

## COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

Fig.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	)
PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,	) ) SUPERIOR COURT
VS.	NO. A-090435
JOE HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HENRY GAMSKY,	)
DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.	OCT 0 9 1367

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY
HONORABLE LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE PRESIDING
REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

APPEARANCES:

FOR PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT: JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP

STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL 3580 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD

**ROOM 800** 

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90010

FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT: IN PROPRIA PERSONA

VOLUME g OF 101 (PAGES ggg TO ggg, INCLUSIVE)



ROSEMARIE GOODBODY, CSR NO. 932 SALLY YERGER, CSR NO. 2008 OFFICIAL REPORTERS

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES					
3	DEPARTMENT WEST C HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND,	JUDGE				
4						
5	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )					
6	PLAINTIFF,					
7	VS. ) NO. A-090435					
8	JOE HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HENRY GAMSKY,					
9	DEFENDANT.					
10						
11	REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT					
12	TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1986					
13	VOLUME 8					
14	(PAGES 763 TO 941, INCLUSIVE)					
15	APPEARANCES:					
16	FOR THE PEOPLE: IRA REINER, DISTRICT ATTORNEY	,				
17	BY: FREDERICK N. WAPNER, DEF 1725 MAIN STREET	YTU				
18	SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 9040	)1				
19	FOR THE DEFENDANT: ARTHUR H. BARENS, ESQ. 10209 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD					
20	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067					
21	AND RICHARD C. CHIER, ESQ.					
22	10920 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024	+				
23						
24						
<b>2</b> 5	DOCEMARIE COORDON CER NO C	7.7				
26	ROSEMARIE GOODBODY, CSR NO. S SALLY YERGER, CSR NO. 2008	104				
27	OFFICIAL REPORTERS					

1	TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1986	VOLUME 8	PAGES 763 TO	941	
2		A.M.		763	
3		P.M.		809	
4					
5		CERTUGE.			
6	PROCEEDINGS				
7	HEARING RE EXCLUSION OF THE F			367	
8				763 .	
9	VOIR DIRE OF PROSPECTIVE JURG	OKS (CONTINUED)		775	
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

```
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1986; 10:40 A.M.
1
                                   HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE
     DEPARTMENT WEST C
2
                 (APPEARANCES AS HERETOFORE NOTED.)
3
4
                 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD
5
                 IN OPEN COURT WITH THE PRESENCE OF
6
                 STEPHEN G. CONTOPULOS, ESQ., OF THE
7
                 FIRM OF DONOVAN, LEISURE, NEWTON & IRVINE,
8
                 ON BEHALF OF COOKE MEDIA GROUP INCORPORATED,
9
                 PUBLISHER OF THE DAILY NEWS:)
10
          THE COURT: PEOPLE VERSUS HUNT.
11
          MR. BARENS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. THE DEFENSE WOULD
12
     LIKE ABOUT TEN MINUTES. WE HAVE BEEN EXCHANGING PAPERS WITH
13
     COUNSEL FOR THE PRESS AND WITH THE PEOPLE AND I HAVE NOT HAD
14
     AN OPPORTUNITY TO READ COUNSEL'S MOTION.
15
                 I ALSO SUBMITTED A DOCUMENT --
16
          THE COURT: YES, I HAVE READ IT.
17
           MR. BARENS: -- I WOULD LIKE YOUR HONOR TO READ THIS
18
19
     MORNING.
           THE COURT: YOU WANT TEN MINUTES, DO YOU?
20
          MR. BARENS: YES, IF YOU WOULD, PLEASE.
21
22
                 (RECESS.)
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THE COURT WILL CONSIDER AT THIS
23
     TIME THE MOTION OF THE DEFENDANT TO BAR -- CLOSE THE COURTROOM
24
     TO ANY MEDIA OR ANY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.
25
                I THINK LAST NIGHT YOUR COLLEAGUE, MR. CHIER, MADE
26
     A CATEGORICAL STATEMENT THAT HE HAD AUTHORITY THAT IT IS
27
     MANDATORY UPON THE COURT TO BAR ANY MEMBERS OF THE PRESS FROM
28
```

2 FO

\_\_\_

MR. BARENS: AGAIN, I WILL STAND CORRECTED, IF THAT BE THE CASE. I DON'T HAVE A RECOLLECTION. BUT NONETHELESS, WE SUBMITTED --

THE COURT: AND BASED UPON THAT, I EXCLUDED A MEMBER

OF THE PRESS BECAUSE OF THE STATEMENT MADE BY YOUR CO-COUNSEL.

MR. BARENS: AS WE HAVE INDICATED THIS MORNING, DEFENSE IN THIS INSTANCE, SEEKS TO BAR THE PRESS SOLELY FROM THE PORTION OF THE TRIAL INVOLVING -- NOT THE TRIAL, BUT THE PORTION OF THE JURY EXAMINATION INVOLVING THE HOVEY VOIR DIRE.

IN YOUR HONOR, EVERY INSTANCE INVOLVING THE ISSUES ATTENDANT, IT IS A BALANCING QUESTION. THE COURT HAS TO EXERCISE THE COURT'S DISCRETION.

THE COURT: I HAVE TO MAKE FINDINGS THAT IT IS FOR THE BEST INTEREST OF THE DEFENDANT IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, THAT IT IS OF OVERRIDING IMPORTANCE THAT THE PRESS BE BARRED.

MR. BARENS: THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR HONOR. BASED ON THE CASE THAT WE CITE TO YOUR HONOR, THE PRESS ENTERPRISE CASE WHICH IS THE SAME CASE I BELIEVE COUNSEL, IN OPPOSITION, WILL BE REFERRING TO THIS MORNING, WE BELIEVE THAT THAT CASE CLEARLY SHOWS THAT YOUR HONOR HAS THE DISCRETION TO MAKE FINDINGS THAT FOR PURPOSES OF ASSURING A FAIR TRIAL FOR THE DEFENDANT IN THIS OR ANY OTHER ANALOGOUS INSTANCE, THAT THE PRESS CAN BE BARRED.

(MR. CHIER ENTERS THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: WHAT FINDING SHOULD I MAKE IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT IN THE PAST, UP UNTIL THIS DATE, THERE HAS BEEN CONSIDERABLE PUBLICITY IN THIS CASE, ENGENDERED

LARGELY BY INTERVIEWS THAT YOU HAD GIVEN TO THE PRESS AND STATEMENTS MADE BY YOU.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE THAT WE ARE HERE
TALKING ABOUT THE CONSENTS OF THESE JURORS. I BELIEVE THAT
THE JURORS HAVE A RIGHT TO PRIVACY UNDER THE CALIFORNIA
CONSTITUTION, WHICH WE POINT OUT HERE. I BELIEVE THE PRESENCE
OF THE PUBLIC OR THE PRESS DURING PERIODS OF TIME WHEN THE
JURORS ARE BEING INQUIRED INTO AS TO THEIR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS,
THEIR PHILOSOPHY AND THEIR BELIEF ON THE DEATH PENALTY IN
GENERAL, THAT THE PEOPLE --

THE COURT: WHERE DID YOU GET THE IDEA THAT THESE QUESTIONS ARE PERTINENT IN <u>HOVEY</u>, THEIR RELIGIOUS IDEAS?

MR. CHIER: THOSE ARE PERMISSIBLE QUESTIONS THAT --

THE COURT: WILL YOU -- I WILL TELL YOU TO SHUT UP.

I AM NOT LISTENING TO YOU. I WANT YOU NOT TO INTERFERE WHEN

COUNSEL IS ADDRESSING THE COURT.

YOU WILL HAVE YOUR OPPORTUNITY LATER ON, IF I GIVE IT TO YOU. YOU SIT DOWN.

MR. CHIER: I AM TO SHUT UP, YOUR HONOR?

THE COURT: WILL YOU SIT DOWN?

