 5 report --6 JUROR NO. 8: My friend did, because he lost his 7 wallet. I let it go because, truthfully, I didn't see 8 anything coming out of the situation. 9 THE COURT: Do you know what the outcome or what 10 happened as a result of your friend filing a complaint in 11 Montgomery County? 12 JUROR NO. 8: He said they strung him along; they'd 13 look into it. But, overall, I don't think he's gotten an 14 answer because he hasn't told me anything. 15 THE COURT: How long ago was this? 16 JUROR NO. 8: About four to five years ago. 17 THE COURT: Based on what happened to you and your 18 friend in that particular instance, could what happened to 19 you and your friend in any way impair your ability to serve 2.0 as a juror in this case and render a fair and impartial 21 verdict? 22 JUROR NO. 8: Honestly, I haven't had much faith in 23 any police department ever since that incident, because it 24 never happened before, and I don't know if any associates of 25 mine that it has happened to, honestly.

THE COURT: Again, looking at it in that light, how 1 2 would you respond to my question, could that in any way 3 impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case? 4 JUROR NO. 8: Maybe. I don't think so, honestly. 5 THE COURT: You do not think that you could be 6 impartial or you do not think --7 JUROR NO. 8: I don't think I can be impaired. 8 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 9 JUROR NO. 8: I don't think I can have impaired 10 judgment in giving an honest verdict. 11 THE COURT: Correct me if I'm wrong. I'm not 12 trying to put words in your mouth. Are you telling us that 13 you may not be able to render a fair and impartial verdict 14 because of what happened to you? 15 JUROR NO. 8: I hope not. It's hard for me to give a definite answer because I really --16 17 Obviously, you know how important this THE COURT: 18 is to Mr. Washington, who has been charged with this, and you 19 know how important it is to the State. We appreciate you, 20 number one, coming up here and telling us. 21 JUROR NO. 8: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: What we're trying to do is put together 12 people who would not be influenced by anything that may 23 24 have happened to them in their own personal lives, that in 25 some way could shape the course of their thoughts.

```
JUROR NO. 8: I understood that.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: So if you think of it in that light
 3
     when I ask you the question, we need an answer that --
 4
               JUROR NO. 8: Yes, sir.
 5
               THE COURT: And that is, could what happened to you
 6
     in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this
 7
     case and render a fair and impartial verdict?
 8
               JUROR NO. 8: Since I honestly believe there would
 9
     be a possibility, I would have to answer yes.
10
               THE COURT: Number 1, thank you very much for
11
     coming up and telling us that. We all appreciate it.
12
               MR. COHEN: Just for the record, this was number 8?
13
               MR. WRIGHT: Number 8.
14
               MR. COHEN: Number 146, what was his answer to that
15
     impartial question? The one that just came up.
16
               MR. WRIGHT: He could be fair.
17
               THE COURT: He could be fair. That's what I heard.
18
     Did you hear anything else?
19
               MR. WRIGHT: No.
2.0
               THE COURT: With respect to number 8.
21
               MR. COHEN: Move for cause.
22
               THE COURT: Do you want me to let him go
23
     immediately, or do you want me to hold him here for a while,
2.4
     or do you think that may spur more people coming up?
25
               MR. COHEN: I think the question has already been
```

asked and answered. I would probably let him go. 1 2 MR. MOOMAU: What was the question, Judge? 3 THE COURT: Do you want me to let him go now? 4 MR. WRIGHT: I would suggest no. Because then 5 everyone will realize they can get off. 6 THE COURT: Let's hold off for a little while, but 7 make a note to yourselves to bring that back. You may as 8 well stay up here. 9 The Court sees no other affirmative responses to 10 that question. 11 Does any member of this prospective jury panel hold 12 any general beliefs or opinions about the Prince George's 13 County Police Department or its officers? If so, please 14 The Court sees no affirmative response. 15 Has any member of this prospective jury panel ever 16 had an experience, or know of any family member or close 17 personal friends who have had an experience, with a police 18 officer, where you believe the officer treated you or that 19 other individual unfairly or improperly, whether or not a 2.0 complaint was actually filed? Please stand. 21 THE BAILIFF: Number 8. 22 THE COURT: Yes, sir. Does this relate to the same 23 experience? 24 JUROR NO. 8: Yes, sir. I just wanted to make that 25 known.

I appreciate that. Not another 1 THE COURT: 2 experience, but the same one? 3 JUROR NO. 8: The same one. 4 Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. THE COURT: 5 THE BAILIFF: Number 14. 6 THE COURT: Good morning, ma'am. Juror number 14? 7 JUROR NO. 14: Yes. My son worked in Bethesda at 8 the time, was mishandled by the Montgomery County police. He 9 had to show his I.D. and they had him on the ground. 10 cuffed him. He was on the ground for like maybe 30 minutes. 11 THE COURT: Do you know why they stopped the car? JUROR NO. 14: They said that he looked like 12 13 someone that they were looking for, but he was on his way to 14 the subway from work and it was at night, and he was treated 15 really bad and he's not a bad person. He's a minister. 16 THE COURT: Did they release him? 17 JUROR NO. 14: Of course, after about 30 minutes or 18 so, but it was devastating for him. 19 THE COURT: I can understand that. Did anyone file 20 a complaint? You're saying he did not file a complaint? 21 JUROR NO. 14: He did not. I called myself to 22 express my concern with the treatment, but he did not. And 23 at this time he was about 24. He just let it go. 24 THE COURT: Based on what happened to your son and 25 your experiences that you associated with that, could that

experience in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror 1 2. in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict? 3 JUROR NO. 14: No. THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate it. 4 5 THE BAILIFF: Number 52. 6 THE COURT: Good morning. Number 52? 7 JUROR NO. 52: Yes. The incident occurred in June 8 of this summer, when my 16-year-old son, who only had his 9 driver's license for five days, fell asleep at four o'clock 10 in the afternoon and put the car in the ditch on 301. A 11 Prince George's County officer arrived at the scene and 12 accused my son of drinking, which was not the case. 13 My son explained that he had just finished driver's 14 ed, and they said that you get mesmerized sometimes, and you 15 can put yourself to sleep by looking at the car in front of 16 The officer explained to my son that the only thing 17 that mesmerizes him is a pair of good tits. 18 So I thought that was totally inappropriate to say 19 to my son. The state officer arrived on the scene. 20 Prince George's County policeman sped off of the scene. I 21 never got his name, but I thought that was inappropriate. 22 And so I never reported the case. 23 THE COURT: Would that in any way impair your 24 ability to serve as a juror in this case --25 JUROR NO. 52: No, it doesn't. I believe it was a

case that was totally isolated to one individual. 1 2. THE COURT: Thank you. 3 THE BAILIFF: Number 98. 4 THE COURT: Yes, sir, you're juror number 98? 5 JUROR NO. 98: Yes. This must be about ten years 6 I was living in Bowie. My neighbor across the street, 7 African-American, a D.C. police officer, had a complaint 8 filed against him by a business owner for making a racially 9 insensitive remark. Six or seven P. G. police officers 10 approached him -- I was watching from our window to his 11 house. He was sitting in his car, unarmed, facing six to 12 seven white P. G. police officers, with their guns drawn 13 against an unarmed man. 14 I ended up testifying in his behalf in the D.C. 15 court about -- just as a character witness. He used to 16 babysit my son. And I also testified in P. G. County, here, 17 in his lawsuit against the P. G. County police for 18 unnecessary force. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Would what you saw and your 20 experiences with that situation in any way impair your 21 ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair 22 and impartial verdict? 23 I don't think so. I have complaints JUROR NO. 98: 24 about those particular officers --25 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

JUROR NO. 98: Only those particular officers 1 2 involved, but not against any P. G. police as a whole. 3 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. 4 THE BAILIFF: Number 107. 5 Yes, ma'am, you're juror number 107? THE COURT: 6 JUROR NO. 107: Yes. I have a group of friends 7 that were in an altercation in D.C., and they were -- there 8 was a brawl and they were, in my opinion, falsely arrested. 9 Both sides of the story weren't heard, and even 10 after the -- my friends consulted. They got stopped by a They also agreed that matters were not handled the way 11 12 they should have been handled. 13 THE COURT: Were you there and saw what the --14 JUROR NO. 107: No. 15 THE COURT: This is what you heard from your 16 friends? 17 JUROR NO. 107: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Based on what you were made aware of 19 about that particular situation and what transpired, could 2.0 that in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict? 21 22 JUROR NO. 107: No. THE COURT: Thank you very much. 23 2.4 THE BATLIFF: Number 131. 25 THE COURT: Good morning, ma'am. You are juror

```
number 131?
 1
 2
               JUROR NO. 131: Yes. Well, I have two incidents.
 3
     One was my uncle. He was taken into custody, and his rights
 4
     were never read to him.
 5
               THE COURT: Was that in Prince George's County?
 6
               JUROR NO. 131: Yes. No, I'm sorry. Montgomery
 7
     County.
 8
               THE COURT: You said you have another incident as
 9
     well?
10
               JUROR NO. 131: Yes. My best friend was pulled
11
     over for a traffic violation, and she said that the police
12
     were taunting her because she was crying. It was one police
13
     officer.
14
               THE COURT: Where was that; do you remember?
15
               JUROR NO. 131: It was in P. G. County, Greenbelt,
16
     Maryland.
17
               THE COURT: Do you know what your uncle was taken
18
     into custody for?
19
               JUROR NO. 131: I believe it was assault charges.
20
               THE COURT: And you indicated that, to the best of
21
     your knowledge, no officer read him his rights?
22
               JUROR NO. 131: Right.
23
               THE COURT: That was what you were told by your
2.4
     uncle or --
25
               JUROR NO. 131: Well, supposedly, the police
```

```
officer said that he wouldn't understand English anyway, so
 1
 2.
     they never gave him -- didn't read him his rights.
 3
               THE COURT: Would either one of those experiences
     in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this
 4
 5
     case and render a fair and impartial verdict?
 6
               JUROR NO. 131: No, sir.
 7
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate it.
 8
               THE BAILIFF: Number 146.
 9
               THE COURT:
                          Juror number 146?
10
               JUROR NO. 146: Yes. The first one was my cousin.
11
     That was one. And then I told you yesterday about I had a
12
     possession with intent charge.
13
               THE COURT:
                          Yes.
14
               JUROR NO. 146: I didn't have anything on me. I
15
     was in a car with a friend, who had like three or four bags
16
     on him. He told the police that it was his, but the lady
17
     said I need the arrest, so everybody in the car had to go.
18
     But I didn't have anything on me. He told me the drugs were
19
           I had to come to court for nothing. She threw it out
2.0
     as soon as I got here.
21
               THE COURT: Was that in District Court or Circuit
22
     Court.
23
               JUROR NO. 146: Yes. My lawyer was Mooney.
2.4
               THE COURT: Tom Mooney?
25
               JUROR NO. 146: Yes, sir.
```

THE COURT: Based on your experience in that 1 2 setting, could that in any way impair your ability to serve 3 as a juror in this case and render a fair and impartial 4 verdict? 5 JUROR NO. 146: No. Thank you very much. 6 THE COURT: 7 THE BAILIFF: And number 147. 8 THE COURT: Juror number 147. 9 JUROR NO. 147: Yes. I believe in '93 I, again, 10 was charged with three counts of attempted murder. I believe 11 the detective at the time was a Detective Holloway. I will 12 never forget that name. 13 I was charged and I was treated in a way that I 14 felt that was real unjust. I was never formally given any 15 apology. I never was even contacted by Prince George's 16 County police based on all the anguish that it caused my 17 family, with the split up of my mom and dad. It cost a lot. 18 It changed our life tremendously. It was such a huge case. 19 I never got past the way that I seen in the future 20 the way a lot of police officers went about situations when 21 they were called upon. I felt a lot of arrogance with P. G., 22 Prince George's County police officers, and, in a sense, I 23 still feel that way in some of the things as an adult now. 24 I still get the respect as if sometimes I'm like a 25 I'm a homeowner, I'm a taxpayer, and I've called them

```
numerous times in my area. I get this arrogant attitude.
 1
     believe that's one of the reasons why it may be hard for me
 2
 3
     to kind of, like, look at them at this time a lit different.
 4
               THE COURT: All right, sir. So my question to you
 5
     is -- number one, we appreciate very much you coming up.
 6
               JUROR NO. 147: Thank you.
 7
               THE COURT: My question to you then would be, in
 8
     light of what you said, could your experiences in the setting
 9
     that you described for us in any way impair your ability to
10
     serve as a juror in this case and render a fair and impartial
11
     verdict?
12
               JUROR NO. 147: Yes.
13
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. Appreciate
14
     it.
15
               MR. COHEN: Cause, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Any agreement?
17
               MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Juror 147 is stricken for cause by
19
     agreement.
20
               Do you want me to ask the next question, weigh the
     testimony of a police officer? May as well stay here. We'll
21
22
     call them up.
23
               The Court sees no other affirmative responses for
24
     that question.
25
               Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is there any
```

member of this prospective jury panel who is more likely or 1 2. less likely to believe a witness because that witness is a 3 law enforcement officer? I'll read it again. 4 Is there any member of this prospective jury panel 5 who is more likely or less likely to believe a witness 6 because that witness is a law enforcement officer? The Court 7 sees no affirmative response. 8 At the conclusion of this case, ladies and 9 gentlemen, the Court will give you instructions as to the law 10 in this case. These instructions will be binding upon you. 11 Will any of you have difficulty in adhering to and following 12 the Court's instructions and return a fair and impartial 13 verdict based solely on the evidence presented in this case? 14 The Court sees no affirmative response. 15 Has any member of this prospective jury panel 16 served on a grand jury or served as a juror in another trial 17 in either a criminal or a civil case? If so, please stand. 18 I don't think we need to take these answers at the 19 bench; do you? 2.0 (Counsel returned to trial tables and the following 21 ensued.) 22 THE COURT: Juror number -- I think it's 3. Is it 23 3? 24 JUROR NO. 3: Yes. I believe it was a civil case, in a traffic incident. 25

```
1
               THE COURT: And you served as a juror in Prince
 2
     George's County?
 3
               JUROR NO. 3: Yes, sir.
 4
               THE COURT: Would that fact of prior jury service
 5
     in a civil case involving a traffic accident in any way
 6
     impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case?
 7
               JUROR NO. 3: No, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: Thank you. Your juror number, ma'am?
 9
               JUROR NO. 6: Number 6. I served in D.C. on a
10
     grand jury.
11
               THE COURT: How long ago was that, please?
12
               JUROR NO. 6: Maybe seven, eight years ago.
13
               THE COURT: Would the fact of your prior service as
14
     a grand juror in the District of Columbia in any way impair
15
     your ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a
16
     fair and impartial verdict?
17
               JUROR NO. 6: No, it would not.
18
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. Yes, sir,
19
     please.
20
               JUROR NO. 32: Number 32. I served in a civil
21
     trial right here in Upper Marlboro.
22
               THE COURT: How long ago was that, sir?
               JUROR NO. 32: About seven years ago, I guess.
23
24
               THE COURT: Do you remember the nature of the civil
25
     trial?
```

```
JUROR NO. 32: It was an employer suing an employee
 1
 2
     for some school loans that he didn't repay.
 3
               THE COURT: Would your prior service in a civil
 4
     case in the Circuit Court for Prince George's County in any
 5
     way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case and
 6
     render a fair and impartial verdict?
 7
               JUROR NO. 32: No, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. Yes, ma'am?
 9
               JUROR NO. 52: Number 52. About six years ago I
10
     served right here in this courtroom. The case was attempted
11
     murder.
12
               THE COURT: What was the outcome in that case,
13
     please?
14
               JUROR NO. 52: He was quilty.
15
               THE COURT: Would your prior service in a criminal
16
     case in Prince George's County in any way impair your ability
17
     to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair and
18
     impartial verdict?
19
               JUROR NO. 52: No, sir, not at all.
20
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. Yes, sir,
21
     I believe that's number 66?
22
               JUROR NO. 66: Yes. I served in D.C. It was a
23
     weapons charge.
24
               THE COURT: Do you remember the outcome in that
25
     case, sir, and how long ago it may have been?
```

```
JUROR NO. 66: Probably 17 years ago, and I believe
 1
 2
     it was not quilty.
 3
               THE COURT: Would your prior service in a criminal
 4
     case as a juror in the District of Columbia in any way impair
 5
     your ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a
 6
     fair and impartial verdict?
 7
               JUROR NO. 66: It would not.
 8
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Yes, sir, your number?
               JUROR NO. 71: Number 71. It was a theft ring
 9
10
     trial.
11
               THE COURT: In what jurisdiction, sir?
12
               JUROR NO. 71: Prince George's County.
13
               THE COURT: And you served as a juror in that case?
14
               JUROR NO. 71: Yes.
15
               THE COURT: Do you remember what the outcome was?
16
               JUROR NO. 71: It was quilty.
17
               THE COURT: Would your prior service in a criminal
18
     case in Prince George's County in any way impair your ability
19
     to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair and
2.0
     impartial verdict?
21
               JUROR NO. 71: No, sir.
22
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. Yes, ma'am?
               JUROR NO. 79: Number 79. I served in Ohio in 2000
23
2.4
     on two civil cases.
25
               THE COURT: In Prince George's County?
```