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, TRYING TO MOVE AHEAD HERE, I
BELIEVE THAT INQUIRIING INTO RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND ORIENTATIONS
OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS ARE PERMISSIBLE IN THE HOVEY
EXAMINATION.

THERE IS CERTAINLY AMPLE PRECEDENT FOR THAT, YOUR HONOR. HOWEVER, THAT ONLY AMOUNTS TO ONE OF THE THREE AREAS OF CONCERN I HAVE THAT THE PRESENCE OF THE PRESS OR THE PUBLIC DURING HOVEY VOIR DIRE WOULD HAVE A CHILLING EFFECT ON THE

PROSPECTIVE JURORS IN THE CANDOR OF THEIR RESPONSE, PARTICULARLY KNOWING AS THEY WOULD, THAT THEIR RESPONSES AND THEIR NAMES COULD BE PRINTED. THE COURT: WELL, LET ME INTERRUPT YOU. YOU SUBMITTED TO ME A LIST OF QUESTIONS WHICH WOULD BE ASKED OF JURORS ON THE VOIR DIRE, THE GENERAL VOIR DIRE AFTER WE HAD DISPENSED WITH HOVEY. ONE OF THE THINGS YOU WANTED TO INQUIRE INTO WAS ALSO THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT THEY MAKE, RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION, THEIR POLITICAL AFFILIATION AND HOW THEY VOTED IN OTHER CASES AND EVERYTHING ELSE, WHICH GOES DEEPLY INTO THE PERSONAL LIVES AND THEIR PRIVACY. MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THAT WAS ASKED TO BE DONE ON THE GENERAL VOIR DIRE AND NOT NOW.

THE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OF ANY -- UNLESS THEY HAVE A

PHILOSOPHICAL BELIEF AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY--I WOULDN'T

PERMIT THAT TO BE DONE ON THE HOVEY QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: YES, THAT IS THE AREA I AM DISCUSSING THAT

WE WOULD BE INQUIRING INTO. OBVIOUSLY, MUCH OF THE OPPOSITION

OR FAVORING OF THE DEATH PENALTY ISSUE IS ATTRIBUTABLE TO A

THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION ANALOGOUS TO AN EYE FOR AN EYE, WHICH

CERTAINLY HAS ITS GENESIS IN THEOLOGY.

MR. HUNT'S INTERESTS IN A FAIR TRIAL.

QUESTIONS WERE INAPPROPRIATE.

WE ARE NOT ASKING THAT THE PRESS BE EXCLUDED FROM ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE HOVEY VOIR DIRE IN THIS TRIAL.

YOUR HONOR, AGAIN, WE ARE TRYING TO PROTECT

MR. BARENS: AND THE DEFENSE WAS WILLING TO ABIDE BY

THE COURT: WELL, I WON'T PERMIT YOU TO INQUIRE AS TO

YOUR HONOR'S DECISION.WITHOUT OBJECTION, THAT CERTAIN OF THOSE

YOUR HONOR, WE FELT THAT THERE WERE CERTAIN -
IF THE COURT WAS GOING TO RULE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IN THIS

INSTANCE, THERE WERE CERTAIN INHIBITIONS THE COURT DOES HAVE

DISCRETION TO IMPOSE, WHICH WE SUGGESTED AT THE END OF OUR

MOTION.

CERTAINLY, THE COURT COULD INQUIRE OF THE JURORS
THEMSELVES WHETHER OR NOT THEY WANTED TO SURRENDER THEIR
RIGHT TO PRIVACY AS CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED IN THIS
INSTANCE, AND AT THE VERY LEAST, A PROPHYLACTIC MEASURE WOULD
INVOLVE A PROHIBITION FROM THE PRESS DISCLOSING THE NAME OF
THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR OR THEIR RESPONSES WITHOUT THE
UNEQUIVOCAL CONSENT BY THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR.

THE DAILY

AGAIN, YOUR HONOR, I THINK THERE ARE TWO ISSUES BEFORE THE COURT: ONE, THE INTERESTS OF A FAIR TRIAL FOR MR. HUNT.

AND TWO, THE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED ISSUE OF PRIVACY FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE JUROR. THE JURORS, TOO, YOUR HONOR, HAVE THEIR RIGHTS.

THE COURT: LET'S NOT TALK ABOUT THE JURORS. WE ARE TALKING NOW ABOUT THE RIGHTS OF THE DEFENDANT. YOU FORGET ABOUT THE JURORS, I WILL TAKE CARE OF THEM.

I WANT YOU TO ADDRESS YOURSELF TO THE QUESTION

AS TO HOW, IF PERMITTING THE MEDIA TO BE PRESENT DURING THE

HOVEY QUESTIONING, IS GOING TO BE PREJUDICIAL TO THE

DEFENDANT. FORGET ABOUT THE JURORS.

MR. BARENS: TWO RESPONSES, YOUR HONOR: NUMBER ONE, I BELIEVE, AS I INDICATED, IT WOULD HAVE A CHILLING EFFECT ON THE JURORS.

AND NUMBER TWO, YOUR HONOR, AS DEFENSE COUNSEL,

I DON'T THINK I CAN ACTUALLY FORGET ABOUT THE JURORS AND THE

PROSPECTIVE JUROR'S ORIENTATION IN THIS MATTER. I BELIEVE

THAT I CAN ASSERT THEIR RIGHT TO PRIVACY AS A PART OF THE

OVERALL CONTEXT OF WHAT WE ARE DEALING WITH HERE AND THAT

CANNOT BE DISREGARDED BY THE DEFENSE AND, CERTAINLY, IS NOT

BEING DISREGARDED BY THE COURT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, I WILL HEAR FROM COUNSEL, MR. CONTOPULOS.

MR. CONTOPULOS: GOOD MORNING. STEVE CONTOPULOS FOR THE DAILY NEWS.

THIS IS NOT A UNIQUE CASE. THIS IS NOT A CASE

OF FIRST IMPRESSION. THE <u>RIVERSIDE PRESS</u> CASE THAT WE BROUGHT TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION WAS SPECIFICALLY ON THE ISSUE OF DEATH QUALIFICATIONS. THERE IS NOTHING IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE THAT MAKES IT UNIQUE.

THE SAME ARGUMENT ABOUT THE CANDOR OF THE JURORS WAS MADE IN THE <u>UKIAH DAILY JOURNAL</u> CASE THAT WE SUBMITTED TO THE COURT. AGAIN, THAT CASE WAS SPECIFICALLY VOIR DIRED ON DEATH QUALIFICATION.

WE SUBMIT TO THE COURT THAT THIS ISSUE HAS BEEN

DETERMINED; THAT THE COURT HAS GUIDELINES FROM THE UNITED STATES

SUPREME COURT AND BY THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THAT IN FACT

THERE IS A PRESUMPTION OF OPENNESS OF THIS TRIAL AND VOIR DIRE

IS PART OF THAT.

THERE MUST BE SPECIFIC FINDINGS OF SUBSTANTIAL

PROBABILITY OF DENIAL OF THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL. THERE

HAS TO BE A FINDING AS AN ALTERNATIVE THAT IN FACT CLOSURE

WILL ACHIEVE THE ENDS OF A FAIR TRIAL AND NOTHING OF THAT HAS

OCCURRED HERE.

THE COURT: AND NOTHING AS TO THOSE POINTS RELATING TO
THAT HAS BEEN SUBMITTED BY COUNSEL, WHICH IS VERY ABLE COUNSEL,
BY THE WAY, TO THE EFFECT THAT WE HAVE TO PRESERVE THE RIGHTS
OF PRIVACY OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.

MR. CONTOPULOS: IN FACT, IN THE <u>RIVERSIDE</u> CASE THAT WAS MENTIONED BY THE COURT, IN THAT CASE IT WAS A RAPE CASE AND THE COURT SAID THAT IT IS A CONSIDERATION OF THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY BUT THAT ALONE DOES NOT MEAN THAT YOU THEREFORE FORECLOSE THE RIGHT OF THE PUBLIC TO ATTEND THE TRIAL. SO THE MERE SPECTOR OF THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY IS NOT THE ISSUE.

THE ISSUE BECOMES WHETHER THERE IS A DENIAL OF
THAT RIGHT OF PRIVACY, WHETHER IN FACT THESE AREAS OF
INQUIRY WHICH, I SUBMIT, ARE AREAS OF INQUIRY DURING ANY
DEATH PENALTY QUALIFICATION, IS SOMEHOW UNIQUE AND NEITHER
THE RIVERSIDE PRESS CASE, WHICH WENT TO DEATH QUALIFICATION
AND THE UKIAH CASE, WHICH WAS A DEATH QUALIFICATION CASE, IN
ANY WAY FIND THAT THE VOIR DIRE ON DEATH QUALIFICATION SHOULD
BE ANYTHING OTHER THAN OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, WHICH IS OUR
POSITION.

AND WE THINK THERE IS AMPLE PRECEDENT FOR THIS.

THE COURT: ANYTHING ELSE?

MR. BARENS: WITHIN THAT PRECEDENT, I THINK COUNSEL WOULD LIKE THE COURT TO BELIEVE THAT THERE IS SOMETHING THAT MANDATES THE COURT'S DECISION IN THIS AREA. RATHER, I BELIEVE THE CASES QUITE CLEARLY MAKE IT A MATTER OF DISCRETION FOR YOUR HONOR IN EACH AND EVERY CASE TO BE DECIDED ON AN INDIVIDUALIZED BASIS, BALANCING THE INTERESTS OF THE DEFENDANT AND THE PRIVACY INTERESTS OF THE JURORS. THE PRESS-ENTERPRISE CASE CERTAINLY PROVIDES YOUR HONOR WITH DISCRETION IN MAKING THIS RULING.

THE DEFENSE IN THIS INSTANCE AGAIN IS URGING THE COURT IN TERMS OF INSURING A FAIR TRIAL FOR MR. HUNT THAT IN THIS INSTANCE, IN THE LIMITED AREA OF HOVEY VOIR DIRE, TO EXERCISE THAT DISCRETION THAT THE COURT CLEARLY HAS IN THE INTERESTS OF A FAIR TRIAL AND IN THE INTERESTS OF PROTECTING THE PRIVACY OF THESE JURORS.

MR. WAPNER: MAY I BE HEARD, YOUR HONOR, BRIEFLY?

THE COURT: YES, I WANTED TO CALL ON YOU ANYWAY.

FΟ

MR. WAPNER; FIRST OF ALL, THE POLICY OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE IS THAT THE TRIAL SHOULD BE OPEN AND PUBLIC AND THE PRESS SHOULD HAVE ACCESS TO ALL PHASES OF CRIMINAL TRIALS, AND I AGREE WITH MR. CONTOPULOS IN THIS INSTANCE THAT THIS IS NOT ANY DIFFERENT THAN ANY OTHER CASE IN THAT REGARD.

SECOND OF ALL, I DON'T THINK THAT COUNSEL HAS

DEMONSTRATED -- COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENSE HAS DEMONSTRATED HOW

THIS IN ANY WAY PREJUDICES THE DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS TO HAVE

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS HERE.

THIRD OF ALL, MY CONCERN, MY ONLY REAL CONCERN WAS THE HOVEY ISSUE AND I AM SATISFIED IN READING THE BRIEF SUBMITTED BY THE DAILY NEWS THAT THE UKIAH CASE ANSWERS THAT CONCERN.

FOURTH OF ALL, IS THAT I THINK ANY CONCERN THERE COULD BE THAT SOMEHOW, HOVEY IS GOING TO BE VIOLATED BECAUSE ONE JUROR MIGHT READ IN THE PAPER WHAT SOME OTHER JUROR HAS SAID. IT CAN BE CURED BY SIMPLY INSTRUCTING EACH JUROR AS THEY LEAVE, NOT TO READ ANY ACCOUNTS IN THE PRESS WHATSOEVER THAT MAY BE WRITTEN ABOUT THE CASE. THAT WILL CURE NOT ONLY THE HOVEY PROBLEM, BUT IN ANY EVENT, SHOULD BE DONE, TO KEEP THEM FROM BEING EXPOSED TO ANY PUBLICITY ABOUT THE CASE SO IF THEY ARE CHOSEN AS JURORS, THEY WILL DECIDE THE CASE ONLY ON THE FACTS THEY HEAR IN THE COURTROOM AND NOT WHAT THEY READ IN THE NEWSPAPER.

AND LASTLY, ALTHOUGH IT IS NOT ESPECIALLY PERTINENT BECAUSE MOSTLY WE ARE TALKING ABOUT RIGHT NOW, THE PRINT MEDIA, IT SHOULD BE CLEAR THAT THE COURT RULES SET OUT THAT THERE CAN BE NO RECORDING OR PHOTOGRAPHING OF ANY OF THE JURY SELECTION. THAT IS IN 980 OF THE RULES OF COURT.

SO THAT TO THE EXTENT THAT THIS MOTION GOES TO LEAVING THE PROCEEDINGS OPEN AND THAT THE PRESS CAN COVER, I HAVE NO OBJECTION.

IN THE EVENT THAT WE GET ANY CAMERAS OR TAPE
RECORDERS IN THE COURTROOM, THE COURT RULES SPECIFICALLY
PROHIBIT THE PHOTOGRAPHING OR RECORDING IN ANY WAY, OF THE
JURY SELECTION PROCESS.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE MOTION OF THE DEFENDANT TO CLOSE THE PROCEEDINGS ON THE HOVEY HEARING TO THE PRESS, WILL BE DENIED.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THANK YOU. WOULD YOUR HONOR
BE INCLINED TO GIVE ANY INHIBITIONS AS REQUESTED AND PERMITTED

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

BY THE CASES CITED. THAT THE NAMES OF PROSPECTIVE JURORS AND THEIR RESPONSES ON THE DEATH PENALTY ISSUES, NOT BE PRINTED OR PUBLISHED WITHOUT THEIR PERMISSION?

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT ME TO MAKE THE RULING OF THAT KIND. MR. CONTOPULOS? THAT WOULD BE LIMITED.

MR. CONTOPULOS: THE LAW IS PRETTY CLEAR ON PRIOR RESTRAINT. THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT COUNSEL IS ASKING YOU TO DO, IS RESTRICT WHAT CAN GO INTO THE NEWSPAPER BEFORE IT OCCURS.

THE COURT: 1 WILL NOT DO THAT.

MR. CONTOPULOS: YOUR HONOR, CAN I HAVE ONE CLARIFICATION? I UNDERSTAND THAT YESTERDAY THERE WAS A PORTION OF THE PROCEEDINGS THAT WAS CLOSED. AND I WONDER IF WE MIGHT HAVE ACCESS TO THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE PORTION THAT WAS CLOSED?

THE COURT: YES, YOU CAN.

MR. CONTOPULOS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. CONTOPULOS FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS MATTER.

MR. CONTOPULOS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WE'LL PROCEED NOW. IS THAT ALSO INCLUDING THE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? DOES IT INCLUDE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC THAT WOULD ALSO HAVE A RIGHT TO BE PRESENT, WOULD THEY NOT?

MR. WAPNER: ABSOLUTELY.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WE WILL PROCEED NOW, WITH THE JURY.

WE HAVE A TRANSCRIPT OF THE INTERROGATION OF THE JURORS THAT HAVE BEEN HEARD UP TO THIS TIME, IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO LOOK AT IT.