JUROR NO. 79: No; in Ohio. 1 2 THE COURT: Do you recall the nature of those civil 3 cases? 4 JUROR NO. 79: One was a medical malpractice, and 5 we found for the person bringing the complaint. The other 6 was a traffic infraction, and we found for the defendant. 7 THE COURT: Would your prior experience as a juror 8 in those civil cases in any way impair your ability to serve 9 as a juror in this case and render a fair and impartial 10 verdict? 11 JUROR NO. 79: No, sir. 12 THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. 13 ma'am? 14 JUROR NO. 92: Juror number 92. I served as a 15 juror on a criminal case in Prince George's County about five 16 years ago. 17 THE COURT: Do you recall what the charge and what 18 the outcome was? 19 JUROR NO. 92: Felony murder and found quilty. 20 THE COURT: Would your prior service in a criminal 21 case in Prince George's County in any way impair your ability 22 to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair and 23 impartial verdict? 24 JUROR NO. 92: No, sir. 25 THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am.

```
ma'am?
 1
 2
               JUROR NO. 94: Juror number 94. A civil case in
     Prince George's County over ten years ago. It was a money
 3
 4
             They were found quilty. I was an alternate.
 5
               THE COURT: Would your prior service in that civil
 6
     action in this jurisdiction in any way impair your ability to
 7
     serve as a juror in a criminal case?
 8
               JUROR NO. 94: No.
 9
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am.
10
     ma'am?
11
               JUROR NO. 109: Number 109. Criminal, Prince
12
     George's County. It was petty theft but, since he left the
     store without the item, it was dismissed.
13
14
               THE COURT: It was dismissed or found not quilty by
15
     the jury, or how did you --
16
               JUROR NO. 109: Well, as he was walking through the
17
     store, he was stuffing things in his jacket.
18
               THE COURT: No, that's okay. I mean, did the jury
19
     come back and find him not quilty?
20
               JUROR NO. 109: No. The judge --
21
               THE COURT: Dismissed it before it actually reached
22
     the jury.
23
               JUROR NO. 109: Yes.
24
               THE COURT: Would that fact of your prior jury
25
     service in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in
```

```
this case and render a fair and impartial verdict?
 1
 2.
               JUROR NO. 109: No, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am?
 4
               JUROR NO. 118: Juror number 118. It was a civil
 5
     case in Prince George's County about two ten years ago, an
 6
     automobile accident.
 7
               THE COURT: Would that prior jury service in that
 8
     civil case in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror
 9
     in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict?
10
               JUROR NO. 118: No.
11
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
12
               JUROR NO. 124: Juror number 124. A civil case in
13
     Prince George's County, auto accident. That was three years
14
     ago.
15
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
16
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
17
     and impartial verdict?
18
               JUROR NO. 124: No, sir.
19
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, ma'am?
2.0
               JUROR NO. 125: Number 125. I served in two civil
21
     and one criminal.
22
               THE COURT: In Prince George's County?
23
               JUROR NO. 125: Yes.
24
               THE COURT: Do you remember the nature of the
     criminal case?
25
```

```
JUROR NO. 125: Assault, kidnapping, rape.
 1
 2.
               THE COURT: How long ago was that?
 3
               JUROR NO. 125: About ten years ago.
 4
               THE COURT: And do you recall what the outcome was?
 5
               JUROR NO. 125: Guilty.
 6
               THE COURT: And the nature of the two civil cases,
 7
     please?
 8
               JUROR NO. 125: One was seeking more compensation
 9
     for disabilities, and the other one was two shoppers were --
10
     someone had fallen.
11
               THE COURT: Would the fact of your prior jury
12
     service in either that criminal case or those civil cases in
13
     any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case
14
     and render a fair and impartial verdict?
15
               JUROR NO. 125: No, sir.
16
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, sir?
17
               JUROR NO. 143: In 2005, a civil case. It was
18
     traffic and was quilty.
19
               THE COURT: What was your juror number, sir?
2.0
               JUROR NO. 143: Number 143.
21
               THE COURT: Would your prior service in that civil
22
     case in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in
23
     this case and render a fair and impartial verdict?
               JUROR NO. 143: No, it would not.
2.4
25
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. Yes, ma'am?
```

```
JUROR NO. 130: Juror number 130. An automobile
 1
 2
     accident and he was found quilty.
 3
                          In Prince George's County?
               THE COURT:
 4
               JUROR NO. 130: Yes.
 5
               THE COURT: And would that fact in any way impair
 6
     your ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a
 7
     fair and impartial verdict?
 8
               JUROR NO. 130: No, sir.
 9
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, ma'am, all the
10
     way in the back.
11
               JUROR NO. 53: Juror number 53. A civil case,
12
     Prince George's County, automobile.
13
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
14
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
15
     and impartial verdict?
16
               JUROR NO. 53: No.
17
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. The Court
18
     sees no other affirmative response to that question.
19
               Are any members of this prospective jury panel,
20
     members of your immediate family or close personal friends
21
     lawyers? Yes, ma'am?
22
               JUROR NO. 18: Juror number 18. A friend of the
23
     family is a member of -- has her own law firm, family law.
2.4
               THE COURT: Do you remember in what jurisdiction?
25
               JUROR NO. 18: Prince George's County.
```

```
THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
 1
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
 2
 3
     and impartial verdict?
 4
               JUROR NO. 18:
                              No.
 5
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. Yes, sir?
 6
               JUROR NO. 25: Juror number 25. I have a
 7
     brother-in-law that's an attorney.
 8
               THE COURT: And in this jurisdiction, sir?
 9
               JUROR NO. 25: Calvert County, sir.
10
               THE COURT: Does he undertake any criminal
11
     practice; do you know?
12
               JUROR NO. 25: No, sir.
13
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
14
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
15
     and impartial verdict?
16
               JUROR NO. 25: No, Your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. Yes, sir?
18
               JUROR NO. 32: Number 32. My brother.
19
               THE COURT: In this jurisdiction?
2.0
               JUROR NO. 32: No. He lives in Mannsville, Texas.
21
               THE COURT: Would the fact of the occupation of
22
     your brother in any way impair your ability to serve as a
23
     juror on this case and render a fair and impartial verdict?
2.4
               JUROR NO. 32: No, it does not.
25
               THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am?
```

```
JUROR NO. 50: Juror number 50. Relatives,
 1
 2
     immigration lawyers.
 3
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
 4
     ability to serve as a juror on this case and render a fair
 5
     and impartial verdict?
 6
               JUROR NO. 50: No, Your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Thank you very much ma'am. Yes, ma'am?
 8
               JUROR NO. 51: Number 51. A close friend of my
 9
     mother is a lawyer in Prince George's County. It wasn't
10
     criminal, but I'm not sure what it is.
11
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
12
     ability to serve as a juror on this case and render a fair
13
     and impartial verdict?
14
               JUROR NO. 51:
15
               THE COURT: Juror number 66, yes, sir?
16
               JUROR NO. 66: Yes, I have eight friends who are
17
     lawyers.
18
               THE COURT: Do any of them practice any criminal
19
     law?
2.0
               JUROR NO. 66:
                              Yes.
               THE COURT: In this jurisdiction, sir, if you know?
21
22
               JUROR NO. 66: Three of them are in the D.C. metro
23
     area.
24
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
25
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
```

```
and impartial verdict?
 1
 2.
               JUROR NO. 66: No, it wouldn't.
 3
               THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, sir?
                              I have several friends --
 4
               JUROR NO. 98:
 5
               THE COURT: Your number?
 6
               JUROR NO. 98: Number 98. I have several friends
 7
     who are lawyers, including my best friend.
 8
               THE COURT: Any of them practice criminal law in
 9
     this jurisdiction?
10
               JUROR NO. 98:
                              No.
11
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
12
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
13
     and impartial verdict?
14
               JUROR NO. 98:
                              No.
15
               THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am.
16
               JUROR NO. 100: Juror number 100. I have a friend
17
     previously employed with the state's attorney general's
18
     office.
19
               THE COURT:
                           In Maryland?
2.0
               JUROR NO. 100: Yes.
21
               THE COURT: Do you know whether they were in any
     criminal section of the attorney general's office?
22
23
               JUROR NO. 100: I'm not sure.
2.4
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
25
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
```

```
and impartial verdict?
 1
 2.
               JUROR NO. 100: No, it would not.
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am.
 3
 4
     ma'am?
 5
                                            We have a family
               JUROR NO. 111: Number 111.
 6
     friend who is a lawyer, but I'm not certain as to what type
 7
     of law she practices.
 8
               THE COURT: In this jurisdiction?
 9
               JUROR NO. 111: Yes.
10
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
11
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
12
     and impartial verdict?
13
               JUROR NO. 111: No, sir.
14
                          Thank you, ma'am. Yes, ma'am?
               THE COURT:
15
               JUROR NO. 118: Number 118. My sister is an
     attorney, and she is licensed to practice in the State of
16
17
     Maryland and the District of Columbia.
18
               THE COURT: Does she perform any criminal work?
19
               JUROR NO. 118: No, she does not.
20
               THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your
21
     ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair
22
     and impartial verdict?
               JUROR NO. 118: No, sir.
23
2.4
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. Yes, sir?
25
               JUROR NO. 149: Number 149. FBI agent father,
```

retired attorney before he was an FBI agent. I have a personal friend who is a civil attorney for the City of Alexandria.

THE COURT: Would that fact in any way impair your ability, sir, to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict?

JUROR NO. 149: No, sir.

2.0

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I see no other affirmative responses to that question.

Is there any member of this jury panel who has such strong feelings about guns that you would be unable to render a fair and impartial verdict based solely on the evidence presented in this case? If you have a yes or affirmative answer, please stand. The Court sees no affirmative response to that question.

Does any member of the prospective jury panel have such strong feelings about homicide that you would be unable to render a fair and impartial verdict in this case based solely on the evidence presented? The Court sees no affirmative response to that question.

Is there any member of this prospective jury panel who has ever worked for any advocacy group, law firm, political campaign, shelter, neighborhood organization, or any other organization that focuses some or all of its work on issues relating to gun control, gun violence, violence

among youths, or crime reduction?

If you'd like me to read it again, I will. Has any member of this prospective jury panel ever worked for any advocacy group, law firm, political campaign, shelter, neighborhood organization, or any other organization that focuses some or all of its work on issues relating to gun control, gun violence, violence among youths, or crime reduction? Yes, ma'am, juror number?

JUROR NO. 17: Juror number 17. Laurel Police

Department. Did do some advocacy work. They had a

community-based program as part of the department's

activities, issuing gun locks, going out into neighborhoods

and helping victims of crime, that court of thing.

THE COURT: Would your work in that area, as a member of the Laurel City Police Department, in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict?

JUROR NO. 17: No, it would not.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. Yes, sir, juror number 66.

JUROR NO. 66: In my capacity as a therapist over 20 years, about a quarter of my caseload was identified by Juvenile Justice Department.

THE COURT: And you participated in any number of programs, I'm sure, involved in assisting juveniles; is that

correct?

JUROR NO. 66: That's correct.

THE COURT: Would that in any way impair your ability to serve as a juror in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict based only on the evidence?

JUROR NO. 66: It would not.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. The Court sees no other affirmative response to that particular question.

If Mr. Washington were to testify in this case, would any of you be less likely to believe his testimony simply because he is the defendant? The Court sees no affirmative response.

Would any members of this prospective jury panel tend to view the testimony of witnesses called by the defense with more skepticism than those called by the State merely because they are called by the defense? The Court sees no affirmative response to that question.

Does any member of this prospective jury panel, because of religious, moral or philosophical reasons, have difficulty sitting in judgment on another person accused of a crime? The Court sees no affirmative response to that question.

Is there any juror who has either a seeing or hearing disability or another physical condition that might

impair your ability to focus on the evidence in this case if 1 2. you were chosen to sit in this case? And that's juror number 3 101, correct? 4 JUROR NO. 101: Right. 5 THE COURT: Yes, sir, we are aware of that. Thank 6 And your number, sir? you. 7 JUROR NO. 121: Number 121. 8 THE COURT: Yes, we're aware of that, sir. 9 The Court sees no other affirmative response to that 10 question. 11 Does any member of the prospective jury panel hold 12 any beliefs concerning the administration of justice in this 13 county that would cause you to hesitate in your ability to 14 deliver a fair and impartial verdict based solely on the 15 evidence to be presented in this case? The Court sees no 16 affirmative response to that question. 17 Is there any other reason whatsoever, that we did 18 not ask, why you would think that you could not sit as a 19 juror in this case and render a fair and impartial verdict 2.0 based only on the evidence to be presented? The Court sees 21 no affirmative response to that question. 22 Is there any member of this prospective jury panel 23 who is not a resident of Prince George's County? The Court

Is there any member of this prospective jury panel

2.4

25

sees no affirmative response.

who is not a citizen of the United States? The Court sees no 1 2. affirmative response. 3 Would counsel like to approach the bench? 4 (Counsel approached the bench and the following 5 ensued.) 6 Is the State satisfied with the voir THE COURT: 7 dire as requested? 8 MR. MOOMAU: Yes. I was shocked about the one 9 about the five to seven days, but I'm satisfied. 10 THE COURT: Is the defense satisfied with the voir 11 dire as given? 12 MR. COHEN: We are, Your Honor. The five to seven 13 days, the excused by the juror's office, is that language 14 commonplace in terms of --15 THE COURT: I have used that language because --16 well, that's the language that I use and other judges use 17 because, if they had anything that was going to take place 18 within a period of time and they had let the jury 19 commissioner know that, the jury commissioner would make a 2.0 decision and then refer them to us to determine, and they 21 didn't do that in this situation. 22 MR. COHEN: I see. 23 THE COURT: I don't know if all judges do that. 2.4 MR. COHEN: We're fine. 25 MR. MOOMAU: Because there were some notes on here

about some things. 1 2 MR. COHEN: In the comments section. 3 Then if we have no other matter THE COURT: Yes. 4 with respect to voir dire, why don't we start the process of 5 selection. MR. COHEN: Your Honor, if you could repeat what 6 7 you said about the 12 peremptories that you said earlier. If 8 you could give us a quick overview of how this Court likes to do peremptories. I believe you said there's an extra 12. 9 10 THE COURT: No, no, no. In this matter, because 11 the sentence is less than life, you would receive ten 12 peremptory challenges; the State would receive five. We're 13 choosing four alternates. So that in that, for each 14 alternate, you would have two challenges; the State would 15 only have one. 16 We do it in alternating fashion. The State, 17 initially, 12 to 15 will be called to the rail, so that you 18 can see them when their numbers come up, and the strikes will 19 alternate back and forth. And I'll tell you whose turn it 2.0 is. But, as you can see, I had to change my numbers. 21 MR. MOOMAU: I am right on that. 22 THE COURT: You were. I didn't think of that 23 because -- I'm going to look at it once again to make sure, 2.4 but T believe --

MR. STARR: How, logistically, do we exercise the

25

1 | strikes? Is there a form or --

THE COURT: No. Do it orally. We keep track and you keep track. In other words, many people say "with respect, the juror is challenged" or "the juror is stricken," however you want to do it. But it's done orally.

Most times, if it was a case under 20 years, you could do it on paper, but it's not.

MR. STARR: And do we do it orally at the bench, or do we do it at the tables?

THE COURT: Right, sitting where you are.

MR. STARR: And they'll continue to be seated where they're seated for that process?

THE COURT: Yes. Once a juror is seated, you would have the ability, before they are sworn, to challenge them, even if they are in the box.

In other words, if you have challenges remaining from your ten, and the State had originally sworn a juror, Maryland law permits you, even though you've done that, if you have any challenges remaining, to challenge them from the box before the jury is sworn. So you can exercise them from the bench; you can hold off, and exercise them when they're actually put in the box.

In other words, if the State were to say swear the juror -- you or the State were to say swear the juror, and you would say on that occasion swear the juror and they're

put in the box, as long as you have a strike remaining at the 1 2 end, you can challenge them from sitting in the box. 3 I see. They're called up one by one. MR. STARR: 4 THE COURT: Yes. We put 12 to 15 at the rail in 5 front of you. They're each called one by one, give their 6 juror number, challenge, back and forth, alternating. 7 MR. STARR: And then we go back and forth for the 8 first five, and then after that --9 THE COURT: First five? 10 MR. COHEN: I got it. 11 It would be alternating strike every THE COURT: 12 single time for the first 12. And assuming that you don't 13 challenge anyone from the box, then it would be two and one, 14 alternating for the alternates. 15 So I would ask you after each phase. 16 there are 12 jurors in that box that you've both indicated 17 you wish sworn, then I would say is the State satisfied with 18 that jury. If they were to say one moment, Your Honor, look 19 at their notes and say I have the ability to challenge 20 anyone, if they have any remaining strikes. 21 If they say the State is satisfied with that jury, 22 I would look to you and say are you satisfied. Then you 23 could exercise whatever challenges you have remaining or say 2.4 I'm satisfied. 25 So, if you're satisfied with the 12 we're seating,

```
1
     then we go to the alternates, alternating back and forth in
 2
     the same process.
 3
                          Your Honor, are there going to be 16
               MR. COHEN:
 4
     total, Your Honor?
 5
               THE COURT: I think, in this case, it's good to
 6
     have four alternates.
 7
               MR. COHEN:
                           We agree.
 8
               THE COURT: So what we will do is we will call
 9
     them, put them up at the rail. She'll call them each
10
     individually by number. They'll acknowledge who they are.
11
     The State starts, and then it goes back and forth.
12
                (Counsel returned to trial tables and the following
13
               ensued.)
                           I apologize. Would you gentlemen like
14
               THE COURT:
15
     to approach the bench again.
16
                (Counsel approached the bench and the following
17
               ensued.)
18
               THE COURT: One of the jurors, number 79, just
19
     remembered something with regard to his employment, where he
20
     would work and know lawyers. Does anyone have any problem
21
     with that or wish me to call him to the bench to ask him to
22
     answer any further questions?
23
               MR. MOOMAU: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.
24
               MR. COHEN: No, Your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: Would you sign that, Mr. Moomau, so we
```

can file it in the case. There's no objection.

Also, I'm going to excuse juror number

Also, I'm going to excuse juror number 8 now and number 147. They're the two that we, by agreement, were stricken for cause.