23

24

26

25

27

MR. CONTOPULOS: HOW SOON CAN WE GET AHOLD OF THAT? 1 THE COURT: THE CLERK WILL MAKE IT AVAILABLE TO YOU. 2 (MR. CONTOPULOS EXITS THE COURTROOM.) 3 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR DORRIS SMITH ENTERS 4 THE COURTROOM.) 5 THE COURT: MISS SMITH, I UNDERSTAND THAT YOU COMMUNICATED 6 WITH YOUR EMPLOYER AND THEY WILL NOT PAY YOU? 7 8 MISS SMITH: ONLY FOR UP TO 30 DAYS. THE COURT: JUST 30 DAYS? 9 10 MISS SMITH: YES. MR. BARENS: NO OBJECTION. 11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU WILL BE EXCUSED. THANK YOU 12 VERY MUCH. 13 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR DORRIS SMITH EXITS 14 15 THE COURTROOM.) THE COURT: CALL IN THE NEXT JUROR. 16 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BLEVINS ENTERS THE 17 18 COURTROOM.) 19 THE COURT: MISS BLEVINS, I WILL ASK A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS. PLEASE LISTEN TO THEM CAREFULLY AND ANSWER YES 20 OR NO, WITHOUT ANY FURTHER STATEMENT, IF YOU CAN. IF THE 21 22 QUESTION IS UNCLEAR, PLEASE ASK THAT IT BE REPEATED. 23 DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS 24 25 TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT? 26 MISS BLEVINS: NO. THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY 27 28 THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN

WHEN THE PROSECUTION ONLY PROVES THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE OR MANSLAUGHTER?

MISS BLEVINS: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH
PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION
CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES
ALLEGED IN THIS CASE? I TOLD YOU THAT IF THE JURY FINDS THE
DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THERE
IS A SECOND PHASE THAT THEY GO INTO. THAT IS TO DETERMINE
THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES IS WHETHER OR NOT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. THAT IS THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

ALL RIGHT?

MISS BLEVINS: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: I WILL READ IT AGAIN TO YOU.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY

THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION

CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

ALLEGED IN THIS CASE?

MISS BLEVINS: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING
THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE
IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE
WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, REGARDLESS OF ANY
EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE
TRIAL?

MISS BLEVINS: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL? MISS BLEVINS: NO. THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT OCCUR IN THIS CASE, AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL? MISS BLEVINS: YES. THE COURT: NO, HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS CASE IN THE NEWSPAPERS OR ANY OTHER MEDIA? MISS BIFVINS: NO. THE COURT: DOES ANYTHING LIKE THE BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT RING A BELL IN YOUR MIND? MISS BLEVINS: NO. 

THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND OF COURSE, THAT FROM NOW 1 2 ON, YOU ARE NOT UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, TO READ ANY ACCOUNTING 3 OF THIS CASE IN THE NEWSPAPER OR LISTEN TO ANY BROADCASTS 4 EITHER ON THE RADIO OR BY TELEVISION? DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 5 MISS BLEVINS: YES. 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 7 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. MISS BLEVINS, DO YOU UNDERSTAND 8 THAT THERE IS NO CRIME IN CALIFORNIA WHEREIN THE DEATH 9 PENALTY IS MANDATED OR ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY? DO YOU UNDER-10 STAND WHAT I MEAN? 11 MISS BLEVINS: I AM THINKING ABOUT YOUR QUESTION, WHETHER 12 I UNDERSTAND WHAT THE LAW SAYS. 13 MR. BARENS: YES, MA'AM? 14 THE COURT: WHAT HE SAYS, IS, IS THERE ANYTHING THAT 15 YOU KNOW ABOUT IN THE LAW -- THE LAW DOES NOT SAY THAT A JURY 16 MUST FIND THE DEATH PENALTY IN ANY KIND OF CASE. 17 MISS BLEVINS: ALL RIGHT, THEN. I UNDERSTAND. YES. 18 MR. BARENS: THEREFORE, YOU WOULD UNDERSTAND THAT IN 19 THE EVENT WE WOULD EVER GET TO A PENALTY PHASE IN THIS TRIAL, 20 THAT WOULD BE A DECISION THAT YOU, AS JURORS, WOULD MAKE AFTER 21 YOU HAD FIRST HAD A FINDING OF GUILT? DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT 22 IDEA? 23 MISS BLEVINS: YES. 24 MR. BARENS: SO, AS HIS HONOR HAS POINTED OUT, THERE 25 COULD BE TWO PHASES TO THE TRIAL, A GUILT PHASE AND A PENALTY

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

26

27

28

PHASE?

MR. BARENS: YOU REALIZE THAT WE MAY NEVER GET TO THE

PENALTY PHASE, BUT RATHER, AS A MATTER OF LAW, SINCE THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA HAVE ASKED FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, BEFORE WE CAN GET INTO A TRIAL OF THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE, WE FIRST HAVE TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY IDEAS. DO YOU UNDERSTAND? MISS BLEVINS: YES. MR. BARENS: AND YOU DON'T FEEL BECAUSE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THAT, DO YOU, THAT THERE IS ANY GREATER LIKELIHOOD TO BELIEVE MY CLIENT DID ANYTHING WRONG OR IS GUILTY OF ANYTHING, DO YOU? MISS BLEVINS: NO. 

4B-1

28

1 THE COURT: BECAUSE YOU HAVE NOT HEARD ANY EVIDENCE SO 2 FAR. 3 MISS BLEVINS: RIGHT. 4 THE COURT: HE IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT ALL THROUGHOUT 5 THE TRIAL, ALL THROUGHOUT THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE JURORS IN 6 THE JURY ROOM. 7 MISS BLEVINS: YES. 8 MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY 9 AS A GENERAL CONCEPT? 10 MISS BLEVINS: ALL I KNOW IS THAT IT IS ON THE BOOKS AS A LAW AND IT IS A FEASIBLE AND LEGAL PROCEDURE. 11 12 MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK IT IS A GOOD LAW? 13 MISS BLEVINS: I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THE TERM WOULD BE 14 "GOOD". 15 I BELIEVE THAT IF IT IS ON THE LAW BOOKS. THAT 16 IT IS ONE THAT IS ACCESSIBLE AS A LAW TO BE USED. DOES THAT 17 TELL YOU WHAT YOU WANT TO KNOW? 18 MR. BARENS: TO A POINT, MA'AM. COULD YOU TELL ME ANY 19 INSTANCES IN YOUR OWN MIND, WHEN YOU THINK THE DEATH PENALTY 20 IS AN APPROPRIATE REMEDY FOR CONDUCT? 21 MISS BLEVINS: I AM NOT REALLY PREPARED TO ANSWER THAT. 22 MR. BARENS: CAN YOU THINK OF ANY INSTANCES WHEN THE 23 DEATH PENALTY WOULD NOT BE A GOOD IDEA? 24 MISS BLEVINS: I THINK WITH THAT EVIDENCE, I CAN'T ANSWER 25 THOSE QUESTIONS. 26 MR. BARENS: OKAY. IF YOU WERE IN A TRIAL AND DURING 27

THE GUILT PHASE, THAT FIRST PHASE HIS HONOR HAS TALKED ABOUT,

IT WAS ESTABLISHED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT A MURDER

25

26

27

28

HAD OCCURRED AND IT WAS IN COLD BLOOD AND IT WAS DURING THE COMMISSION OF A ROBBERY, WOULD YOU THEN UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES, ALWAYS GIVE THE DEATH PENALTY?

MISS BLEVINS: NO.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL ME WHAT MIGHT INFLUENCE YOU NOT TO GIVE THE DEATH PENALTY?

MISS BLEVINS: NO, I CAN'T TELL YOU AN ANSWER TO THAT.

THE COURT: WELL, LET ME TELL YOU WHAT THE LAW PROVIDES

IF THE DEFENDANT IS FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND THERE ARE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, LIKE DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY OR MAYHEM OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, THEN THE JURY CONSIDERS IN THE PENALTY PHASE, MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES, EVERYTHING THAT IS FAVORABLE TO THE DEFENDANT OR AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, EVERYTHING IN HIS LIFE WHICH AGGRAVATES HIS CONDUCT.

NOW, ALL OF THOSE FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED ARE MITIGATING AND AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

YOU WILL HEAR ALL OF THAT FIRST, BEFORE YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND WHETHER IT SHOULD BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE DEATH PENALTY.

MISS BLEVINS: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: I UNDERSTAND THAT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT WILL ONLY HAPPEN IF IT GOES TO THAT POINT.

MISS BLEVINS: I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU ARE SAYING. BUT I CANNOT TELL YOU WHAT I WILL DO, IN ALL HONESTY. I CANNOT

TELL YOU WHAT I WILL DO UNTIL I HAVE HEARD THE CIRCUMSTANCES. MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL ME SOME IDEA ABOUT WHAT YOU WOULD TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION IN DECIDING WHAT YOU WOULD DO? THE COURT: WELL, I DON'T THINK THAT THAT IS WHAT THE LAW SAYS. SHE HAS A RIGHT TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION NOT WHAT SHE, HERSELF, WOULD. SHE WILL BE GIVEN INSTRUCTIONS ON THAT PARTICULAR SUBJECT. MR. BARENS: I UNDERSTAND, YOUR HONOR. I WAS INQUIRING TO SEE IF SHE HAD ANY PERSONAL ATTITUDES THAT WOULD INFLUENCE FACTORS THAT SHE WOULD TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION OR NOT. THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT IT WHICH WOULD INFLUENCE YOU? MISS BLEVINS: RIGHT NOW, I DON'T HAVE ANY. I AM OPEN TO WHATEVER COMES. 

FΟ

THE COURT: LIKE IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, IT IS ALLEGED

THAT THIS KILLING TOOK PLACE, MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE,

27

TOOK PLACE DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, YOU UNDERSTAND?

MISS BLEVINS: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: THAT IS THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, WHICH THEN MAKES THE DEATH PENALTY A QUESTION IN THE CASE AS TO WHETHER IT SHOULD OR SHOULDN'T BE IMPOSED; DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MISS BLEVINS: YES, YES.

THE COURT: MERELY A DELIBERATE KILLING DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THERE SHOULD BE A DEATH PENALTY.

GO AHEAD.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU.

HAVING THIS DISCUSSION WITH HIS HONOR, I AM ASKING
YOU NOW IF YOU HAD A CASE WHERE AN INTENTIONAL KILLING HAD
OCCURRED AND, LET'S SAY, IT WAS A KILLING DURING A ROBBERY,
WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY THERE?

MISS BLEVINS: DO YOU WANT A YES OR NO ANSWER TO THAT?

MR. BARENS: YES, MA'AM, IF YOU CAN.

MISS BLEVINS: OR AN EXPLAINED ANSWER?

MR. BARENS: I WOULD LIKE A YES OR NO FIRST, IF YOU WOULD.

THE COURT: I DON'T THINK THAT IS A PROPER QUESTION:
WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IF THERE
WAS A DELIBERATE KILLING?

I TOLD HER THAT THE DEATH PENALTY --

MISS BLEVINS: I WOULDN'T AUTOMATICALLY.

THE COURT: -- THAT THE DEATH PENALTY WAS NOT APPLICABLE IN A CASE OF THAT KIND.

MISS BLEVINS: I WOULDN'T AUTOMATICALLY DO ANYTHING AUTOMATICALLY.

```
MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, MY POINT BEING WHEN YOUR HONOR
1
2
     QUESTIONS A PROSPECTIVE JUROR AND INSTRUCTS THE JUROR, YOU GET
3
    ONE RESPONSE.
 4
                 WHAT I AM LOOKING FOR IS AN UNAIDED RESPONSE, IF
5
     WE COULD, YOUR HONOR.
           THE COURT: I AM NOT AIDING THE WITNESS (SIC). I AM
6
7
     JUST CLARIFYING IT FOR HER.
8
          MR. CHIER: YOUR HONOR IS LEADING THE WITNESS (SIC).
9
          THE COURT: WILL YOU STAY OUT OF THIS? HE IS NOW
10
     CONDUCTING THIS. I DON'T WANT TO HAVE THE TWO OF YOU.
11
          MR. CHIER: I WISH FOR THE RECORD TO INDICATE --
12
          THE COURT: I DON'T WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU. PUT HIM DOWN.
13
          MR. CHIER: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE A RIGHT TO SPEAK IN THIS
14
     COURTROOM.
15
          THE COURT: WILL YOU PUT HIM DOWN?
16
          MR. CHIER: YOUR HONOR, I WISH TO BE HEARD.
17
          THE COURT: I DON'T WANT TO HEAR YOU. HE KNOWS WHAT
18
    HE IS DOING.
19
          MR. CHIER: I HAVE A RIGHT TO SPEAK IN THIS COURTROOM.
20
          THE COURT: I DON'T WANT TO HEAR FROM BOTH OF YOU AT
21
    THE SAME TIME.
22
          MR. CHIER: I WANT TO SPEAK WHEN I WISH TO. I AM ENTITLED
23
    TO SPEAK.
24
          THE COURT: SIT DOWN. THAT IS AN ORDER.
25
          MR. BARENS: NOW MRS. BLEVINS, DO YOU FEEL YOURSELF TO
26
     BE AN OPEN-MINDED PERSON?
27
          MISS BLEVINS: YES.
28
          MR. BARENS: AND DO YOU FEEL YOU WOULD LISTEN TO ALL
```

1 POINTS FROM BOTH SIDES BEFORE MAKING A DECISION, ESPECIALLY 2 ON THE DEATH PENALTY? 3 MISS BLEVINS: YES. 4 MR. BARENS: DO YOU REMEMBER AN ELECTION WE HAD IN 5 CALIFORNIA A FEW YEARS AGO WHERE THERE WAS A VOTE TAKEN? 6 MISS BLEVINS: WHETHER OR NOT THERE SHOULD BE THE DEATH 7 PENALTY IN CALIFORNIA? 8 YES. 9 MR. BARNES: DID YOU VOTE IN THAT ELECTION? 10 MISS BLEVINS: YES. 11 MR. BARENS: DO YOU REMEMBER HOW YOU VOTED ON WHETHER 12 OR NOT WE SHOULD HAVE --13 MISS BLEVINS: YES. 14 MR. BARENS: IF YOU WOULD JUST LET ME ASK MY QUESTION 15 FIRST, IT IS GOING TO MAKE IT EASIER FOR THE REPORTER TO GET 16 THIS DOWN, OKAY? 17 MISS BLEVINS: YES. 18 MR. BARENS: DO YOU REMEMBER HOW YOU VOTED? 19 MISS BLEVINS: YES. 20 MR. BARENS: AND YOU VOTED YES? 21 MISS BLEVINS: I DON'T THINK THAT IS ANYTHING I HAVE 22 TO PUT ON THE PUBLIC RECORD, IS IT? 23 MR. BARENS: I BELIEVE I AM ENTITLED -- AND I DON'T MEAN 24 TO PRY, MRS. BLEVINS, BUT BECAUSE OF THE SERIOUSNESS OF WHAT 25 WE ARE DOING HERE AND ARE GOING TO BE DOING HERE, I KIND OF 26 NEED TO KNOW WHAT YOUR ORIENTATION IS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, 27 MA'AM.

28

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

OPTION.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL ME WHY YOU VOTED YES?

MISS BLEVINS: BECAUSE I THINK IF THERE ARE CIRCUMSTANCES

THAT THE LAW SAYS, THAT IS DESIGNED FOR AND SAYS THAT THE

DEATH PENALTY IS THE PROPER PENALTY, THEN WE NEED TO HAVE THE

MR. BARENS: AND WHAT I NEED TO KNOW TODAY ARE NOT THE CIRCUMSTANCES THE LAW IMPOSES BUT WHAT YOUR BELIEFS ARE AS FAR AS WHAT IS APPROPRIATE, COULD YOU TELL ME WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES YOU THINK COULD BE EXISTENT THAT WOULD MAKE YOU WANT SOMEONE TO GET THE DEATH PENALTY?