MR. MOOMAU: I never did ask the question and we never did -- did everyone show back up?

THE COURT: Yes, every single one. Now, some of them were late but, when they came in, we checked them off.

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, you had made a suggestion or said that you would be amenable to having some jurors moved to the back if we thought it was appropriate in terms of the pool. I know there is one gentleman that keeps talking about --

THE COURT: That's what I was going to bring up now. Thank you.

MR. MOOMAU: The guy with the back problems.

THE COURT: Juror 101 and juror 120, I believe. That person with the vacation is struck then. We had the lady with the support hearing, number 77. Let me just go through all the names.

We have the back problem, we have the diabetes and other difficulties. That's number 101 and number 121. We have the elections judge, 118. And the other gentleman has a prostate problem. That's juror 121. And he has diabetes. I believe that's all my notes with regard to that. So it's

1 | 101, 121 and 118.

MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, the State is inclined, as to the elections judge, since that is a today job, she probably is not going to be able to do anything today. The State would request to leave her at her current space.

MR. MOOMAU: Yes.

THE COURT: The only thing I wanted to mention to you, to bring up, is that she seemed a little bit upset or irritated to some extent by asking me several times if I was going to excuse her. So you have to make a determination amongst you. Because it's no cause on whether you want that person on the jury.

So the only thing I'm suggesting -- and you do not have to agree with me -- is that we put her at the bottom of the list, along with juror number 101 and 121.

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, as to all of the three jurors that you've named, we would suggest that we move them to the back of the pool for the physical ailments they stated, as well as with 118. If she is released, she could maybe make the polls by seven this evening, and she did seem a little adamant about wanting to leave. So we would ask that all three be put at the back.

THE COURT: It doesn't mean all three would come up during the process. But if there's agreement, there's agreement. If there isn't, there isn't.

```
The State's only understanding is that
 1
               MR. WRIGHT:
 2
     the election judge, they should have had the training and
 3
     they were getting paid from 6:30 or 5:00 this morning.
 4
                           I'm sorry. Go ahead.
               THE COURT:
 5
               MR. MOOMAU: The lady with the child support
 6
     issue --
 7
               THE COURT:
                          That's 77.
 8
               MR. MOOMAU: I didn't really see the need to put
 9
     her in the back.
10
               THE COURT: I don't have her on there. I'm just
11
     saying, if you want to do that, if you want to consider it.
12
     If you don't, that's fine. The only three I'm talking about
13
     are 101, who has the back problem, number 121, who has
14
     diabetes and prostate --
15
               MR. WRIGHT: The State consents to moving those two
16
     to the back.
17
                           There was another one who had back
               THE COURT:
18
     problems, who was excused for other reasons. Number 140, I
19
     believe it was.
20
               MR. MOOMAU: Number 101 is the guy who came up here
21
     first thing this morning?
22
               THE COURT: Yes.
               MR. MOOMAU: Yes, that's no problem.
23
24
               THE COURT: So if we could put, by agreement, juror
25
     101 and 121 at the bottom of the list, and juror 118 stay in
```

the position that she currently is in. File this with the case.

Ready to proceed? Let me excuse number 8 and number 147.

Juror number 8 and juror number 147, you're excused from jury service. Thank you very much. We appreciate it, and if you could go back to the main jury lounge and give them back your number. I don't believe there is anything else going on, but I can't promise you that. Thank you both, again, very much.

MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, this is a thought among the attorneys. The five to seven day response, or lack thereof, was a little troubling. Can we ask a general catchall question, which some judges do give; that is, is there any reason why you cannot serve on this jury for the next five to seven days?

THE COURT: With all due respect, we've received a number of notes, which we've filed in this case, from jurors who expressed any number of reasons about difficulties they would have in serving. And at the end we asked them a question, is there any other reason whatsoever why you could not sit on this jury and serve the period of time. They've been told that it's five to seven days. No one, unlike all of the other situations when they're passing up notes, has ever responded in that fashion about the time.

```
So is that what you want me to do?
 1
 2
               MR. COHEN: Court's indulgence.
 3
               MR. WRIGHT: We're fine, Your Honor.
 4
               MR. COHEN: Just from the defense, Your Honor.
 5
     just seems odd that none of the jurors responded to the
 6
     question. Again, we're not making any opinion or statement
 7
     about the way it was phrased, but it just seemed odd that
 8
     there was no response about the five to seven days.
 9
               Our concern is that, once they're seated, they
10
     realize that they'll be here for five to seven days, and then
11
     we have a problem similar to the 118, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: I'll ask the question, but I'm telling
13
           Is that what you want me to do? I'll do it.
14
               MR. COHEN: Can I confer with --
15
               MR. WRIGHT: The State is fine.
16
               THE COURT:
                           No. What is it that you want me to
17
     ask?
18
               MR. WRIGHT: We'll defer to the defense.
19
               THE COURT:
                           I mean just tell me what you want me to
2.0
     ask.
21
               MR. MOOMAU:
                            They asked a ton of questions.
22
     more so and brought more things up --
23
               THE COURT: If the defense would like me to ask a
24
     question, if there is anyone for any reason who believes that
25
     they cannot sit as a juror for five to seven days, I'll ask
```

```
it.
 1
 2
               MR. COHEN: I think we would like that done, Your
 3
     Honor.
 4
               (Counsel returned to trial tables and the following
 5
               ensued.)
 6
               THE COURT: As you may recall, ladies and
 7
     gentlemen, I asked you a question or at least relayed to you
 8
     the fact that this case may take five to seven days to try.
 9
     Did you all hear that?
10
               THE JURY: Yes.
11
               THE COURT: Is there any member of this prospective
12
     jury panel who believes for any reason that they will not be
13
     able to sit for five to seven days during trial?
14
               Counsel, approach the bench. We'll do it one at a
15
     time at the bench.
16
               THE BAILIFF: Number 16.
17
               THE COURT: Yes, sir, juror number 16?
18
               JUROR NO. 16: Yes.
19
               THE COURT: Why do you believe that?
20
               JUROR NO. 16: Because I have -- this whole week, I
21
     have bills to pay. I have a meeting to go to on Thursday.
22
     And then I have to go out to Fairfax to get my money to pay
23
     my bills. That's, like, early in morning, so I can't
24
     really -- this whole week I got to take care of bills. They
25
     ain't little bills. They're big bills. I've got mortgage,
```

```
1
     tax.
 2
               THE COURT: I don't know if we're going to be able
 3
     to help you.
 4
               JUROR NO. 16: Well, you know, I'm behind in bills.
 5
     I was late yesterday for one.
 6
               THE COURT: I know, sir, but this is an obligation
 7
     that's required, and I'm not sure we can help you. But I'm
 8
     just telling you that up front.
 9
               JUROR NO. 16: Well, Your Honor, I can't be behind
10
     on my mortgage.
11
               THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
12
               THE BAILIFF: Number 14.
13
               THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, juror number 14?
14
               JUROR NO. 14: Was your question concerning if I'm
15
     able to set in and would my job interfere with --
16
               THE COURT: My question is, is there any reason
17
     that you believe that you could not sit for five to seven
18
     days in trial?
19
               JUROR NO. 14: Well, I mean I can set. But I still
20
     work. After I leave here, I would still have to do that.
21
               THE COURT: All right, ma'am. Thank you. I
22
     appreciate it.
23
               THE BAILIFF: Number 17.
24
               THE COURT: Juror number 17, yes, ma'am.
25
               JUROR NO. 17: My concern is I have no problem
```

```
sitting on a jury for five to seven days but, with this
 1
 2
     particular week, I'm going out of state on Saturday.
 3
     already have my reservations and everything. It's a long
 4
     weekend for the holiday weekend. That's my concern.
 5
               THE COURT: Thank you. Appreciate it.
 6
               THE BAILIFF: Number 19.
 7
               THE COURT: You are juror --
 8
               JUROR NO. 19: I have rheumatoid arthritis --
 9
               THE COURT: You are juror number 19?
10
               JUROR NO. 19: Number 19.
11
               THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
12
               JUROR NO. 19: I have rheumatoid arthritis, and I
13
     don't know whether I can -- some days I have good days; some
14
     days I have bad. To make it down here for -- what is it?
15
     Seven days?
16
               THE COURT:
                          Five to seven days, ma'am.
17
               JUROR NO. 19: Five to seven days all depend if I'm
18
     acting up that morning or whatever.
19
               THE COURT: All right, ma'am. Thank you. I
2.0
     appreciate it.
21
               THE BAILIFF: Number 55.
22
               THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, juror number 55?
23
               JUROR NO. 55: Yes, I am. I'm self-employed.
24
     have a government contract where I transport school children.
25
     That's my only reason.
```

```
THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am.
 1
 2
               THE BAILIFF: Number 72.
 3
               THE COURT: Juror number 72. Yes, sir?
 4
               JUROR NO. 72: Yeah, I work in a body shop with
 5
             We work on Army trucks. I have to attend the job.
 6
     Only two people can work on the back at the same time.
 7
                          Thank you, sir. I appreciate it.
               THE COURT:
 8
               THE BATLIFF: Number 96.
 9
               THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, you're juror number 96?
10
               JUROR NO. 96: Yes. I'm eight months pregnant, and
     I feel uncomfortable for that long. And I also have medical
11
12
     appointments.
13
               THE COURT: When is that, ma'am?
14
               JUROR NO. 96: Well, I had one yesterday, but I'm
15
     have to reschedule it after.
16
               THE COURT: Thank you.
17
               THE BAILIFF: Number 112.
18
               THE COURT: Good morning, sir. Juror number 112?
19
               JUROR NO. 112: Yes. I'm a clinical research
20
     nurse, and I work at the National Institution [sic] of
21
     Health, and I started that job less than five months, and I
22
     have several patients that we're doing clinical trials on,
23
     and I really would like to be able to be there, you know,
2.4
     with the clinical trial study that we're doing.
25
               THE COURT: Thank you. I can't promise you
```

```
anything.
 1
 2.
               THE BAILIFF: Number 125.
 3
               THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, juror number 125?
 4
               JUROR NO. 125: Yes, I am. I have no problem with
 5
     five to seven but, on the 22nd, I have plane tickets for
 6
     vacation. It would depend on when the five to seven started.
 7
               MR. WRIGHT: Can we ask a follow-up question as to
 8
     when is her plane leaving?
               THE COURT:
 9
                           The 22nd.
10
               MR. WRIGHT: The plane is leaving on the 22nd?
11
               JUROR NO. 125: Yes.
12
               THE COURT: Thank you.
13
               THE BAILIFF: Number 131.
14
               THE COURT: Juror number 131, yes, ma'am?
15
               JUROR NO. 131: Well, my main concern is school,
16
     and I participate in a lot of organizations on campus and so
17
     on.
18
                          Thank you, ma'am.
               THE COURT:
19
               THE BAILIFF: Number 101.
20
               THE COURT: Yes, sir, juror number 101?
21
               JUROR NO. 101: Yes, sir.
22
               THE COURT: And that's the matter you told us about
23
     earlier?
24
               JUROR NO. 101: Yes, sir.
25
               THE COURT: We're trying to figure out what to do
```

```
about that.
 1
 2
               JUROR NO. 101: Okay then.
 3
               THE BAILIFF: Number 146.
 4
               THE COURT: Juror number 146?
 5
               JUROR NO. 146: Yes, sir. I work nights at the
 6
     Pentagon, four on, three off. So, like, last night I had to
 7
     leave here at five, go to work at six, get off at six this
 8
     morning, go home, take a shower, and come here. I can't do
 9
     that seven days in a row.
10
               THE COURT: All right, sir.
                                            Thank you.
11
               THE BAILIFF: Number 121.
12
               THE COURT: Juror number 121, yes, sir, we are
13
     aware of both the prostate and the diabetes.
14
               JUROR NO. 121: Yes, prostate cancer.
15
     radiation --
16
                          You're having radiation treatment now?
               THE COURT:
17
               JUROR NO. 121: No, I already had, but the side
18
     effect is I have to go to frequent urination, bowel movement,
19
     plus --
2.0
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
21
               THE BAILIFF: Number 130.
22
               THE COURT: Gentlemen, on this one he has prostate
23
     cancer that he has just undergone radiation treatment for. I
2.4
     did know he had a prostate problem, but I didn't know it was
25
     that.
```

```
Yes, ma'am, you're number?
 1
 2
               JUROR NO. 130: Number 130. I just started a new
 3
     job, and I got promoted to supervisor, and I run my own
 4
     store, and they can't find nobody else to cover my position.
 5
               THE COURT: Alright, ma'am.
                                            Thank you. I
 6
     appreciate it.
 7
                            Number 110.
               THE BAILIFF:
 8
               THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, number 110?
 9
               JUROR NO. 110: Yes. I fell last year and broke my
10
     wrist and hurt my back. I was taking therapy, and I'm
11
     waiting for social security, because I can't go back to work
12
     yet.
13
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate it.
14
               THE BAILIFF: And number 111.
15
               THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, juror number 111?
16
               JUROR NO. 111: Yes. I have a 10:30 hearing on the
17
     26th for child support.
18
                          Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate it.
               THE COURT:
19
               MR. COHEN: Ten minutes, Your Honor. That's all it
20
            Just thought I would put that on the record.
21
               THE COURT: I don't know about juror number 121.
22
     We put him at the bottom of the list.
23
                            The State is fine with excusing him.
               MR. WRIGHT:
24
               THE COURT: Well, I'm just throwing it out there.
25
     I don't know what you may want or not want to do.
```

MR. COHEN: We have no opposition to number 121. 1 2 THE COURT: Number 121, by agreement of the 3 parties, is stricken for cause. 4 Do you want to keep 101 at the bottom? He's the 5 one with the back problem. 6 MR. COHEN: Yes. 7 MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, if I may. I have a 8 question. We didn't discuss this on the scheduling 9 conference, but juror number 125 made mention of it. She's 10 catching a plane out on the 22nd. That is listed as judicial 11 conference. We will sit, if we make it to the 22nd, although 12 I understand none of us are planning to go --13 THE COURT: The 22nd? There will be nobody in the 14 courthouse. 15 MR. WRIGHT: So we will not sit on that day, if we 16 get that far. 17 THE COURT: It's possible, but I can't answer that. 18 I would have to go talk to Judge Missouri. He'll be back 19 Wednesday. I can make the decision now in his absence, but 2.0 he will be back Wednesday. I would prefer to wait. 21 MR. WRIGHT: Juror number 125 stated she had plans 22 to leave for vacation. I guess we may have had a follow-up 23 question as to when she would be coming back into the area itself. We did not ask the question. 2.4 25 THE COURT: What are you asking me to do?

To ask number 125 when is she coming 1 MR. WRIGHT: 2 back. 3 MR. MOOMAU: She said just a long weekend. 4 If we start getting -- you have another THE COURT: 5 number with another vacation on the 25th. You want me to 6 bring both those people back up here? 7 MR. WRIGHT: No. I guess the State would caution 8 in terms of scheduling. There is a chance, I feel, that we 9 could go -- at least a jury could go until the 22nd. I just 10 want to be safe. If she is one of the jurors, the fact 11 that. --12 MR. COHEN: We defer to the State, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: You'll have to make up your mind when 14 we call them all up. 15 (Counsel returned to trial tables and the following 16 ensued.) 17 THE COURT: Juror number 121, you are excused from 18 service, sir. We would ask you please return to the jury 19 lounge and give them your number. And, sir, would you tell 2.0 them about that condition, please. 21 JUROR NO. 121: Yes. 22 Thank you. Okay. THE COURT: 23 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen, when I 24 call your number, please stand and answer by saying "here" 25 and approach the railing. The next time I call your number,

please raise your hand to be identified. If you are 1 2 selected, please have a seat in the jury box. If you are 3 challenged, please have a seat in the courtroom. 4 (Jurors indicate difficulty hearing.) 5 THE COURT: Would you repeat that whole thing 6 again. 7 THE DEPUTY CLERK: When I call your number, please 8 stand and answer by saying "here" and approach the railing. 9 The next time I call your number, please raise your hand to 10 be identified. If you are selected, please have a seat in 11 the jury box. If you are challenged, please have a seat in 12 the courtroom. 13 THE COURT: If you are challenged, please take a 14 seat in the back row of the back aisle on the left part of 15 this room. If you're challenged, which means if you are 16 challenged by one side or the other, just return to the back 17 row, if you wouldn't mind. That way we can keep track of 18 things. Thank you. 19 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 2. 2.0 JUROR NO. 2: Here. 21 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 3. 22 JUROR NO. 3: Here. 23 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 4. 2.4 JUROR NO. 4: Here. 25 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 6.

1	JUROR NO. 6: Here.
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 14.
3	JUROR NO. 14: Here.
4	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 16.
5	JUROR NO. 16: Here.
6	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 17.
7	JUROR NO. 17: Here.
8	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 18.
9	JUROR NO. 18: Here.
10	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 19.
11	JUROR NO. 19: Here.
12	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 21.
13	JUROR NO. 21: Here.
14	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 22.
15	JUROR NO. 22: Here.
16	THE DEPUTY CLERK: And juror number 23.
17	JUROR NO. 23: Here.
18	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 2.
19	THE COURT: When your number is called now, would
20	you please raise your hand. Thank you. State.
21	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
22	MR. COHEN: Court's indulgence. Please seat.
23	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 3.
24	THE COURT: Defense.
25	MR. COHEN: Please seat.

1	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 4.
3	THE COURT: State.
4	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
5	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
6	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 6.
7	THE COURT: Defense.
8	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
9	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
10	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 14.
11	THE COURT: State.
12	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
13	MR. COHEN: Challenge.
14	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 16.
15	THE COURT: Defense.
16	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
17	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
18	THE COURT: That was number?
19	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Sixteen. Juror number 17.
20	THE COURT: State.
21	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
22	MR. COHEN: Challenge.
23	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 18.
24	THE COURT: Defense.
25	MR. COHEN: Please seat.