MISS BLEVINS: I THINK MY TERMINOLOGY OF VICIOUS CRIMES
MIGHT PROPERLY BE TREATED WITH THE DEATH PENALTY WHICH ARE -HOW DO I SAY IT -- VICIOUS CRIMES, PEOPLE THAT DO THAT, MORE
THAN JUST AN ACCIDENTAL DEATH OF A RESULT OF SOMETHING.

MR. BARENS: WE WOULDN'T BE HERE, MRS. BLEVINS, ON AN ACCIDENTAL DEATH.

MISS BLEVINS: I KNOW.

MR. BARENS: THEY DON'T CALL THAT FIRST DEGREE MURDER.

MISS BLEVINS: I KNOW.

MR. BARENS: WHAT WE ARE HERE DISCUSSING WITH YOU IS HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE INSTANCE OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER, KNOWING YOU HAVE A CHOICE BETWEEN LIFE AND DEATH; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT YOUR OTHER CHOICE IS WHAT IS CALLED LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MISS BLEVINS: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT UNDER THE

STANDARD OF THE LAW IN CALIFORNIA TODAY THAT LIFE WITHOUT THE

POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE MEANS THAT THAT DEFENDANT WILL NEVER

GET OUT OF JAIL DURING HIS LIFETIME? MISS BLEVINS: UH-HUH. MR. BARENS: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT? MISS BLEVINS: DO I BELIEVE IN THE LAW? 

-6

MR. BARENS: NOW DO YOU BELIEVE THAT WHEN THE JUDGE SAYS LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBLITY OF PAROLE THAT IT ACTUALLY MEANS THAT OR DO YOU BELIEVE THAT MAYBE THERE IS A CHANCE THE GUY IS GOING TO GET OUT LATER?

MISS BLEVINS: I MIGHT HAVE SOME HESITATION ON TAKING IT HOOK, LINE AND SINKER.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THAT WOULD MAKE YOU HESITATE BEFORE YOU GIVE SOMEONE A FINDING OF LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MISS BLEVINS; I THINK ANY OF THIS IS GOING TO GIVE ME A LOT TO THINK ABOUT.

MR. BARENS: WHAT I NEED TO KNOW --

MISS BLEVINS: AND I CAN'T TELL YOU AT THIS POINT WHAT
I AM GOING TO DO, IN EFFECT. THAT IS MY HONEST ANSWER TO YOU.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL ME IF YOU WOULD BE LESS LIKELY
TO VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE BECAUSE
YOU THOUGHT THAT THE DEFENDANT MIGHT GET OUT?

(PAUSE.)

MISS BLEVINS: MAYBE.

MR. BARENS: MAYBE?

MISS BLEVINS: I MIGHT. I MAY CHANGE ALL OF THAT WHEN

MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME. I DIDN'T GET THAT ANSWER.

I DON'T THINK THE REPORTER DID.

MISS BLEVINS: I SAID I MIGHT. I SAID I MAY CHANGE ALL

CF THESE ANSWERS WHEN I HAVE A LITTLE MORE TIME TO THINK ABOUT

THESE QUESTIONS.

MR. BARENS: TO WHICH I RESPONDED, YOU ARE ENTITLED.

IN MAKING A DECISION AS TO WHETHER A DEFENDANT

SHOULD DIE IN THE GAS CHAMBER OR HAVE LIFE WITHOUT THE

POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, I BELIEVE HIS HONOR INDICATED YOU MIGHT

HAVE TO CONSIDER THE DEFENDANT'S AGE, PRIOR CRIMINAL BACKGROUND,

PRIOR ACTS OF VIOLENCE; WOULD YOU TAKE ALL OF THAT INTO

ACCOUNT?

MISS BLEVINS: CERTAINLY.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE A PREFERENCE, AS YOU SIT HERE TODAY, WHEN YOU CONSIDER SOMEONE THAT YOU BELIEVE HAD COMMITTED AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING THE COMMISSION OF A ROBBERY, DO YOU HAVE A PREFERENCE AS TO WHETHER THAT PERSON SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY OR LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MISS BLEVINS: DO I HAVE A PREFERENCE? DO I HAVE A PREFERENCE? PROBABLY NO.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU FEEL AS FAR AS YOU ARE CONCERNED,

TODAY AT LEAST, IN ANSWERING ME TODAY, YOU WOULD

LISTEN

TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE BEFORE YOU MADE A DECISION?

MISS BLEVINS: THAT, YES.

MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU LISTEN TO MORE THAN JUST THE EVIDENCE OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CRIME; WOULD YOU WANT TO LISTEN TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ABOUT THE DEFENDANT AND ABOUT THE VICTIM?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR'. BARENS: AND ALL OF THAT WOULD PLAY INTO YOUR DECISION?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. BARENS: IF WE HAD A CLOSE CASE IN YOUR MIND, A CASE

where there was a real close issue between innocence and guilt,
would you be likely to vote guilty, knowing that, "well, later
in the penalty phase i will give the defendant life without
the possibility of parole and in making that concession, i
won't give him the death penalty," would that happen in your
mind?

Miss blevins: No, i don't think so.

MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO SEGREGATE THE TWO
PHASES OF THE TRIAL ENTIRELY WHEN YOU WERE DECIDING INNOCENCE
OR GUILT, THE PENALTY WOULD HAVE NO BEARING ON YOUR THINKING?

MISS BLEVINS: I THINK SO.

MR. BARENS: AND ONCE AGAIN, YOU REALIZE THAT ALTHOUGH
I HAVE DISCUSSED THESE ISSUES WITH YOU AND TALKED TO YOU ABOUT
PREMEDITATED MURDER AND TALKED TO YOU ABOUT ROBBERY, THAT
DOESN'T GIVE YOU ANY IMPRESSION IN YOUR MIND THAT YOU ARE
ULTIMATELY GOING TO BELIEVE, BECAUSE WE HAVE DISCUSSED THAT,
THAT JOE HUNT HAS DONE ANY OF THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: NO.

MR. BARENS: I THANK YOU.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MR. WAPNER.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

MRS. BLEVINS, I WANT TO COME AT THIS MAYBE FROM A LITTLE BIT OF A DIFFERENT ANGLE.

IS THERE ANYTHING IN YOUR BACKGROUND, RELIGIOUS,
PHILOSOPHICAL OR OTHERWISE THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM VOTING
FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IF YOU THOUGHT IT WAS WARRANTED IN THIS
CASE?

MISS BLEVINS: NO.

MR. WAPNER: ON THE OTHER HAND, THE FLIP SIDE OF THAT COIN, IS THERE ANYTHING IN YOUR BACKGROUND THAT WOULD MAKE YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY REGARDLESS OF THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE? MISS BLEVINS: NO. 

5 F0

MR. WAPNER: IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION THAT MR. BARENS

ASKED YOU ABOUT NOT CONSIDERING PENALTY DURING THE GUILT

PHASE OF THE TRIAL, I WANT TO FOLLOW UP ON THAT A LITTLE BIT.

DID YOU UNDERSTAND THE JUDGE YESTERDAY, WHEN HE WAS EXPLAINING

TO YOU ABOUT THE DIFFERENT POSSIBLE PHASES OF THIS TRIAL?

A I THOUGHT SO, YES.

Q OKAY. SO WHAT WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT, IS THE FIRST PHASE OR THE GUILT PHASE, WHERE THE JURORS ARE CALLED UPON TO MAKE A DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY OF MURDER AND WHETHER THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE TRUE OR NOT TRUE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THE JUDGE IS GOING TO TELL YOU, BEFORE YOU GO OUT TO DELIBERATE, THAT YOU CANNOT CONSIDER PENALTY OR PUNISHMENT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT MEANS WHEN YOU ARE DECIDING WHETHER THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY, YOU CAN'T THINK ABOUT POSSIBLE PUNISHMENTS HE IS GOING TO GET IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY?

MISS BLEVINS: I UNDERSTAND.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THE WHOLE REASON BEHIND THAT

OEVIOUSLY, IS THAT YOU WANT TO MAKE YOUR DECISION BASED ON

THE FACTS AND THE LAW AND NOT WELL, GEE, IF I FIND HIM GUILTY,

HE MIGHT GO TO JAIL OR MIGHT BE EXECUTED.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT YOU HAVE TO PUT THOSE

CONSIDERATIONS OUT OF YOUR MIND IN MAKING YOUR DETERMINATION OF GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. CAN YOU DO THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND THE SAME IS TRUE OBVIOUSLY, OF YOUR DETERMINATION OF WHETHER THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE TRUE? THAT IS, WHETHER OR NOT THE MURDER WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, DEPENDS UPON THE EVIDENCE AND THE LAW, NOT ON WHAT PUNISHMENT THE DEFENDANT MIGHT GET IF YOU MAKE THAT DECISION. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: YOU COULD DO THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THEN, IF AND ONLY IF YOU HAVE

DECIDED THAT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER

AND THAT THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE TRUE, DO YOU GET TO

THAT PHASE WE CALL THE PENALTY PHASE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: THE MOST IMPORTANT THING I THINK FOR YOU TO UNDERSTAND ABOUT THE PENALTY PHASE, IS THAT WHEN YOU GET TO THAT PART OF THE CASE, THE DECISION -- WELL, LET ME BACK UP A LITTLE BIT.

WHEN YOU GET TO THAT PART OF THE CASE, YOU WILL HEAR OTHER EVIDENCE FROM THE PROSECUTION AND FROM THE DEFENSE, EITHER IN AGGRAVATION OR MITIGATION. YOU WILL HEAR ARGUMENTS OF THE LAWYERS AND THEN YOU WILL BE ASKED TO GO BACK WITH THE OTHER 11 JURORS AND MAKE A DECISION.

AND THE JUDGE WILL GIVE YOU SOME GUIDELINES THAT
YOU CAN CONSIDER THE AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

BUT THE MOST IMPORTANT THING IS, THAT IT HAS TO BE YOUR INDIVIDUAL DECISION. IN OTHER WORDS, YOU CAN'T JUST SIT THERE AND SAY OKAY, THE REST OF YOU II WILL DECIDE AND I WILL GO ALONG WITH THE GROUP. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK THAT IS A DECISION YOU ARE CAPABLE OF MAKING?

MISS BLEVINS: I HOPE SO. BUT I HAVE TO SAY YES OR NO, DON'T 1?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, YOU KNOW, WE DON'T MEAN TO BE PUSHY.

BUT ON THE OTHER HAND, THIS IS OUR ONLY CHANCE TO QUESTION

YOU.

I APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT WE JUST SPRUNG IT ON YOU THIS MORNING. BUT OBVIOUSLY, IF YOU CAN'T MAKE THAT DECISION, THEN THIS IS GOING TO BE YOUR ONLY OPPORTUNITY TO TELL US THAT.

YOU WERE GOING TO BE CALLED ON TO MAKE AN INDIVIDUAL DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT SHOULD SPEND THE REST OF HIS LIFE IN PRISON OR WHETHER HE SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY, ASSUMING THAT YOU HAVE ALREADY FOUND HIM GUILTY.

AND IT IS GOING -- IT PROBABLY, OBVIOUSLY -- YOU WILL KNOW A LOT MORE ABOUT THE CASE THAN YOU KNOW NOW. I AM NOT ASKING YOU TO JUDGE THE FACTS OF THE CASE.

FACTS, DO YOU -- DO YOU THINK THAT YOU ARE CAPABLE OF
PERSONALLY MAKING A DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THIS DEFENDANT

SHOULD GET LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR WHETHER HE SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK AS YOU SIT THERE NOW, THAT

IT WOULD BE MORE DIFFICULT FOR YOU TO IMPOSE THE DEATH

PENALTY THAN LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: NEVERTHELESS, DO YOU THINK YOU COULD DO IT IN AN APPROPRIATE CASE?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

23 24

25

26

27

28

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK IT WOULD BE MORE DIFFICULT --LET ME REPHRASE THAT. THE STANDARD THAT THE COURT WILL GIVE YOU, WHEN YOU ARE DECIDING THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE, IS THAT THE CASE HAS TO BE PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WOULD HOLD THE PROSECUTION TO A STANDARD HIGHER THAN THAT, KNOWING THAT AT SOME POSSIBLE PHASE DOWN THE LINE, YOU MIGHT BE CALLED UPON TO MAKE A DECISION ON THE DEATH PENALTY? MISS BLEVINS: COULD YOU RESTATE THAT? YOU GAVE SOME QUALIFICATIONS THERE.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. DURING THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL WHERE YOU WILL BE CALLED UPON TO MAKE A DETERMINATION --

THE COURT: ASK THAT QUESTION ON THE GENERAL VOIR DIRE. IT IS NOT APPLICABLE IN THIS PARTICULAR INSTANCE.

THIS IS A RESTRICTED HEARING ON THE HOVEY OUESTIONS. I WILL SUSTAIN MY OWN OBJECTION TO IT. LET'S GO ON TO SOMETHING ELSE.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, I AM TRYING TO FIND OUT WHETHER SHE WOULD HOLD THE PROSECUTION TO A HIGHER STANDARD BECAUSE IF SHE CANNOT GIVE THE PEOPLE A FAIR TRIAL IN THE GUILT PHASE, BECAUSE OF HER FEELINGS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY --

THE COURT: I JUST MADE A RULING ON THE QUESTION YOU ASKED. YOU CAN ASK SOMETHING ELSE NOW ALONG THE LINES YOU HAVE JUST OBJECTED.

Q BY MR. WAPNER: LET ME APPROACH IT THIS WAY. THE STANDARD OF PROOF FOR PROVING A CRIMINAL DEFENDANT GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY IS THE SAME IN ALL CRIMINAL CASES WHETHER THEY ARE DEATH PENALTY CASES OR OTHER CASES. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AND BECAUSE THIS IS A DEATH PENALTY CASE,
DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WOULD TAKE IT UPON YOURSELF TO IMPOSE
A HIGHER STANDARD ON THE PROSECUTION, KNOWING THAT YOU MIGHT
HAVE TO BE -- YOU MIGHT BE CALLED UPON TO DECIDE THE ISSUE
OF LIFE IMPRISONMENT OR DEATH AT SOME LATER TIME?

MISS BLEVINS: NO.

MR. WAPNER: OTHER THAN MAKING A DECISION WHEN YOU WENT TO THE BALLOT BOX SEVERAL YEARS AGO ON THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY, HAD YOU GIVEN THIS MUCH THOUGHT BEFORE YOU CAME TO COURT TODAY?

MISS BLEVINS: JUST A LITTLE, SINCE WE KNEW IT WAS -- SINCE YESTERDAY.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND DID YOU, SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN
THINKING ABOUT THIS SINCE YESTERDAY -- HAS ANYTHING OCCURRED
TO YOU THAT MAKES YOU THINK THAT YOU COULD NOT SIT ON THIS
KIND OF A CASE?

MISS BLEVINS: I WOULD RATHER NOT.

MR. WAPNER: WHY IS THAT?

MISS BLEVINS: BECAUSE I THINK IT IS A VERY RESPONSIBLE POSITION AND IT IS A BIG DECISION.

THE COURT: ARE YOU WILLING TO MAKE THAT DECISION, IF YOU ARE SELECTED AS A JUROR? IS THAT RIGHT?

MISS BLEVINS: I WOULD HAVE TO.

THE COURT: ANYTHING FURTHER?

MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU EVER SAT ON ANY KIND OF A SERIOUS

CASE BEFORE AS A JUROR?

MISS BLEVINS: NO.