1	MR. WRIGHT: Court's indulgence. Please seat.
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 19.
3	THE COURT: State.
4	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
5	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
6	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 21.
7	THE COURT: Defense.
8	MR. COHEN: Challenge.
9	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 22.
10	THE COURT: State.
11	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
12	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
13	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 23.
14	THE COURT: Defense.
15	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
16	MR. WRIGHT: Please thank and excuse.
17	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the
18	jury, again, as we call your number, please answer by saying
19	"here" for the record and approach the railing.
20	Juror number 25.
21	JUROR NO. 25: Here.
22	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 27.
23	JUROR NO. 27: Here.
24	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 32.
25	JUROR NO. 32: Here.

1	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 33.
2	JUROR NO. 33: Here.
3	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 37.
4	JUROR NO. 37: Here.
5	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 38.
6	JUROR NO. 38: Here.
7	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 40.
8	JUROR NO. 40: Here.
9	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 41.
10	JUROR NO. 41: Here.
11	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 44.
12	JUROR NO. 44: Here.
13	THE DEPUTY CLERK: As I call your number this time,
14	please raise your hand to be identified. If sworn, please
15	have a seat in the jury box. If challenged, please have a
16	seat in the courtroom in the back row.
17	Juror number 25.
18	THE COURT: State.
19	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
20	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
21	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 27.
22	THE COURT: Defense.
23	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
24	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
25	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 32.

1	THE COURT: State.
2	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
3	MR. COHEN: Please excuse.
4	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 33.
5	THE COURT: Defense.
6	MR. COHEN: Please excuse.
7	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 37.
8	THE COURT: State.
9	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
10	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
11	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 38.
12	THE COURT: Defense.
13	MR. COHEN: Please excuse.
14	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 40.
15	THE COURT: State.
16	MR. WRIGHT: Court's indulgence. Please seat.
17	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
18	THE COURT: Is the State satisfied with the jury as
19	comprised?
20	MR. MOOMAU: Court's indulgence, please.
21	MR. WRIGHT: Court's indulgence.
22	MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, if we may strike juror
23	number 18.
24	THE COURT: Eighteen?
25	MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor.

```
THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 41.
 1
 2.
               THE COURT:
                          Defense.
 3
               MR. COHEN:
                          Please excuse.
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 44.
 4
 5
               THE COURT:
                          State.
 6
               MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
 7
               MR. COHEN: Please seat.
 8
               MR. WRIGHT: Can we call six more numbers?
 9
               THE COURT:
                          Well, we're going to have to wait a
10
              Is the defense satisfied with the jury as comprised?
11
               MR. COHEN: One moment, please. Your Honor, may we
12
     approach for a moment?
13
               THE COURT: Certainly.
14
               (Counsel approached the bench and the following
15
               ensued.)
16
               MR. STARR:
                          I'm sorry, Judge. I just -- I wasn't
17
     looking at one point and I got a little confused. I'm just
18
     trying to figure out who is it that is in seat number 6,
19
     because I got confused at that point. Second to the right,
2.0
     in front. She's the older African-American woman with the
21
     black jacket on.
22
               THE COURT: She's the one that has arthritis.
23
     it's the lady with the black jacket on and the maroon shirt,
2.4
     she's the one that has arthritis. That is juror number 19.
25
               MR. COHEN: Your Honor, just two questions.
```

alternate strikes, it would start once we're okay with the 1 2 jurors in the box? 3 THE COURT: Depending on what he's going to do, yes. If both sides agree to the 12 and are satisfied, then 4 5 it would start the same thing. You would have two challenges 6 to call each alternate up -- I mean, we'd call a number of 7 jurors up, but then, again, it starts with the State. They 8 would have an opportunity to swear or seat, and then it would switch to you. 9 10 The only difference is they only get one challenge; 11 you get two for each specific alternate. They don't carry 12 over. 13 And, yes, we'll be alternating back and forth, just 14 like we've done it on this main setting. 15 MR. COHEN: Okay, I understand. 16 (Counsel returned to trial tables and the following 17 ensued.) 18 MR. COHEN: Your Honor, the defense is fine with 19 the jury as seated. 20 MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, we still have another 21 strike remaining. Juror number 40. 22 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen, again, as 23 I call your number, please answer by saying "here" and 24 approach the railing. 25 Juror number 48.

1	TIDOD NO. 40. II.
1	JUROR NO. 48: Here.
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 49.
3	JUROR NO. 49: Here.
4	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 50.
5	JUROR NO. 50: Here.
6	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 51.
7	JUROR NO. 51: Here.
8	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 52.
9	JUROR NO. 52: Here.
10	THE DEPUTY CLERK: And juror number 53.
11	JUROR NO. 53: Here.
12	THE DEPUTY CLERK: The next time that your number
13	is called, please raise your hand to be identified. If you
14	are selected, please have a seat in the jury box. If you are
15	challenged, please have a seat in the back of the courtroom.
16	Juror number 48.
17	THE COURT: State.
18	MR. WRIGHT: Please excuse.
19	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 49.
20	THE COURT: Defense.
21	MR. COHEN: Please excuse.
22	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 50.
23	THE COURT: State.
24	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
25	MR. COHEN: Please seat.

```
THE COURT: Is the State satisfied with the jury as
 1
 2
     comprised?
 3
               MR. WRIGHT: Court's brief indulgence. The State
 4
     is satisfied.
 5
               THE COURT: Is the defense satisfied with the jury
 6
     as comprised?
 7
               MR. COHEN: The defense is satisfied, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: We will now proceed to the alternates.
 9
     The challenges, beginning with the State, will be one for the
10
     State, two for the defense, for each.
11
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Number 51.
12
               THE COURT: State.
13
               MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, if we can call about six
14
     more numbers --
15
               THE COURT: We're not doing that now. We're
     proceeding right now as we are.
16
17
               MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
18
               MR. COHEN: Please seat.
19
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 52.
2.0
               THE COURT: Defense.
21
               MR. COHEN: Please excuse.
22
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror number 53.
23
               THE COURT: State.
2.4
               MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
25
               MR. COHEN: Please seat.
```

```
THE COURT: Is the State satisfied with alternate
 1
 2.
     number 1?
 3
               MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Is the defense satisfied with alternate
 4
 5
     number 1?
 6
               MR. COHEN: Yes, Your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Then we'll proceed to alternate number
 8
     2.
 9
               MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, I may be mistaken. I
10
     believe we just did alternate number 2.
11
               THE COURT: Okay. Are both sides satisfied with
12
     alternate number 1 and alternate number 2?
13
               MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor.
14
               MR. COHEN: Yes, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: Okay.
16
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: As I call your number, please
17
     approach the railing. Number 55.
18
               JUROR NO. 55: Here.
19
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Number 57.
2.0
               JUROR NO. 57: Here.
21
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Number 59.
22
               JUROR NO. 59: Here.
23
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Number 63.
24
               JUROR NO. 63: Here.
25
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: And number 66.
```

1	JUROR NO. 66: Here.
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Number 55.
3	THE COURT: Defense.
4	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
5	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
6	THE COURT: Is the State satisfied with alternate
7	number 3?
8	MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Is the defense satisfied with alternate
10	number 3?
11	MR. COHEN: Yes, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Proceed to alternate number 4.
13	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Number 57.
14	THE COURT: State.
15	MR. WRIGHT: Please excuse.
16	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Number 59.
17	THE COURT: Defense.
18	MR. COHEN: Please seat.
19	MR. WRIGHT: Please seat.
20	THE COURT: Is the defense satisfied with alternate
21	number 4?
22	MR. COHEN: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Is the State satisfied with alternate
24	number 4?
25	MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor.

```
THE COURT: We have a jury. Ladies and gentlemen,
 1
     those of who you who were not selected, we want to thank you
 2
 3
     very much. You spent two day with a great deal of patience.
 4
     We really appreciate it. As you can see, we have a very
 5
     deliberative process which is very important to the
 6
     proceedings, and we thank you all very much.
 7
               If you would please return to jurors' lounge. I
 8
     don't believe they have any more work for you, but I don't
 9
     know that to be the case.
10
               Would you gentlemen like to approach the bench for
11
     a moment?
12
               (Counsel approached the bench and the following
13
               ensued.)
14
               THE COURT: Just administrative matters. My
15
     understanding is that you do not want to start until
16
     tomorrow; is that correct?
17
               MR. COHEN: Correct.
18
               MR. MOOMAU: Yes.
19
               THE COURT: I'm not going to swear the jury now,
20
     just out of an abundance of caution.
21
               MR. MOOMAU:
                            I agree.
22
                           I'm going to excuse them to go home for
               THE COURT:
23
     the day. What time do you believe would be best to have them
24
     here in the morning? If I tell them to get here by 8:30,
25
     then we can proceed at nine. Is that reasonable?
```

```
That's fine, Your Honor.
 1
               MR. COHEN:
 2
               MR. MOOMAU: That's fine.
 3
               THE COURT: Are there any matters that we can do
 4
     today?
 5
               MR. MOOMAU: Oh, yes.
 6
               THE COURT: What would they be?
 7
               MR. MOOMAU: We're going to deal with the issue of
 8
     Robert White and the registration. I told him to come here
 9
     at two o'clock.
10
               THE COURT:
                           That's okay.
11
                            There's going to be some other
               MR. MOOMAU:
12
     outstanding motions.
13
               MR. COHEN: The toxicology report is one --
14
               THE COURT: Well, I don't think I can make a
15
     determination unless I hear something about some testimony
16
     about what's -- I mean, all I have is your motions. You're
17
     asking it to be excluded because of the fact, I quess, a
18
     chain of custody; is that correct? And you're asking for it
19
     to be excluded because you don't believe it's relevant to
2.0
     some extent.
21
               MR. MOOMAU: Well, not really that. I made a
22
     motion that it be excluded just simply because of the
23
     language that's written on it. Now, I have to admit -- maybe
2.4
     we want to wait and talk about this outside the presence of
25
     the jury?
```

THE COURT: Okay. I'll excuse them then.

(Counsel returned to trial tables and the following ensued.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, because of some administrative matters that we have to take care of prior to you actually hearing any testimony, it probably will take us the rest of the day to accomplish that purpose. So we felt that your time would be wasted here this afternoon, and we are going to excuse you for the rest of the day.

We are going to ask you to return tomorrow morning by 8:30, at which time we are going to proceed with the trial. We felt uncomfortable about keeping you here, away from your homes and other matters, while we dealt with these issues.

So I have to admonish you, once again, that you are not permitted to speak to anybody, under any circumstances, about this case, any of the questions that we may have asked you at the bench, any of your responses.

And for those of you who indicated to us that you heard some accounts of this matter through any of the news media, you're not permitted to speak to any anyone about what you may have heard. You're not to speak to each other about anything that you may have heard. You're not permitted to expose yourself, hear any television, radio accounts of

anything about this trial, as well as the print media, 1 newspapers, etc. You cannot expose yourself to any of that 2 3 content, understanding you're not permitted to conduct any of 4 your own independent investigation by driving to the location 5 of where the incident is alleged to have taken place. You 6 are not permitted to go on the internet to associate or make 7 yourself aware of any issue relating to this case whatsoever, 8 in any form or any fashion. 9 We're asking you to do that out of an abundance of 10 caution, for the best purposes of everyone during the course 11 of this trial, as you can well imagine. 12 Given those admonitions, we thank you very much for 13 your participation up to this point. 14 Now, Sheila, we had a problem this morning. Where 15 are they supposed to report at 8:30 in the morning? 16 The main jury lounge. THE BAILIFF: 17 THE COURT: We are contacting the main jury lounge. 18 I know they sent you into the courtroom today. That's not 19 going to happen tomorrow. You need to report to the main 20 jury lounge by 8:30, and then they will do what they do every 21 morning and make you as comfortable as they possibly can, and 22 we will have you in this courtroom as promptly as we possibly 23 can shortly thereafter. 24 Thank you very much.

(The jury retired at 11:50 a.m.)

25

MOTIONS IN LIMINE

THE COURT: What issues do we need to address that we can begin this afternoon?

MR. STARR: Your Honor, we were talking about the issue of the toxicology report while we were at the bench and the State's motion to exclude it. Now, as I understand it, the State does not contest that the toxicology of Robert White is relevant.

When he was taken to the hospital after the shooting, he was given a urine screening and it was positive for cocaine. We want to admit that, Your Honor. The State's only basis is that there is some stock language on the report that says that the hospital is not intending it to be used in court.

But the treating physician, who is going to testify for the State, Dr. Khan, has indicated that it's a medically reliable test, it was germane to Mr. White's medical treatment, and that it was relied on, and that that's the type of report that the hospital relies on in treating patients.

In addition to the clear factual relevance of whether or not there was cocaine in this man's system --

THE COURT: What is the clear factual relevance that you're alleging?

MR. STARR: The factual relevance we allege, Your

Honor, is that there was cocaine, based on what this test says, in Robert White's system at the time of the incident.

That, Your Honor, goes to several different things.

One, his behavior, whether his behavior would have been influenced by cocaine; whether, Your Honor, he was able to accurately perceive and recall the events, given that there was cocaine in his system; and, Your Honor, the additional issue that we raised in our motion is that, when confronted with the positive cocaine test in the grand jury or when asked about whether he had used cocaine, Mr. White said that he hadn't used cocaine and, indeed, denied that he has ever used it in his life, which we think is inconsistent with the test and is a false statement in the grand jury.

THE COURT: Mr. State's Attorney.

MR. MOOMAU: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, I did concede that it was medically germane. I informed defense counsel about that and I talked to Dr. Khan about that. He did say, in this particular case, they would have done whatever they were going to do at the hospital anyway because of the condition he was in when he was brought in there.

My objection, however, Your Honor, was that there was no follow-up confirmation test done. That's the words that are written on top of the actual test, it's not for legal purposes, and because of chain of custody and because it wasn't confirmed. I don't see how we can rely on it if it

says, on its face, that it can't be used for legal purposes.

Also, the testimony would be -- and I think the defense put it in one of their memos -- is that the test would show use within two to three days of January 24th. There's really no testimony or no evidence, medical or otherwise, that he was using at that particular time on the 24th; particularly, that he was under the influence when this incident took place.

THE COURT: Well, let's separate the two for a moment. What is your argument with respect to the grand jury testimony of Mr. White relating to his use or lack of use of cocaine as an issue of credibility?

MR. MOOMAU: Mr. White said and he still says that he didn't use cocaine.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOOMAU: The test found — the screening test showed there was cocaine in his system. However, going with my first argument about whether it's reliable, whether it can be used for legal purposes, I don't think it's a reliable measurement and, for that reason, shouldn't be allowed in this legal proceeding.

THE COURT: Now, this toxicology report, as I understand it, and correct me if I'm wrong, was relied upon by state doctors in giving their treatment or renditions of their treatment to the State, correct?

1 MR. MOOMAU: Well, to the patient.

THE COURT: Is that document going to be used in any way to form any opinions of the doctors that you intend to call?

MR. MOOMAU: None.

MR. STARR: Actually, Your Honor, the toxicology report is contained in the same medical records that the doctor is going to rely on. He relied on the medical records, that we received from the State that contain these toxicology reports, when he was testifying about Brandon Clark at the last hearing at which he did testify, and the State has stipulated to the authenticity of those records. The authenticity is not in dispute.

So the records are authentic, the test is medically germane, it's relied on by the doctor, and the doctor says it's reliable.

In response to Mr. Moomau's argument about the facts of the case and the window of two to three days, first of all, that doesn't address the credibility issue because he says in the grand jury he's never used cocaine, ever. That is clearly inconsistent with the test.

The other issue, Your Honor, is that we do have a witness who was turned over, I presume as a Brady witness, who was a prior customer on the route of Mr. White and Mr. Clark that day. When he was interviewed by the State, he

said that he believed Mr. White was behaving as though he was intoxicated or high.

MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, we did turn that information over. We are going to be making a motion in limine for that opinion.

I think that witness needs to testify outside of the jury, first, before it can be found whether there's an adequate foundation for him to state that the person was high, that he was on drugs or intoxicated. The statement says he was just staring. He wasn't stumbling; he wasn't threatening; he was just staring.

But we can settle that with an in-camera hearing. We would like the Court to hear that before that evidence would even get to the jury and before the defense can even mention that to the jury.

MR. STARR: Our position, Your Honor, is that intoxication is an admissible lay opinion based on someone who had contact with the person and observed him.

MR. MOOMAU: Maybe intoxication. Perhaps. I'm not even conceding that, because we have some cases on it.

However, drug use is not, we don't believe. They have to lay a foundation for that.

THE COURT: Well, foundation would have to be laid before there is any testimony on whether it's alcohol and/or controlled dangerous substances and whether somebody would be

able to render that opinion as a lay witness. So I agree to that extent.

What would be issue number two that you wish to proceed on this afternoon?

MR. MOOMAU: Well, I'm not sure what order we will proceed. There is an issue about Robert White and the registration. We need to resolve that. I instructed him to be here at two o'clock. We might be able to get him here a little earlier.

THE COURT: What else can we do today?

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, the remaining outstanding motions had to do with our motion to exclude a live photo of the decedent, and there was a motion made to exclude hearsay. The State had enumerated —

THE COURT: Well, that I'm not going to be able to do until I hear testimony and foundations for that. And that will probably have to be done out of the presence of the jury at some point, but I don't think we're close to it today.

MR. STARR: And there was an issue that we wanted to raise with the Court that we've discussed. We made a motion that the Court -- and I don't think this was a subject of a written opinion, but I recall the Court stating that -- I'm talking about the motion regarding Robert White's grand jury testimony, and we filed a motion saying there were two false statements, provably false statements that he had made

in the grand jury.

One was when he said his prior sexual conviction was an attempt rather than an assault with intent to --

THE COURT: I believe I did address that.

MR. STARR: I think you have addressed it. I'm raising an issue that pertains to it, a tangential issue.

The others had to deal with -- and I believe the Court said this is what we were entitled to use. The fact that Mr. White did not state his first degree burglary conviction, and then was asked whether he had stated them all, and he had -- and that one had not been stated. The Court had indicated that we would be allowed to present that.

What I want to make the Court aware of, because we've made vigorous efforts in this case to not say or do anything explosive in front of the jury that is going to surprise the Court, in the questioning that is the subject of that particular area of impeachment, he is asked, Mr. White is asked to list or — some of it is leading but, basically, a list of his prior convictions is stated, and the false statement is that he didn't include the conviction — one of the convictions the Court deemed admissible, the first degree burglary from 1995.

On that list is his conviction -- or the sex conviction is discussed. So it's discussed in that portion of the grand jury testimony that we understand the Court to

have deemed admissible. 1 2 THE COURT: To have deemed? 3 MR. STARR: Admissible as relative to his 4 credibility because its indicative of prior false statement 5 in the grand jury. 6 THE COURT: I did not rule -- no, my ruling was 7 that the burglary false statement was admissible but not 8 the --9 MR. STARR: Yes, that's what I'm saying. 10 burglary false statement arises through omission. 11 it happens this way: His prior convictions are listed 12 without the burglary, and then he testifies under oath that 13 that list is exhaustive. Not using that language, but one 14 way or another he testifies that that's an exhaustive list. 15 On the list are his priors, which include the sexual 16 conviction. 17 So I want to bring that to the Court's attention 18 because I want to have leave in advance to state what was 19 stated in the grand jury, which is the list of the 2.0 convictions that he does have. 21 THE COURT: About his prior record? 22 MR. STARR: Correct. 23 THE COURT: I'm not quite sure I understand what 24 you mean by that, because I've already made rulings on all of 25 his prior convictions of whether or not they are admissible

and gave you a definitive list of those convictions that I found to be admissible and a definitive list of those convictions I didn't find to be admissible as lacking relevance to the issue of credibility.

2.0

MR. STARR: I agree with that. For purposes of impeachment of credibility with prior conviction, I understand the Court's stated three convictions that are admissible. I'm not asking the Court to revisit that ruling.

THE COURT: What possible setting are you putting before me about having leave to read the entire list given to the grand jury?

MR. STARR: Because it is the subject of the false testimony that I understand the Court — or that the Court indicated we are allowed to elicit. The testimony is a list of his convictions. That's what it is.

We wouldn't object, obviously, to a jury instruction saying that that's the only way in which they could consider it, but it's separate and apart from the previous ruling about the prior convictions that are relevant to impeachment.

This is relevant only to the issue of the false statement made in the grand jury, where, through omission, he represented that he did not have this first degree burglary conviction, and that is what the Court has indicated we would be allowed to elicit.

```
I'm just talking about, mechanically, it happens in
 1
 2
     the grand jury through a list of his prior convictions.
 3
     is affirmatively omitted, and then that omission is the
 4
     subject of the false testimony, and the Court granted that
 5
     portion of our motion.
 6
               THE COURT: So I guess, as I understand it, you
 7
     wish to prove your point in front of the jury by showing them
 8
     a complete list because of the omission of the burglary part.
 9
     Is my understanding correct?
10
               MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
11
               MR. STARR: Correct.
12
               THE COURT: And that would be your only purpose?
13
                                     This is only dealing with
               MR. STARR: Correct.
14
     that one motion. Now, I'm not going back to the other motion
15
     on which the Court has ruled.
               MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, the State opposes that.
16
17
     First, the burglary conviction, Mr. Wright never asked him
18
     about that from the grand jury. That was left out.
19
     didn't have a complete --
2.0
               THE COURT: I understand that part.
21
               MR. MOOMAU: And that's admissible.
22
               THE COURT: I'm asking you to address the part
23
     about the list.
               MR. MOOMAU: The list includes offenses he wasn't
24
25
     even convicted of.
```

THE COURT: I'm just asking you to address the issue.

MR. MOOMAU: We object to the list, Your Honor. It doesn't go to his credibility. Because he left the one out, that should be the only one he should be limited to, and he wasn't even asked about that by the state's attorney who was doing the questioning.

THE COURT: Well, I can rule on that one. As I understand it, my written opinion related to the entire breadth of his criminal convictions, and it excluded a number based on what I believed to be some remote in time, under the Maryland statute, for being relevant to the issue of credibility; others because I didn't believe -- and they are fully delineated in the opinion -- that I did not believe to be relevant to the issue of credibility because they lacked that onus of stealth or deceit or covert activity and were purely violent, which our courts have said, for the most part, are not relevant to the issue of credibility; and others that were, as I outlined, admissible as to the issue of relevance, and that was a grand larceny, grand receiving, burglary, if I recall, and there may have been one other that I don't recall, because I don't have that before me.

And I agreed with the defense that, as a result of the grand jury testimony that Mr. White provided and that the questions he was asked as a result, that he omitted on a general question to him, "is that all you have been convicted of," burglary. Because of that, I believe that's relevant to the issue of credibility of his testimony in terms of the grand jury testimony provided.

But I don't believe that list — and I don't know of any list — that you're referring to in front of the grand jury would in any way be — well, I believe that that would certainly be highly prejudicial, after my earlier rulings, and would outweigh any probative benefit of it because I excluded the second crime that you're referring to as a result of the interpretation of the comments between the assistant state's attorney, who was handling the questioning in front of the grand jury, and Mr. White's responses, which I put specifically in that motion.

So if there's no other reason than what you're saying, then providing that list in support of or in addition to that which I'm permitting you to do, without any other legal theory behind it, I'm denying that.

MR. STARR: What I would say, Your Honor, just so our argument is clear and the record is clear, is that that detracts from any force that the impeachment by omission through the grand jury would have. To not be able to show what he said and what he omitted and from what it was omitted detracts from the force of that, and it forces us to contort the cross-examination in a way that prevents us from

effectively presenting something that the Court has deemed relevant to credibility.

THE COURT: I believe that I've provided you with the right to cross-examine as to the burglary in front of the grand jury and prevented you from addressing the other crime in front of the grand jury because of the way it was presented to Mr. White and the way his response to that question was.

He never denied being convicted of either a sexual or an attempted offense. He is not a lawyer, and he indicated on three separate occasions that he was, in fact, convicted of some form of sexual offense, but he had not the knowledge of exactly the terminology of what it was. And that's why I'm precluding you from using that as a false statement made to the grand jury.

And no list is going to be supportive of that or detrimental to that, that I can understand, and I believe that that would be used as a guise to get the entire list in that I have precluded a number of offenses from any jury having the opportunity to view.

MR. STARR: And what I would say, Judge, is that we would not, based on the Court's ruling, argue -- because the Court has said we can't -- that --

THE COURT: The law says you can't; not the Court.

MR. STARR: As interpreted by the Court.

1 THE COURT: Thank you. 2 MR. STARR: We would not be arguing that the false 3 statement, which we maintain it is a false statement, but we 4 understand the Court's ruling against us, where he said he 5 was convicted of an attempt rather than a sexual assault. 6 That is an entirely separate issue and we lost that. So we 7 would not make that argument. 8 And if I haven't said it, I would say to the Court 9 that if allowed to utilize the questions and answers, as they 10 were stated in the grand jury, that's all we want. We're not trying to spin it or anything. It's a false statement and it 11 12 is what it is. We just want to say what really was said to 13 the jury. 14 THE COURT: What do you mean when you refer to as a 15 list? 16 MR. STARR: I can present the Court with the 17 testimony. 18 I know the testimony. I've read the THE COURT: 19 transcript because you've permitted me to do that. A list of 20 what are you talking about? 21 MR. STARR: It happens like this --22 THE COURT: Are you talking about a list of 23 offenses that he provided by some form of written list? 24 MR. STARR: No, it's not a list. It's question and 25 answer, one question, one answer, repetitively, going

1 through --

2.0

THE COURT: So you wish to be able to provide, verbatim, that list of questions and answers?

MR. STARR: Yes, just what was said in the grand jury; that's all. We don't want to introduce -- and if I misled the Court, that's my fault. We're not trying to introduce a list. We just want to introduce what the actual questions and answers were in the grand jury so that we can show the omission. That's all I'm saying.

I raise it with the Court because the questions and answers reference some of the convictions that the Court made a separate ruling on.

THE COURT: Well, again, I believe that you have the right to cross-examine on the issue of any inconsistent statement, if it were to take place, using the grand jury transcript.

But for purposes of impeachment, you can only ask your question and receive an appropriate response. You're not able to recite, verbatim, the question and answer in front of the grand jury.

MR. STARR: That is the manner in which -- that's the truth of how the false statement came out, Your Honor. That's all we're trying to do.

THE COURT: Mr. Starr, you know how to impeach a witness; don't you?

MR. STARR: I believe so.

about the questions you need to ask -- and I know you do -to ask a question that is permissible as an impeachment
offense. And you find me a case that says -- and if you do,
I'd certainly consider it. You find me a specific case that
said you will be able to do what you are asking, in terms of
the kind of questions that you would ask with respect to an
impeachable offense.

Since that may be an issue, that's probably why I cannot resolve it without hearing testimony. So, again, that may be something that we're going to have to do outside the presence of the jury during the trial.

I've made a ruling in writing about what crimes you are able to ask in both contexts. It doesn't include a list of the questions. Show me a case where you're permitted to do that, and I'll read it.

What other outstanding issues?

MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, as far as the toxicology,
I never really got to respond to the last thing they said. I
did admit that the records were authentic. We have an
agreement as to that. They are certified and they are
authentic. That's part of it.

But as far as reliability and even whether it's medically germane, it's medically germane in general, but on

2	that particular night when they brought him in there, they
	were going to do what they could do to save his life, and
3	that really didn't have anything to do with it. That's it.
4	THE COURT: Well, let me think about it, look at it
5	again, and what time do you wish to proceed this afternoon?
6	MR. MOOMAU: Two o'clock.
7	THE COURT: Two o'clock is fine. Thank you.
8	(At 12:15 p.m. a luncheon recess was taken.)
9	-000-
10	AFTERNOON SESSION
11	2:00 p.m.
12	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Criminal trial 07-1446X, State
13	of Maryland versus Keith A. Washington.
14	MR. MOOMAU: Good afternoon, Your Honor. William
15	Moomau for the State.
16	MR. WRIGHT: Joseph Wright on behalf of the State.
17	MR. COHEN: Vincent H. Cohen, Jr., on behalf of
18	Keith Washington.
	NO OUNDD. And Minkers Commenters
19	MR. STARR: And Michael Starr for Mr. Washington.
19 20	Mr. Washington is present.
20	Mr. Washington is present.
20 21	Mr. Washington is present. THE COURT: Thank you. Are we ready to proceed?
20 21 22	Mr. Washington is present. THE COURT: Thank you. Are we ready to proceed? MOTIONS IN LIMINE (Continued)

1 THE COURT: Okay.

2.4

MR. WRIGHT: I have brought copies for Your Honor of the toxicology report, because I'm going to refer to it, if I may bring it to you. I also made copies for the defense.

What I have presented to Your Honor and defense, the first page is a copy of the toxicology report. The second page is a copy of Mr. White's testimony regarding the toxicology report. As to the medical records, the toxicology report, as far as the cocaine, the State has four essential arguments.

First, if you look at the toxicology report itself, it states that it is not for legal use. That is in the second paragraph, and I'll quote for the record: "Statement: This is a screening test which is not intended for legal purposes. No chain of custody has been documented. Confirmation has not been done by a second method."

On its face the report says it's not for legal use and, on its face, it says that confirmation is necessary. The State would compare this to preliminary breath tests taking in DUI's, DWI's, or even in terms of field tests that are utilized in drug cases. Without an actual test, this is not — this should not be for legal use, as the report states on its face.

The second argument the State has involves the fact

that we have no actual test. We have no test, no readings, 1 2 no findings of cocaine in the system. There is no result. 3 Argument number 3 deals with due process --4 THE COURT: What do you mean there is no result? 5 I.e., if there was an actual cocaine MR. WRIGHT: 6 test, we would have results of how much cocaine was in the 7 system; as to the blood, the dissemination in the blood, to 8 some type of milliliters. But there is no actual test. All 9 we have is a general, vanilla statement that cocaine may have 10 been found, and that this bald statement may not and does, in 11 fact, require confirmation. 12 THE COURT: What part of that report are you 13 looking at that tells you? 14 MR. WRIGHT: The report itself has, under it, PCP, 15 negative. And that's in the second paragraph, where it says 16 "urine TDM I." U PCP, negative; U Benzo -- I assume that 17 stands for some type of benzocaine -- negative; U cocaine, 18 positive; U Amphet -- which I assume means amphetamines --19 negative; U THC, which is referring to marijuana, negative; U 20 Opiates, negative; U Barb, which I assume stands for 21 barbiturates, negative; U Methadone, negative. And then it 22 says this is not for legal purposes; no chain of custody has 23 been documented. 24 That's what I'm dealing with, no chain of custody

has been documented; i.e., we do not know who took the test,

25

are there actual tests results, and confirmation has not been done by a second, i.e., parenthetical, which is not there, more reliable or reliable method itself.

THE COURT: Well, since I don't understand what this says, who does?

MR. WRIGHT: And that leads me to State's argument number 3, if I may, Your Honor. The victim has denied use, and that is on page 3 and 4 of this.

The State has no ability to further inquire as to the findings. The victim has said I do not have cocaine in my system, and it cannot be fought because there is no actual test for him to fight. There is no chain of custody to determine who took it, whether the test is accurate or not accurate. There is nothing. And that goes under due process for the State and the victim because he has said I do not know, I do not use cocaine, it is not in my system.

We've all seen quite a few reports. This report, which also falls under my next argument, is hearsay, hearsay which falls under no exception. This is not — it's just hearsay, and it's something that we cannot confirm, we cannot verify, there's no results. There's nothing here. There is no actual test.

THE COURT: Do I have the entire legible copy of this report?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, you do, Your Honor.

```
1
               THE COURT: When you were saying that there was
 2
     some notation of "U" to all of these things, what are you --
 3
               MR. WRIGHT: Say that again.
                          Did you say some of these indications
 4
               THE COURT:
 5
     were "U PCP"?
 6
               MR. WRIGHT: Yes. If you look on the first page,
 7
     the second paragraph, straight across, all of the different
 8
     drugs I mentioned have a "U" in front of them, the letter
 9
     "U." The State understands that means urine. It's called
10
     urine TDM I. I can approach and show you what I mean, if you
11
     wish.
12
               THE COURT: Well, that's okay. What about the
13
     indications beneath?
14
               MR. WRIGHT: Say that again.
15
               THE COURT: The representations beneath that
16
     horizontal line that runs perpendicular, what is that?
17
               MR. WRIGHT: Are you referring to the negatives,
18
     the words that say negative?
19
               THE COURT: Yes, because it has, apparently,
20
     similar listings for everything again, without -- I'm just
21
     asking you, what is that?
22
               MR. WRIGHT: I guess, Your Honor, we're both
23
     essentially looking at this document and guessing what does
24
     it mean because it is not an actual test. That's a part of
25
     the State's concern. I'm assuming you're talking about where
```

the words "negative" show up. 1 2 THE COURT: Yes. The State can only assume, without any 3 MR. WRIGHT: 4 chain of custody or actual test, that this means that they 5 checked for eight different controlled dangerous substances, 6 and they found seven of them negative. That's just an 7 assumption that we have to make in reading this; however, 8 that is not an assumption the State is comfortable relying 9 upon because we have no confirmation. 10 This is the full report. Of all the hospital 11 records submitted in this matter, this is the only page with 12 a disclaimer which says "not for legal use; confirmation is 13 necessary." 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 Those are the State's four main MR. WRIGHT: 16 arguments. 17 Thank you, Your Honor. First, I MR. STARR: 18 sincerely don't understand what the State is saying when they 19 say there is no test and there is no result. The man's urine 20 was tested for the presence of the drugs listed, and the 21 tests show that it was positive for cocaine. 22 Now, Mr. Wright says we don't know quantity. 23 is also inaccurate because we see a listing here of the cut 2.4 off values that are used to interpret the tests, meaning --25 THE COURT: The perpendicular underneath the --

MR. STARR: Correct, the list there. It says cocaine, cut off value, 300 nanograms per milliliter. If there is more than that, then you're positive. That's how the tests are done. So we do have a value, and we do have a test result that's clearly positive.

Also, what we have here is records — first of all, the State says it's not reliable, but their doctor says it is and that it was given during the course of his medical treatment. They're going to call this doctor, and he's going to testify from these records as an expert, and they're going to now ask the Court to pick and choose, well, he can rely on these parts of the records because they're reliable during the course of his medical treatment, but he can't rely on the other parts of the records that document his medical treatment.

The only reason this test was done is because this man was taken to the hospital after he was shot and they did this test and it reveals what it reveals. So we have a test that the doctors rely on, that they say is reliable, that it's contained in the medical records that we know are authentic, because the parties agree and stipulate they're authentic. It has a cut off value and it is positive. That's what it is.

There is no other way to characterize it then this man's urine tested positive for cocaine on January 24, 2007,

while he was being treated by the hospital, and the treating
physician says the test is reliable. That's where we are.

That's where we are.

2.0

So to say that because there's some language on the form, which, frankly, the doctor is already coming in.

And also, Your Honor, I should say that we've consulted with our own expert about this issue. He says the testimony is reliable. He's qualified to interpret the results, and he's familiar with this particular method of testing. He agrees with the State's doctor: It's a reliable test; it's a test that's relied on in the course of medical treatment by hospitals under these circumstances.

To say that, because this language is on the form, that we now have to pretend that it is something other than it is, I think, Your Honor, is taking us to a dangerous place. What I mean is this: The language that's printed on the form is only designed to prevent hospitals from being dragged in in every DUI or --

THE COURT: I'm not interested in what's printed on the form.

MR. STARR: Well, if the Court is not interested in that, then I think where we are is we have a reliable test that the State's doctor says is reliable. We know why it was given. It was given as part of the medical treatment. The defense expert agrees that it's a reliable test. It's in the

records that they agree to be authentic. We know that there's a cut off value. We know the circumstances under which it was administered. And it's part of the medical records that the State is going to rely on and that their expert witness is going to rely on during their case in chief at trial.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Your Honor. I guess counsel essentially read into the form as to the cut off values. That's one of the concerns the State has. When you look at the form, you have to take it on its face as to what it says. It does say cut off value 300 NG/ML. How can you read more into that statement? I guess what counsel is saying is, obviously, assumably, clearly, that means there was more in the system than the cut off value; however, we can not make that important leap of faith.

Number two, the doctor did not give the testimony.

And that's one of the things that the form also tells you.

The chain of custody has not been established.

With that, the State will submit.

MR. STARR: The only thing I say in response to that is that Dr. Khan's name is on the form as the admitting doctor and the doctor that ordered the test. So this is part of his medical treatment of this man and, frankly, that's not contested.

The reason that the State doesn't want the test to come in is because of what it says; it's positive.

MR. WRIGHT: I do have one other thing. I apologize.

THE COURT: That's alright.

MR. WRIGHT: There's an asterisk beside the word "POS," meaning positive. It is not clear why that asterisk is on the test.

When I look down there at the bottom of the form, it's a little unclear whether asterisk equals abnormal. I don't know if that's the same asterisk they're referring to or not because I really cannot read more into the test.

THE COURT: At this moment in time I have no testimony in front of me. I have legal argument in front of me. But it seems to me that there are two separate issues in this matter because the defense is asking for the admission of the toxicology report on two separate issues.

One, they believe that they have a right to cross-examine the witness as to his ability to perceive the events of the night in question, much like alcohol, similar situation would and could involve drugs. And there are a number of legal decisions indicating that that's an appropriate mechanism for cross-examination, if there is some eliciting of information that way, and they have a right to cross-examine upon that issue with respect to the witness's

ability to perceive the events in question.

They are also asking for the admissibility of the toxicology report for other uses because the victim, again, in the transcript before the grand jury, indicated that he did not use cocaine, period. And so they wish to have that available for their use and cross-examination, which is a separate issue, legally.

As to the first issue, and that is the ability to cross-examine a witness as to their opportunity to observe and the mechanisms they had at the time to observe, or whether they were able to make those observations based on alcohol or drugs, I believe that they properly can question the witness.

But, at the same time, if they intend to introduce or attempt to introduce the toxicology report, because the toxicology report, in and of itself, is meaningless as to the extent of the drug in an individual's system that may or may not impair their ability to perceive the events in question, they're going to need the testimony of a toxicologist to interpret that for us. Because it would not be relevant unless it would measure what it was in the system, and somebody would be able to provide that expert testimony of what that would actually mean for a jury in terms of that witness's ability to perceive the events.

However, the report, as I see it as to the second

legal question, and that is the ability to impeach, potentially, one's credibility as a result of a denial before a grand jury session that he used the drug in question, and since that report has been stipulated to as authenticated by the State, that, as to that issue, they would be able to use and that report should be admitted for that purpose on whether or not the defendant was being credible in his denial for the use or lack thereof of cocaine.

And the Court so rules.

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, what my co-counsel said -so there's no alarms or any things in front of the Court at
the last minute, I think it behooves us to bring up our
intent on bringing up the fact that Mr. White did deny using
cocaine. We intend to do that in our opening statement. We
wanted to alert the Court to that, given the Court's most
recent ruling.

MR. MOOMAU: I understand that, Your Honor. Just so I understand it, when they're questioning Mr. White, they could ask him, which I'm sure they will --

THE COURT: On their cross-examination as to his ability to perceive the events in question, if that's what your asking me?

MR. MOOMAU: Well, no. We're getting to the grand jury testimony. They could ask him, well, isn't it true that there was a toxicology test done at the hospital, and your

urine tested positive for cocaine. 1 2. THE COURT: Correct. 3 MR. MOOMAU: But, without expert testimony, the 4 report itself wouldn't come in. 5 THE COURT: No. I believe that that toxicology 6 report can come in on the issue of the denial of the victim 7 that he used cocaine. And we can look at the document and, 8 accordingly, make it a positive test without any other 9 amplification. 10 But they cannot use that document as an impeachment 11 tool for his ability to perceive without the expert testimony 12 of a toxicologist to tell the jury what the amount was in the 13 bloodstream and what effect that would have on a witness's 14 ability to perceive the events in question. 15 MR. MOOMAU: Understand. 16 MR. COHEN: Understood, Your Honor. 17 MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, at some point we may be 18 crafting an instruction to present to the Court as to the 19 weight or consideration to be given to that language in the 2.0 report because of that language on it. 21 THE COURT: Well, I'll consider anything that 22 anybody has by way of input for any instruction. 23 What's the next issue? 24 MR. MOOMAU: We have the issue involving Mr. White. 25 Can we approach on this?

THE COURT: Certainly. 1 2 (Counsel approached the bench and the following 3 ensued.) 4 MR. MOOMAU: He's here. Now, I don't know if you 5 want me to testify or -- because I am representing me, the 6 prosecutor, one of the prosecutors. The State hasn't made 7 him any offers. I've put that in memos. 8 Now, if I have to testify, I mean, I will, but I 9 don't know if that would be necessary unless they're willing 10 to accept that proffer. It's a two-part test, whether the 11 State has made and extended any offers and, two, whether or not he's expecting anything. 12 13 MR. STARR: I guess what I would say is this. 14 Mr. Moomau says -- and he's exactly right. The issue is --15 the bias issue is what's in the mind of the witness. 16 If an issue comes up during the examination of 17 Mr. White, where he says, well, Mr. Moomau said this or 18 didn't say this, we may have to find out what Mr. Moomau says 19 about it. I'm not saying that we would require sworn 20 testimony. We may be able to just accept his 21 representations, but I would want to see what it is before 22 committing. 23 MR. MOOMAU: Do you want me to wait outside? 24 MR. STARR: I mean, I think there is potential for 25 him to be a witness, but I'm trying to avoid that, if it can

be done. So as of right now, I can't say for certain that we
wouldn't get there.

MR. MOOMAU: I mean, I had a witness when I spoke to him, when I talked to him. That's one issue.

Another issue is if he is questioned about, in fact, whether or not he was registered in Maryland, this and that -- and that brings up another issue.

I'm not sure what he's being investigated for, if he is. I referred it on to the county officer that does that. So if he's investigating looking into that, and White is asked questions about whether he was, in fact, or wasn't registered, he has a fifth amendment privilege there.

To me, that isn't even an issue of this proceeding. The issue ought to be whether he is expecting anything.

MR. STARR: Well, I think, Your Honor, we were going to raise that issue with you, the fifth amendment privilege, as well.

Because what we have is his grand jury testimony, which is before the Court, and at some point we should probably just make it part of the record, since we've been referring to it so much, and we would move to do that. But he says three times in there that he had been working at this job for three weeks, and lists another job that he had worked at before he worked delivering furniture for Marlo, that we believe is also in Maryland.

We know what the statute says. We don't need testimony on that. It says 14 days, after you begin employment, you have to register or it's a misdemeanor and you can face three years in prison. We know that he's not registered, and we know that he's a registrant under the statute. So all the elements are met.

That leaves us in a position where I do think -- I agree with Mr. Moomau that it's prudent to bring a potential fifth amendment issue to the Court's attention.

MR. MOOMAU: I have no problem with his grand jury testimony. He did say he was working here three weeks, I think.

THE COURT: You want me to admit the grand jury transcript?

MR. MOOMAU: For that particular issue. But, really, Your Honor, it's not even an issue in this case because — that's not relevant to this particular issue because whether he committed the crime or not is not part of it; it's whether he is expecting anything.

MR. STARR: But, Your Honor, you know, we do -- our right to conduct a biassed cross-examination is not contingent solely on accepting everything that Mr. White says as true.

The situation that we're in is that what we know is all of the elements of the crime are met. We know that the

State has referred it to the investigating agency and that, if a decision is made to prosecute, it's going to be by the same state's attorney's office that is sponsoring his testimony. All of the elements of a biassed cross-examination are there.

The case law is very clear in Maryland, and we cite some of it in our pleading, that what's relevant is the state of mind of the witness, not necessarily whether there's an express agreement, and that there can be bias in the absence of an express agreement.

MR. MOOMAU: Say he was facing a charge, if he had an active charge right now, that's not automatically coming in. He has to be expecting some benefit or the Court has to make that finding. That's the Ebb case that I cited in my motion. When the State is not making an offer, and he doesn't expect anything, even if it was a pending charge, doesn't mean it comes in.

And in this particular case anyway, to think that his -- he's a victim. I mean, he's not a third party getting some deal. He's a shooting victim. He could file a lawsuit on this thing, which is going to come in as far as cross-examination. It's not like anyone is having to coax him to testify or even offering him anything, and that will be apparent from his testimony.

MR. STARR: That is entirely separate from whether

or not this incident uncovered an ongoing crime that he was committing in this state that falls under the jurisdiction of the state's attorney's office. It is entirely separate.

He may have other biases. I'm sure there is never a witness that testifies that's here for one reason and one reason alone, or there are often witnesses that are here for a number of different reasons, some of them competing.

But this issue is that the shooting brought to light the fact that he was working in this state for more than 14 days without registering. And that's what happened. I mean that's just true.

So where we are now is that there is an investigation and a decision, a decision as to whether or not the state's attorney's office is going to prosecute this man is pending at the time that he takes the witness stand in this case. Those are the facts.

So, you know, we can say that he may have some other reason or some other combination of reasons, but this exists as a bias. It exists, and every element of it is present before Mr. White gets on the witness stand in this hearing and after he gets on the witness stand in this hearing, no matter what he says. Because we are not stuck, Your Honor, with Mr. White's --

THE COURT: Hold up a minute. What do you mean no matter what he says? The issue is whether or not he believes

1	that he has some arrangement with the state's attorney's
2	office about whether he's going to be charged or not or
3	whether he has been told that he has such an arrangement, and
4	you base it on the credibility of witnesses and the
5	presentation of evidence, etc. So it's not regardless of
6	MR. STARR: I guess what I'm saying is this, and
7	I'll say it in response to the Court's comments. The issue
8	is not just whether he's been told that he has an arrangement
9	or whether there is a formal arrangement
10	THE COURT: Or whether he believes he can expect
11	some leniency on that in his own mind; is that not correct?
12	MR. STARR: Correct; whether, in his mind, he has
13	some expectation, some motive
14	THE COURT: Well, you're going to question him on
15	all that, correct, and that's what the ultimate issue is
16	going to be for me to determine, based on the testimony and
17	whatever evidence is presented, correct?
18	MR. STARR: I agree that you will make that
19	determination after the testimony. I'm not sure we
20	completely agree on how we view the issue. So I don't want
21	to be boxed in on the record on that.
22	THE COURT: I'm not trying to box you in. What do
23	you believe is the issue you wish me to determine?
24	MR. STARR: Whether or not we have a good faith
25	basis to conduct a biassed cross-examination.

THE COURT: About? 1 2 MR. STARR: About a potential motive to curry favor 3 with the State based on their awareness and the pending 4 investigation of a crime committed by him that has come to 5 light. 6 In front of the jury? THE COURT: 7 MR. STARR: Oh, yes, I want to do it in front of 8 the jury, yes. 9 THE COURT: I understand that. And if I were to 10 make a finding that I didn't believe that that was the 11 setting as I understood the testimony or his understanding of 12 it, what are you saying? Have I framed the issue correctly? 13 MR. STARR: I think the issue is framed correctly. 14 I guess, if the Court makes a factual finding he is not 15 biassed and, as a matter of fact, has no such expectation or 16 motive, then I agree that we lose. I agree with that. 17 MR. COHEN: Court's indulgence for one moment. 18 MR. STARR: And, Your Honor, just to make sure that 19 what I'm saying is exactly clear on the issue about which I 20 take issue with the Court. The issue is not to be determined 21 by whether Mr. White acknowledges a bias. The circumstances 22 are present that give us a good faith basis to infer a bias 23 and to present that to a jury for their consideration. 24 It is proper for him to answer the questions

however he wants, but the circumstances create a clear,

25

1 justified inference of a bias. If he says, no, that doesn't

2 | influence me at all, then that's for the jury to consider.

But that's not a question of admissibility; that's a question of weight.

THE COURT: But you're equating it to the issue of not registering, correct?

MR. STARR: Correct. Well, that's what the issue is. I didn't create it that way. Those are the facts of this man's background and the situation and what he said in the grand jury. We have not — that's just what it is. We haven't manufactured that. That's what's been presented to us as the true facts of the case.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, what he's saying is not the law in this state. Based on their argument, anytime somebody has a pending charge, then that can be used; that witness can be cross-examined on that pending charge, even if it bears no relation to the testimony that they don't expect anything and they're not being offered anything, and that's not the law. Just because they have what they say is a good faith basis to ask a question about, that's not the rule and that's not the standard. The standard is whether something has been offered and whether there is an expectation.

THE COURT: Well, I'll hear the testimony and --

MR. COHEN: Just so the record is clear, Your

```
Honor, the defense had put the fifth amendment issue on the
 1
 2
     record, correct?
 3
               THE COURT: You put the fifth amendment issue on
 4
     the record, and he should be advised of his fifth amendment
 5
     rights. Do you agree or not agree?
 6
                            I agree. I just don't think it's
               MR. MOOMAU:
 7
     relevant that he would be asked questions about whether he
 8
     was registered or not.
 9
               THE COURT: You don't.
10
               MR. MOOMAU:
                           No.
11
               THE COURT: Why?
               MR. MOOMAU: I mean, he wasn't. He was registered
12
13
     in D.C.; he was registered in South Carolina.
14
               THE COURT:
                          I understand that.
15
               MR. MOOMAU: Whether he committed this particular
16
     offense or not, I just don't see how that is relevant.
17
     like if somebody is charged with a particular crime and you
18
     have to have this same type of questioning, you don't go into
19
     the facts of that crime, whether they committed it. The
20
     question is whether they have any expectation as far as that
21
     particular matter.
22
               THE COURT: Well, how would you phrase it then?
23
     What is it you're saying they would have or would not have
2.4
     the ability to do with that?
25
               MR. MOOMAU: Go into facts of were you registered
```

here; how long were you here? That would be for some 1 2 charging authority or the investigating officer. 3 THE COURT: Is there a stipulation that he's not 4 registered in the State of Maryland? 5 MR. MOOMAU: Yes. He wasn't when this happened and 6 he was working here and he was --7 THE COURT: If the State is stipulating, for your 8 argument purposes, that he has not registered in the State of 9 Maryland, then I believe that then your question shouldn't 10 relate to whether or not he did because they're stipulating 11 that he did not, but you can elicit information from him 12 about the employment, how long, etc. 13 MR. MOOMAU: I mean, his residence was in D.C. 14 THE COURT: I'm just stating. 15 MR. STARR: So the one thing that the Court is 16 ruling that we're not going to ask him about, because it's 17 mooted by stipulation, is whether he actually registered in 18 Maryland. 19 THE COURT: Yes. 20 MR. MOOMAU: Because this isn't a trial on the --21 THE COURT: I'm not saying it is. I'm just looking 22 at the fifth amendment issue. 23 MR. STARR: I think we can only go so far in kind 24 of arguing Mr. White's fifth amendment rights. The Court is 25 going to handle that the way it's going to handle it.

```
THE COURT: I don't know what you mean.
 1
 2
               MR. STARR: I guess, as I understand the fifth
 3
     amendment issue, is whether he's going to be asked questions
     that could incriminate him.
 4
 5
               MR. COHEN: The answer is yes.
 6
               THE COURT: That could encompass more than just the
 7
     answer of whether he did or did not register.
 8
               MR. STARR: That's what we're saying.
 9
               THE COURT: Why don't you sit down with them and
10
     see if you can write a stipulation on this. We'll recess for
11
     that period.
12
               (A brief recess was taken.)
13
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Criminal trial 07-1664X, State
14
     of Maryland versus Keith Washington.
15
               MR. MOOMAU: William Moomau for the State, Your
16
     Honor.
17
               MR. WRIGHT: Joseph Wright on behalf of the State.
18
               MS. ZANZUCCHI: Raemarie Zanzucchi on behalf of the
19
     State.
20
               MR. COHEN: Vincent H. Cohen on behalf of
21
     Mr. Washington.
22
               MR. STARR: Michael Starr on behalf of
23
     Mr. Washington, who is present.
24
               MR. MOOMAU: As far as a stipulation, Your Honor, I
25
     don't know if we have a stipulation, but what the State is
```

willing to represent is that Mr. White was registered in the District of Columbia; he was not registered in Maryland; he resided in the District of Columbia; and he was working in Maryland as of January 24, 2007.

MR. STARR: Your Honor, we accept and we stipulate to those facts. They don't, however, resolve the issue of Mr. White's fifth amendment privilege, and our understanding of the State's position is that they will not stipulate to facts that would constitute the crime; specifically, the fact that was at issue, that we discussed stipulating to was whether he had worked in Maryland for more than 14 days. We know he said three times in the grand jury that he had. But that's why we don't have a stipulation that moots the fifth amendment issue.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STARR: These questions, questions such as whether he worked in Maryland for more than 14 days, are relevant to his bias and relevant to his expectations and why he would have them and how he would be motivated in giving his testimony in this case.

So I think where we are is that he still has a fifth amendment privilege, and he has to either waive it or assert it.

MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, my response to all that, as far as how deep the questioning can go, I refer the Court

to the Court of Appeals case Ebb versus State. It's cited in my memorandum there, 341 Md. 578, and it deals with this issue. Particularly, in that case questioning was done about a State's witness — I think there were actually three of them, dealing with pending charges that they had. It didn't go into the details of those charges; just whether or not the person was expecting a deal.

I object to any questioning about the details of any particular offense, the specifics of it, because that's not really what's at issue.

MR. STARR: Your Honor, we have case law to cite in response to that. Specifically, Your Honor, one of the cases is Ware versus State and we cited that, where a capital murder conviction was reversed. What was at issue was state witnesses pending motion for reconsideration of sentence in a separate court, in the absence of any formal agreement between the State and the witness. The cases are clear that a formal agreement is not required; that the issue is the state of mind of the witness and any expectation that the witness may have.

Your Honor, additionally, there's the Marshall case, which is 346 Md. 186 and 695 A 2nd 184. The cite of Ware is 702 A 2nd 699 and 348 Md. 19.

In the Marshall case, a conviction was reversed based on a denial of cross-examination in a similar instance,

a motive to curry favor with the State. The basis of the reversal was that the defense wasn't allowed to get into the actual details of the witness's bias and the witness's — there was expressed agreement in that case, agreement with the State. So the details do drive the bias —

THE COURT: Details of any agreement or any expectation, or lack thereof, of any leniency. Not details of what may or may not have taken place with regard to the pending allegations or crime, correct, as I understand that case?

MR. STARR: That's the holding of the case, Your Honor, but the details -- when I say that, I mean that it is the facts that would generate and speak to the strength of the bias.

So based on that authority and, particularly, the Ware case, Your Honor, in which there was no expressed agreement, we do think that the bias law requires that we be allowed to conduct a cross-examination and to talk about the basis of it so that it can have probative force.

THE COURT: Well, I don't agree with that part of it. What I believe is that you certainly have a right to inquire of Mr. White, based on a stipulation made by the State that, in fact, he had not registered in Maryland; he had registered in South Carolina and the District of Columbia; that he's a resident of the District of Columbia,

but he was working in Maryland; that given that stipulation, that you would have the ability to inquire of him whether there was any specificity of any agreement with he and the State of Maryland about that particular setting, or whether he had any expectation of leniency in any fashion as a result of that particular setting.

But I don't believe that that would permit you to go into specifically inquire of him the facts of any such omission, since it's being, essentially, stipulated to. I don't think there's a distinction between the probative force and not the probative force if, in fact, there has been no registration in Maryland.

So you're limited to facts surrounding his expectation or lack thereof or however you wish to phrase it in terms of any leniency or any specific expectations or formal expectations that he may have with the State of Maryland.

MR. STARR: I assume that that right to examine him includes the right to inquire about the fact that he had been working for more than 14 days in Maryland.

THE COURT: Is that stipulated to?

MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, no, that's not stipulated to. I don't see how I can stipulate that he did violate a law of this state. I stipulate that he was working in Maryland, he wasn't registered here and he was living in D.C.

MR. STARR: Well, it's odd because our only source, 1 2 as I understand it -- Mr. Moomau can correct me if I'm wrong, 3 but the source from which the State is drawing that 4 information is Mr. White's grand jury testimony where, in the 5 very same sentences, he says that he had been working in 6 Maryland for more than 14 days. 7 I can stipulate to what he's already MR. MOOMAU: 8 testified to. If you want to get that page of the transcript 9 and --10 THE COURT: And we'll have that -- well, the whole 11 transcript is going to be admitted for purposes of this 12 proceeding anyway, as requested by the defense. I'll admit 13 that transcript, and that will be part of the measure of 14 evidence in this case. 15 So, again, based on that, you're limited in your 16 inquiry to those areas that I mentioned factually. 17 MR. COHEN: Court's indulgence for a moment. 18 Your Honor, what is the Court's ruling MR. STARR: 19 with regard to Mr. White's fifth amendment privilege? 20 THE COURT: That there is no inquiry necessary into 21 that because you're not going to get into the facts of that 22 specific setting. The State has stipulated that he hasn't

registered in Maryland. His grand jury transcript indicates

working in Maryland, which is sufficient for your purposes,

what it does about the length of time that he had been

23

24

25

meaning the 14 days. 1 Therefore, your inquiry is restricted to what he 2 3 believes, if he does, any arrangement with the State of 4 Maryland as a result of that setting and/or what he believes 5 or doesn't believe with return of any leniency in any 6 fashion, as portrayed in the Ebb case. 7 MR. STARR: Your Honor, as to his intent or 8 knowledge regarding the 14 day requirement --9 THE COURT: Once again, meaning no disrespect. 10 not trying to cut you off. We do not have to go into his 11 intent if, in fact, the State has stipulated, as it has, and 12 if, in fact, they are stipulating to his grand jury testimony 13 about that length of time. 14 So for purposes of this hearing, in terms of what 15 you wish to do, that's assumed legally for the purposes of 16 this hearing. 17 MR. MOOMAU: We're ready to proceed. Mr. White is 18 here. He does have his attorney with him. I think his 19 attorney would have the right to be here, and maybe if 20 Mr. White -- I don't know how that interaction is going to 21 work, but I just wanted to let the Court know that. 22 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please state and spell your 23 first and last name for the record. 24 THE WITNESS: Robert White, R-o-b-e-r-t, W-h-i-t-e.

THE COURT: Mr. White, just take your time. You

25

may want to put your jacket down, sir. I think you have 1 2 something that is making a little noise for the microphone 3 there. If you wish to face forward, you can pull that 4 microphone over to the front, if you care to do that. 5 THE DEPUTY CLERK: That microphone doesn't work. 6 THE COURT: It doesn't work? Okay. 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. MOOMAU: 9 Good afternoon, Mr. White. Q. 10 Good afternoon. Α. 11 Mr. White, are you aware that there have been Q. 12 allegations made that you committed a crime back on January 13 24, 2007, and before and maybe even after, by not registering 14 as a sexual offender in the State of Maryland? 15 Α. Yes. At anytime have you asked anyone, a prosecuting 16 17 attorney, a police officer, or any law enforcement officer 18 that you not be charged with such a violation? 19 No. Α. 20 Has any prosecuting attorney, policeman or law Q. 21 enforcement officer told you or represented to you that you 22 would not be charged for such a violation of the law? 23 Α. No. 24 Has any prosecuting attorney, policeman or law Q. 25 enforcement officer made any promises to you at all that

relate in any way to your status being not registered as a sexual offender in the State of Maryland?

A. No, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Do you expect that because you're a witness in this case against Keith Washington, that because of any testimony you give in that case, you will not be charged with being in violation of the sexual offender registration statutes for the State of Maryland?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Do you believe or do you expect that, if you are charged with such a violation, you would receive some leniency in that case because you're testifying as a witness for the State in this particular case?
 - A. No, sir.
 - MR. MOOMAU: Court's indulgence, please.
- 16 THE COURT: Certainly.
- 17 BY MR. MOOMAU:
 - Q. Do you expect that somehow your testimony in this criminal action would somehow reflect favorably to your behalf in this investigation or any investigation as to whether or not you violated the sexual offender registry laws for the State of Maryland?
 - A. No, sir.
- 24 Q. Has anyone, not even a law enforcement officer, not 25 a member of the state's attorney or law enforcement officer,

police officer, has anyone told you, hey, you know, if you 1 2 testify against Keith Washington, you won't be investigated 3 or prosecuted or charged for violating the sexual registry 4 laws for the State of Maryland? 5 No, sir. Α. 6 MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, that's all the questions I 7 have on direct. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. STARR: 11 Now, Mr. White, you have been made aware that, Ο. 12 currently, there's an investigation going on about whether or 13 not you're going to be charged with a crime for not 14 registering as a sex offender in the State of Maryland, 15 correct? 16 Α. Correct. 17 And you have been made aware, Mr. White, that that 18 crime that you could be charged with carries a penalty of up 19 to three years in prison, correct? 2.0 Α. Correct. 21 And you would agree with me that you do not want to Ο. 22 be charged with that crime, correct? 23 MR. MOOMAU: Objection. 24 THE COURT: Sustained. 25 BY MR. STARR:

You do not want to serve those three years, 1 Ο. 2. correct? 3 MR. MOOMAU: Objection. 4 THE COURT: Sustained. 5 BY MR. STARR: 6 Now, Mr. White, you understand that if there's a 7 decision made to prosecute you, you could be prosecuted by 8 the state's attorney's office of Maryland for Prince George's 9 County, right? 10 MR. MOOMAU: Objection. 11 THE COURT: Overruled. 12 BY MR. STARR: 13 Do you understand that? Q. 14 Yes. Α. 15 And you understand that that's the same office that Q. 16 these three prosecutors, Mr. Moomau, Mr. Wright and 17 Ms. Zanzucchi work for, correct? 18 Correct. Α. 19 And you understand that that's the same office that 20 is calling you as a witness in the trial against Keith 21 Washington, correct? 22 Α. Correct. 23 Now, Mr. Moomau -- have you had any conversations 24 with Mr. Moomau about this investigation of you for not 25 registering as a sex offender?

No, sir. 1 Α. 2 Well, how were you made aware of it? Q. 3 Could you repeat that again? Α. 4 You testified already that you were aware that Ο. 5 there's an ongoing investigation of you, correct? 6 Α. Correct. 7 How were you made aware of that fact? Q. 8 Through the state's attorney's office. Α. 9 Who at the state's attorney's office told you that? Q. 10 Mr. Moomau. Α. 11 So you did have a conversation with Mr. Moomau Q. 12 about this investigation, correct? 13 Α. Correct. 14 During that conversation Mr. Moomau told you that Ο. 15 he had referred this issue of you not registering to some 16 authority for that person to investigate it, correct? 17 Α. No. 18 What did he tell you? Q. 19 He just said that there could be charges brought Α. 20 against me. 21 I'm sorry. It could be what? Ο. 22 There could be charges brought against me. Α. 23 Anything else? Q. 24 That's it. Α.

And during that conversation when Mr. Moomau told

25

Ο.

you charges could be brought against you, he told you what 1 they could be for, correct? 2. 3 Correct. Α. Now, you've testified that you understand that it 4 5 would be the state's attorney's office, Mr. Moomau's office, 6 that could prosecute you, if a decision was made to prosecute 7 you, right? You understand that, correct? 8 THE COURT: He's answered that question before. 9 MR. STARR: I'm just orienting him. 10 BY MR. STARR: 11 And you understand that the state's attorney's Ο. 12 office can make a decision to either prosecute you or not 13 prosecute you, correct? 14 MR. MOOMAU: Objection. 15 THE COURT: Want to approach the bench. (Counsel approached the bench and the following 16 17 ensued.) 18 THE COURT: He's answered that question too. Where 19 are you going? 20 MR. STARR: I just was going to ask him whether he 21 wants -- whether he understands that they can also make 22 determinations as to plea agreements and sentencing and those 23 things. I just was orienting him. I wasn't trying to trick 2.4 him. 25 THE COURT: Okay.

(Counsel returned to trial tables and the following 1 2. ensued.) 3 BY MR. STARR: 4 Now, Mr. White, understanding that if you are Ο. 5 prosecuted by the state's attorney's office, you also 6 understand that if a decision was made to charge you, the 7 state's attorney's office would be involved in things like 8 making plea offers, correct? 9 Α. Correct. 10 And you understand that they would be involved in 11 matters like making recommendations for what your sentence 12 would be if you were convicted, correct? 13 Α. Correct. 14 Now, you understand that, in this prosecution, the 15 state's attorney's office wants to see Mr. Washington found 16 quilty, correct? 17 MR. MOOMAU: Objection. 18 THE COURT: Sustained. You don't have to answer 19 that question, sir. 2.0 BY MR. STARR: 21 You understand, Mr. White, that if the state's Ο. 22 attorney's office is pleased with your testimony, that they 23 have the power to consider that when they're making the types 2.4 of decisions that we've talked about, like charging decisions 25 and plea decisions and sentencing recommendations.

MR. MOOMAU: Objection. 1 2 THE COURT: Approach the bench, please. 3 (Counsel approached the bench and the following 4 ensued.) 5 THE COURT: Mr. Starr, I'd appreciate it if you 6 think a little bit more about the questions you're asking in 7 terms of using things like being pleased. You can ask him 8 general questions about if he's aware of the power the 9 state's attorney has to make decisions concerning 10 recommendations, sentencing considerations, charging 11 considerations, but, please, be fair in the use of your 12 terminology and words. Ask him if he understands those 13 things. That would be fine and I'm not going to limit you on 14 that. 15 MR. STARR: I'm not arguing with the Court, but I 16 just want to say that I'm just asking him about his 17 expectation and what he understands the playing field to be. 18 THE COURT: I understand that and I think that's 19 proper cross-examination, but the wording of it, if the State 20 were pleased, I don't think you have to phrase it that way. 21 MR. COHEN: I suggest altering the language here at the bench so that he --22 23 That's all. You have a proper line of THE COURT: 24 examination. It's the terms I'm talking about. 25 MR. STARR: Then I'm going to propose a question so

we can agree on it, if that's okay, because I don't want to 1 2. run afoul of what the Court has ruled. 3 I would like to ask him whether he understands that if the State takes a favorable view of him --4 5 THE COURT: That's fine. MR. STARR: -- and that he understands that they 6 7 can consider his testimony in making that --8 THE COURT: That's fine. 9 (Counsel returned to trial tables and the following 10 ensued.) 11 BY MR. STARR: 12 You understand, Mr. White, that if the State takes Q. 13 a favorable view of you, they could consider that in making 14 decisions like whether you will be charged with a crime, 15 correct? 16 Α. Correct. 17 And you understand that if the State takes a 18 favorable view of you, if you were charged with a crime, they 19 could consider that in making decisions like whether you 20 would receive a certain plea agreement or whether they would 21 make a certain sentencing recommendation, correct? 22 Correct. Α. 23 And you understand, Mr. White, that in considering 24 whether or not they take a favorable view of you, the State 25 can consider how they feel about the testimony you provide in

Mr. Washington's trial, correct? 1 2. Α. They never talked about that. 3 Well, I didn't ask you what was talked about. 0. 4 vou understand that? 5 Yes, I understand. Α. So you understand that they can do that? 6 Q. 7 Yes. Α. And, in fact, Mr. White, it is your hope that the 8 Q. 9 State will view you favorably and not charge you with a 10 crime, correct? 11 Α. No. 12 Well, are you hoping not to be charged with this Q. 13 crime, for failing to register as a sex offender? 14 MR. MOOMAU: Objection. 15 THE COURT: Sustained. 16 MR. STARR: Can we approach? 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 (Counsel approached the bench and the following 19 ensued.) 20 MR. STARR: I sincerely don't know why that's not a 21 permissible line of questioning. 22 THE COURT: Well, what he hopes and your 23 questioning to him about what he expects, if anything, or 24 what the State may have offered him, if anything, don't 25 relate.

1 MR. STARR: I think what he hopes, given the
2 playing field that's already been established, which is that
3 there's a pending investigation --

THE COURT: What he hopes is not relevant to what he may or may not expect or to what the State may or may not have offered him. Those things you haven't approached. The question is does he expect leniency or has he been offered some benefit or leniency, not what his hope is, at least in this Court's view.

MR. STARR: I understand. I guess -- I hear what the Court has said. I think that the Court, as you stated, has to make a credibility determination about his testimony, and in order to explore the credibility issue, if I'm only allowed to ask kind of the ultimate conclusory questions, without --

THE COURT: That's not what I'm saying. I'm saying what he may hope doesn't appear to me to be relevant to the issues that we're deciding or presumably to decide.

MR. STARR: One moment. And this is what I'm saying, Your Honor, is my position. He has stated that he understands that the State can consider his testimony in making decisions about his fate in this context, whether he's prosecuted for this offense and how that prosecution goes thereafter, if it were to occur.

The other component of that, the other component of

bias is whether he wants that to happen. And it's not merely whether he's been told it's going to happen, but whether he's testifying with an expectation that it could happen or testifying with a goal of trying to bring that about. It's not just what has he been told. It's we know that he understands that his testimony could be considered by the State as they make decisions about him that, presumably, are important to him.

And the other half of it is whether he, in fact, wants that to be resolved favorably by the State.

THE COURT: Again, it's this Court's view, based on my reading of the cases, that it's what he expects, if he expects anything. Does he have an expectation of leniency for what he's doing, not what he hopes, not what he wants, and I don't believe what he hopes is the equal of what he expects, if anything.

MR. STARR: I understand what the Court is saying, and that may be what the Court ultimately has to assess.

What I'm saying is that, in a very common sense way, what he wants, his motivations, are linked to a credibility determination about whether he has an expectation.

THE COURT: Well, I think this is a very limited situation, and I'm going to permit you certain questions, but I think what he hopes is not related to the issue that we

have to decide. 1 2 I won't ask him about his hope again MR. STARR: 3 since the Court has ruled I can't do it. 4 I'm giving you the correct spelling of MR. COHEN: 5 my name, Your Honor. I think the Court used the name Victor 6 at one point. 7 THE COURT: Did I actually say that? I said Vincent; didn't I? 8 9 MR. COHEN: I thought I heard you say Victor at one 10 point. 11 I do know your name, and I apologize if THE COURT: 12 I said Victor. 13 MR. STARR: We're fine. 14 (Counsel returned to trial tables and the following 15 ensued.) 16 BY MR. STARR: 17 Mr. White, it is your expectation that if the State Q. 18 views your testimony, in a trial against Mr. Washington, 19 favorably, that they will consider that in the decisions they 2.0 make about whether or not to charge you with failing to 21 register in the State of Maryland as a sex offender, correct? 22 Α. I don't know. 23 And it is your expectation that if the State views 24 your testimony, in Mr. Washington's trial, favorably, and 25 they did decide, still, to prosecute you for failing to

1	register as a sex offender in Maryland, that they would
2	consider their favorable view of your testimony as to what
3	kind of plea offer you might receive and what kind of
4	sentencing recommendation they might make.
5	A. I don't know.
6	MR. MOOMAU: I would object to the form of the
7	question, Your Honor. It was compound.
8	THE COURT: Would you rephrase, please.
9	BY MR. STARR:
10	Q. It is your expectation, Mr. White, that if the
11	State views your testimony at Mr. Washington's trial as
12	favorable, that they might consider that when making
13	decisions, if you were prosecuted, about what kind of plea
14	offer you might receive.
15	A. I don't know.
16	Q. You're saying you do not know?
17	MR. MOOMAU: Object. Already answered.
18	THE COURT: He said he did not know.
19	BY MR. STARR:
20	Q. Well, I'm asking you what your expectation is. Are
21	you saying you do not know what your expectation is?
22	MR. MOOMAU: Objection.
23	THE COURT: Sustained. Rephrase the question,
24	please.
25	BY MR. STARR:

What are you saying you expect? 1 Ο. 2 Α. I don't know what they going to do. 3 My question to you is not what you know about what Q. 4 they're going to do, but what your expectation is. 5 The question is, is it your expectation that if the 6 State views your testimony in the trial of Mr. Washington 7 favorably, that they would consider that in deciding whether 8 or not you'll get prosecuted for failing to register as a sex offender? 9 10 Α. I don't know. 11 You don't know what your expectation is? Q. 12 No. Α. 13 Have you thought about that? Q. 14 No. Α. 15 Well, what do you think about that? Q. 16 MR. MOOMAU: Objection. 17 Sustained. Rephrase, please. THE COURT: 18 BY MR. STARR: 19 Do you want the State, if they view your testimony 20 favorably in Mr. Washington's trial, to consider that when 21 deciding whether or not to prosecute you for failing to 22 register as a sex offender? 23 MR. MOOMAU: Objection. 24 THE COURT: Sustained. 25 MR. STARR: No more questions.

MR. MOOMAU: No redirect, Your Honor. 1 2 Thank you, sir. You may step down. THE COURT: MR. MOOMAU: Can we approach, Your Honor? 3 4 THE COURT: Certainly. 5 (Counsel approached the bench and the following 6 ensued.) 7 MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, as far as the testimony 8 and what the State is going to submit about what his 9 expectation was, that's it -- or what his expectation is. 10 Now there's the other issue of what was offered, if 11 anything was offered to him on the State's side. He's given 12 testimony about that. I'm representing that I didn't make 13 any representations to him. 14 Now, I don't want to be caught in a crack with not 15 having to -- there being no record of the State saying or 16 testifying or introducing evidence that it has not made him 17 an offer. I have a witness that's going to say that, because 18 that particular person was there when I spoke to him about 19 that, or we can just accept my representation. 20 MR. STARR: It's not necessary to call a witness. 21 I'll accept Mr. Moomau's proffer that he hasn't made an 22 offer. 23 I would like a proffer, though, as to what 24 Mr. Moomau did say to Mr. White about this issue. 25 MR. MOOMAU: What I told Mr. White is basically

```
what he said on the stand, that there's been allegations made
 1
 2
     that he was in violation of the State of Maryland Sexual
 3
     Offender Registry statute; that whether or not he was in
 4
     violation, I'm not making any representations, no deals; he
 5
     might be charged with that and, if he is charged with that,
 6
     it's not tied at all to his testimony; that whatever happens
 7
     there, happens, and it's not tied to, connected to his
 8
     testimony in any way. And that's what I told, no benefit, no
 9
     promises, nothing.
10
               THE COURT: Okay. Is that sufficient?
11
               MR. STARR: Yes.
12
               MR. WRIGHT: Can we excuse Mr. White for the day?
               MR. STARR: That's fine.
13
14
               MR. COHEN: Will we be able to make arguments, Your
15
     Honor?
16
               THE COURT:
                           Yes.
17
               (Counsel returned to trial tables and the following
18
               ensued.)
19
               THE COURT: I think it is your motion.
20
               MR. STARR:
                           It is.
                                   Judge, I think that where we
21
     are is Mr. White has testified that he is aware that there
22
     can be prosecution of him in the issues being investigated,
23
     whether or not he violated the Maryland Sexual Offender
24
     Registration Act.
25
               The transcript that's been admitted by stipulation
```

indicates that Mr. White says in the grand jury three times that he had worked in Maryland for three weeks, and the transcript lists another place of employment, Indian Head Thrift, also located in Maryland.

The Court can take notice of the statute which contains the requirement that after one begins employment in Maryland, any sexual offender who is a registrant, which is a term of art, which would include Mr. White, that is someone who, by stipulation, we know is a registrant in South Carolina and Washington, D.C., that that person must register as a sex offender in Maryland, and we know that that did not happen with regard to Mr. White. So the elements of the offense are all present in the record.

And it's not just that the offense has been committed and demonstrated to the Court, but it's that Mr. White has testified that he's aware that the state's attorney's office could be the body to issue the prosecution in this case -- and the Court can take notice that they do have jurisdiction -- and that he understands, as he testified, that if the State takes a favorable view of his testimony in Mr. Washington's trial, that that could be considered by the State in making a decision as to whether or not they are going to prosecute him and certain decisions that are made thereafter when the prosecution is initiated.

Now, his answer, when he's asked what is his

expectation, is I don't know, and, frankly, Your Honor, that's not a credible answer. It's not credible that he does not know how he feels about this issue. It's not credible that he does not know whether he expects anything.

If his answer had been no, I have no expectation based on what I was told, then we would be in a very different place. But he doesn't say that. When you ask him, that's not what he says.

Frankly, I think that that takes that argument away from the State. Because if Mr. White had said that, I think that they would still have that argument, but they don't have that argument because that's not what he says. He says he doesn't know what his expectation is, which leaves us basically nowhere, based on that evasive answer, in trying to determine what the expectation is.

It's not a credible answer and, given the playing field, which is that we know the crime has occurred, we know that he knows he can be prosecuted by the State, and we know that he knows it can be to his benefit if the State views his testimony favorably, given that answer, I think, Your Honor, that that creates more than enough for the defense to have not just a good faith basis, but demonstrated a bias, at least enough to ask questions.

He can answer the questions however he wants at trial. He can say in front of the jury "I don't know what my

expectation is." That's fine; that's his right to do that.

But that's a credibility assessment for the jury about

whether or not Mr. White is telling the truth when he says he

doesn't know what his expectation is. He has not said that

he has no expectation. He clearly has not said that. He

says he doesn't know what his expectation is, and that is for

a jury to consider whether or not that is a truthful answer.

So all of the elements of him having a motive to curry favor with the State are present and in the record through stipulation, through the statute that the Court can take notice of, and there is testimony in the grand jury.

His answers to the questions here today, when he says he doesn't know what his expectation is, does nothing but give rise to the clear inference, the most reasonable inference is that he does have an expectation and he just doesn't want to say it. If he didn't have one, it would be very easy to say no, I don't have an expectation; I don't. I think those two things are wholly unrelated. I have no expectation. He can't say that. He doesn't say it.

That's why we brought him in here, to see if he would say that, and he doesn't say it. The fact that he doesn't say it, combined with everything else that I've referenced, creates a clear bias that, under the sixth amendment, the Maryland Declaration of Rights and the case law that we've cited, entitles Mr. Washington to conduct a

biassed cross-examination at trial and for the jury to consider the weight of this evidence.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Starr.

MR. MOOMAU: Your Honor, just to talk about the cases for a second, the Ebb case stands for the same proposition as here, no expectation. There was no expectation of benefit by that witness in the Ebb case.

There is none here.

The Ware case they cited, that was a case where the witness testified at trial -- I think that was a murder case. If I'm wrong about that, then I'm wrong, but it doesn't really matter. The state's witness testified at trial. That state's witness had a pending reconsideration. At that reconsideration, the prosecutor from the same office came and testified for him, and then the Court said, well, we're going to take the reconsideration under advisement until we see how you testify in the case you're supposed to testify at. And then the State didn't turn that over. It was Brady material.

That doesn't even come close to what we have here. Here you have a witness who is a crime victim, who was shot, who doesn't need, really, to be prodded or any motivation or have any expectation of benefit to come in here and testify.

But he has, under questioning today, told the defense, the State, as well as the Court, that he isn't expecting anything. He isn't expecting any leniency if he's

charged with violating the Maryland registry laws. He isn't expecting or doesn't have any thought that he would receive leniency in prosecution or penalty if he's convicted if it. It just hasn't been discussed. It hasn't been discussed; there's been no offers made to him.

Based on Ebb, Your Honor, there is nothing. There is no bias as far as this issue goes. The only bias is because the defense is arguing it, but there is none there.

Thank you.

MR. STARR: Your Honor, in response to that, I would say this. In the Ware case there was no expressed agreement. My understanding of the facts of the Ware case is not that the state's attorney went to the man's sentencing and said if you testify favorably, these things are going to happen, but the State had made it clear that there was no agreement, as the State makes it clear here, that they haven't extended an offer or made an agreement.

Now, Mr. Moomau says that Mr. White is a crime victim, and I understand that's debatable, but what he's essentially saying is, well, he has other motives, so the defense doesn't get to cross-examine him about this one. That's just not what the case law says.

He is the State's only eyewitness in this case. His credibility is the main issue at trial and, constitutionally, we are entitled to probe that credibility

for bias. And just because there's some other bias that may or may not arguably cancel out this one, it has nothing to do with the admissibility of this particular bias. There's no case that says that.

2.0

2.4

So the fact is he does not say that he has no expectation. He says he doesn't know what his expectation is. That's where we are. And he says that he knows that if the State takes a favorable view of his testimony, that can be to his benefit. That's all there is.

And now we're just left with -- basically, what the State is asking you to do is credit an answer to a question, one that Mr. White never gave, but credit it, when his credibility is at issue, and make this ruling based on it. I would say that the Court cannot do that.

THE COURT: Okay. The exact nature of your motion in this instance was a motion in limine concerning motion for permission to elicit, on cross-examination, Robert's White's failure to register as a sex offender in Maryland, that it be admissible as a motive to falsify testimony in order to curry favor with the State.

I've read the Ware case. I've read the Ebb case.

I've gone over other cases, as well, on this specific issue,

and I believe that, in this instance, the Ebb case is

dispositive.

My understanding of Mr. White's testimony and the

proffer made by the State at the bench, which was accepted by the defense, was that no offer whatsoever was made by the State to Mr. White in the instance of his failure to register as a sex offender in the State of Maryland.

I heard Mr. White's testimony, and what he did say was he did not know what the state's attorney's office was planning and that he had not thought about it, didn't know what to expect. To me, that is fairly clear that he was saying that, again, no offer was made to him by the State, and he had no expectation of what to think was going to happen or any expectation of leniency on behalf of anything that he did testify or otherwise in this case.

Secondarily, if you look in evaluating the probative value versus the prejudicial value of your ability to do that in front of a jury, I believe any probative value of that, in terms of what he said as to expectation, is far outweighed by the prejudicial impact that it would have on a jury.

I've made another ruling about the offense for which he was convicted and for which he did not register in Maryland, and I weighed that similarly; that in the State of Maryland, based on my understanding of the current state of the law, I did not believe that offense was relevant to the issue of credibility, and I cited the cases and my reasons to do so and, in fact, that the probative value of such a

conviction, when weighing all of the elements of it versus the prejudicial impact that it would have on the jury, was similarly situated.

And this, my compliments to you on your legal acumen and your four-pronged attack on the purpose of the sexual registration, but I feel that it falls short in this instance and am going to deny your motion and not permit you that cross-examination in this aspect in front of the jury.

MR. STARR: Your Honor, if we may make a proposal without abandoning the request that we've made, I do want to say something on the record and then make a proposal.

What I have to say is this: I think the prejudice versus probative value, as it must be weighed by the Court, is a danger of unfair prejudice. These facts are pointedly true. I think the prejudice to Mr. White or prejudice to the State based on these plainly true facts is something that I don't see, and we disagree with the Court in that regard.

Having said that, we propose this. And, again, this is without abandoning the argument contained in the motion. Would the Court allow us to conduct a biassed cross-examination without referencing the sexual nature of Mr. White's offense, by saying something like there is a pending investigation right now; you know that if a decision is made to prosecute you, you will be facing prosecution for a crime that carries three years and that creates — and then

make the ensuing argument that there is motive to curry favor based on the playing field?

I think that sanitizing it in that way and coupling it with a jury instruction, that they're only to consider it for the limited purpose of assessing his credibility and whether or not he's biassed, addresses the Court's concern and we offer that proposal.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. Again, I'm looking at the testimony that I just heard. Hearing Mr. White's testimony and hearing the State's proffer, which was accepted by the defense, it does not appear to me to be an issue. Because I've made the ruling that I don't believe, based on what I heard, that the State made any offer whatsoever to Mr. White, regardless of what the nature of the pending investigation was or is, and that Mr. White, based on his responses, has no expectation, doesn't know what the State plans.

I feel that it would be inappropriate to permit that to go forward for the same reasons I just gave to the jury, because I believe that, number one, it would no longer be relevant as to bias or motive; and, number two, that the probative value would be far outweighed by the prejudicial impact on the jury.

So with all due respect, in that light your request is denied.

```
What's next? I'm not sure if there is anything,
 1
 2
     but the way things are going.
               MR. STARR: You want some more, Your Honor?
 3
 4
               THE COURT: I know that by tomorrow morning you
 5
     will have more.
 6
               MR. STARR: There were a couple of issues, and I
 7
     don't know what the Court wants to --
 8
               THE COURT: Are these new issues?
 9
               MR. STARR: No.
10
               THE COURT: These are old issues?
11
               MR. STARR: These are old issues. I think the
12
     Court had said you wanted to wait on them.
13
               THE COURT: Oh, the issue of the hearsay setting?
14
               MR. STARR: Correct.
15
               THE COURT: I believe I can't offer any help on
16
     that until I hear testimony and see what the foundations may
17
     be for that, for the acceptance or denial of that kind of
18
     testimony.
19
               MR. COHEN: And I doubt this is necessary, Your
20
     Honor, but in an abundance of caution, if the State could be
21
     admonished not to reference that in opening.
22
               MR. MOOMAU: We're not going to mention anything
23
     that there's any outstanding rulings on. I expect the
2.4
     defense to abide by it also.
25
               THE COURT: I think that leaves the issue of a
```

photograph, if I'm not mistaken. 1 MR. STARR: Correct. We filed a motion on that for 2 3 the Court to consider. 4 MR. MOOMAU: It would be a photograph. Your Honor, 5 I refer the Court to State versus Broberg, a Court of Appeals 6 case. 7 THE COURT: 342 Md. 545? 8 MR. MOOMAU: Yes. We cite that case in support of 9 the Court exercising its discretion to allow us to introduce 10 the photograph. We believe the jury has the right, as well 11 as the victim. The victim laws allow the jury to see who the 12 deceased victim was, a face. 13 THE COURT: Can I see the photograph? 14 I don't have it here, Your Honor. I MR. MOOMAU: 15 can bring it first thing in the morning. 16 THE COURT: Let me hold off on a ruling then until 17 tomorrow morning. 18 MR. MOOMAU: I expected you to rule on that --19 that's what I'm used to when it happens, but I can bring it 20 in the morning. 21 That's alright. So many motions were THE COURT: 22 filed in this, and you've brought it up a couple of times of 23 wanting me to do it in advance, but we can hold off until 2.4 tomorrow. 25 MR. COHEN: I will say the State has made that

available to the defense and we've seen that.

Your Honor, there are just some housekeeping matters in terms of exhibits that we wanted to go over with the State. So I don't think we need to do that with Your Honor until after we show them to the State and get what concerns they have and that sort of thing.

Other than that, I don't think there's much from the defense.

THE COURT: The jury has been asked to come in tomorrow at 8:30. Sheila is going to meet them in the jury deliberation room. She's going to take them right down to this jury deliberation room here. So they'll be in there by 8:30, which will give us about a half hour to go over anything before that may become necessary, and we can obviously delay the start of the opening statements if you wish.

Any other matters I need to address with you today?

MR. COHEN: Not on behalf of the defense, Your

Honor.

MR. MOOMAU: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want you to know that I'm turning off my computer so that I don't get any faxes from either one of you. And I'm closing my fax machine.

MR. COHEN: Will your e-mail be on, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Everything will be on. Hopefully, I

```
won't have to look at it.
 1
 2
               MR. STARR: Hand delivery it is, Judge.
 3
               THE COURT: I figured that would be next.
               (The trial was recessed at 4:00 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Cindy S. Davis, an Official Court Reporter for the Circuit Court for Prince George's County, Maryland, do hereby certify that I stenographically recorded the proceedings in State of Maryland versus Keith A. Washington, criminal trial 07-1664X, on February 12, 2008, before the Honorable Michael P. Whalen, Associate Judge.

I further certify that the page numbers 1 through 179 constitute an official transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me from my stenographic notes to the within typewritten matter in a complete and accurate manner.

In Witness Whereof, I have affixed my signature this 7th day of May, 2008

_....

Cindy S. Davis, RPR
Official Court Reporter