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU WERE CALLED UPON TO MAKE A DECISION

ON THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY, ARE YOU GOING TO BE GUIDED 1 2 BY ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE EVIDENCE THAT IS PRESENTED IN THE 3 PENALTY PHASE AND THE LAW THAT THE JUDGE GIVES YOU TO APPLY 4 TO IT? 5 MISS BLEVINS: NO, OTHER THAN MY OWN INSTINCT, MY OWN 6 PERSON. 7 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THANK YOU. I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER. 8 I PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. 9 MR. BARENS: COULD WE APPROACH THE BENCH, YOUR HONOR? 10 THE COURT: YES. 11 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD AT 12 THE BENCH:) 13 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, AS I ANTICIPATE, YOU AND I MIGHT 14 DISAGREE FROM TIME TO TIME ON CAUSE. I DID NOT WANT TO BURN 15 OFF A JUROR THAT I MAY CHALLENGE FOR CAUSE IN FRONT OF THE 16 JUROR. 17 COULD YOU PLEASE ADOPT A POLICY, IF I HAVE A 18 CHALLENGE OF A JUROR, OF ASKING THE JUROR TO STEP OUTSIDE AND 19 ALLOWING US TO DISCUSS THE CHALLENGE, BEFORE --20 THE COURT: SURE. 21 MR. BARENS: I WOULD APPRECIATE IT IF YOU WOULD DO THAT 22 NOW. 23 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN 24 OPEN COURT:) 25 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MISS BLEVINS, WOULD YOU JUST --26 WE HAVE HAD SOME DISCUSSION. WOULD YOU MIND GOING OUTSIDE 27 FOR A MOMENT?

28

MISS BLEVINS: SURE.

1 2 3 4 5	(PROSPECTIVE COURTROOM.)	JUROR	BLEVINS	LEAVES	THE	
3 4 5	COURTROOM.)					
<b>4</b> 5						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24					ŧ	
25						
26						
27						
28						

- 1

(WHEREUPON, THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT:)

3

4

1

2

THE COURT: THE RECORD WILL INDICATE THAT MRS. BLEVINS HAS LEFT THE COURTROOM.

5

6

MRS. BLEVINS FOR CAUSE ON TWO BASES, ONE, SHE CLEARLY INDICATED

AN OVERRIDING CONCERN THAT SHE DID NOT BELIEVE THAT LIFE

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE DEFENSE WOULD CHALLENGE

7

8 WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE REALLY MEANS THAT, AND I

9

10 AND I BELIEVE THAT CLEARLY WOULD INHIBIT HER FROM ACTUALLY

11

THE OTHER THING THAT VERY MUCH CONCERNED ME, YOUR

CAN UNDERSTAND HER ORIENTATION IN THAT REGARD HISTORICALLY

10

HONOR, WAS HER RELUCTANCE OR INABILITY TO CANDIDLY DISCUSS

VOTING FOR LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

14

HER VIEWPOINT ON MANY OF THE QUESTIONS ASKED BOTH BY MYSELF
AND MR. WAPNER. I SUBMIT THAT IF MISS BLEVINS WERE ON TRIAL

15 16

FOR HER LIFE AND PROSPECTIVE JURORS WERE TO SAY TO HER COUNSEL,

17

"I CAN'T GIVE YOU AN ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION" OR "I DON'T KNOW

18

WHAT I WOULD DO" OR "I DON'T EVEN KNOW WHAT I THINK ABOUT THAT,"

19

THAT WOULD HARDLY BE A SATISFACTORY ANSWER WERE HER LIFE IN

20 21

I SUBMIT THAT THIS JUROR SHOULD BE REMOVED FOR CAUSE. YOUR HONOR.

22

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T THINK THAT IT IS

UNMISTAKABLY CLEARLY THAT SHE WOULD EITHER AUTOMATICALLY VOTE

FOR OR AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY AND I THINK THAT IS THE

2425

26 | STANDARD IN THIS CASE.

THE BALANCE.

27

SHE APPEARED TO ME TO BE A VERY SERIOUS AND CONTEMPLATIVE PERSON. SHE, CONTRARY TO WHAT COUNSEL HAS

- 2

VOTE FOR EITHER OF THE POSSIBLE PENALTIES, SAID THAT SHE MIGHT HAVE MORE DIFFICULTY VOTING FOR THE DEATH PENALTY BECAUSE IT WAS SO SERIOUS. BUT IN ANY EVENT, SHE DID NOT MAKE IT UNMISTAKABLY CLEAR THAT SHE WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER AND, THEREFORE, THE WITHERSPOON STANDARD HAS NOT BEEN MET.

THE COURT: I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THIS PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHOULD BE CHALLENGED FOR CAUSE. THERE DOESN'T EXIST ANY REASON WHY SHE SHOULD.

BRING HER BACK, PLEASE.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BLEVINS ENTERED

THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: MISS BLEVINS, WE HAVE YOUR TELEPHONE NUMBER, HAVEN'T WE?

THE CLERK: WE HAVE ALL OF THE PHONE NUMBERS, JUDGE.

THE COURT: IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT ABOUT DECEMBER 2ND WE WILL BE FINISHED WITH INTERROGATING ALL OF THE JURORS IN CONNECTION WITH EXACTLY THE SAME THINGS YOU HAVE BEEN ASKED. WHAT I AM GOING TO ASK YOU TO DO IS TO COME BACK ON DECEMBER 2ND, UNLESS YOU ARE NOTIFIED OTHERWISE, YOU COME TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AT 10:30 ON DECEMBER 2ND, ALL RIGHT? BY THAT TIME WE WILL HAVE FINISHED ASKING ALL OF THESE QUESTIONS, THE SAME QUESTIONS WE HAVE BEEN ASKING YOU.

MISS BLEVINS: ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: ASKING THE 80 OR MORE THAT WE HAVE LEFT.

MISS BLEVINS: OKAY, DECEMBER 2ND?

THE COURT: YES, DECEMBER 2ND.

MISS BLEVINS: WHAT TIME?
THE COURT: AT 10:30.
MISS BLEVINS: 10:30.
THE COURT: IN THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM, ALL RIGHT?
MISS BLEVINS: OKAY.
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU.
MISS BLEVINS: I AM TO LEAVE NOW?
THE COURT: YOU ARE TO LEAVE NOW, YES.
DON'T DISCUSS, MISS BLEVINS, DON'T DISCUSS WITH
ANYBODY ELSE WHAT TRANSPIRED.
(JUROR BLEVINS LEAVES THE COURTROOM.)
(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BORNE ENTERED
THE COURTROOM.)
THE BAILIFF: THIS IS MISS BORNE.
THE COURT: IS THAT MISS OR MRS.?
MRS. BORNE: MRS.
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MRS. BORNE, I AM GOING TO ASK
YOU A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS. I WANT YOU TO LISTEN VERY
CAREFULLY AND JUST ANSWER THE QUESTIONS YES OR NO, BECAUSE
THEY CALL FOR A YES OR NO ANSWER.
IN THE EVENT, HOWEVER, THAT YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND
IN THE EVENT, HOWEVER, THAT YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND  IT OR HAVEN'T HEARD IT OR IT IS UNCLEAR, I WILL REPEAT IT
IT OR HAVEN'T HEARD IT OR IT IS UNCLEAR, I WILL REPEAT IT
IT OR HAVEN'T HEARD IT OR IT IS UNCLEAR, I WILL REPEAT IT
IT OR HAVEN'T HEARD IT OR IT IS UNCLEAR, I WILL REPEAT IT
IT OR HAVEN'T HEARD IT OR IT IS UNCLEAR, I WILL REPEAT IT

7 – 3

4 F0

5

THE FIRST QUESTION I AM GOING TO ASK YOU IS:

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY

THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS

TO THE GUILT OR IMMOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MRS. BORNE: NO, 1 DON'T.

THE COURT: SECONDLY:

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY
THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN
WHEN THE PROSECUTION ONLY -- IF THE PROSECUTION ONLY PROVES
THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE OR
MANSLAUGHTER?

MRS. BORNE: NO, I DON'T.

THE COURT: THIRD:

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY
THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION
CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES
ALLEGED IN THIS CASE?

NOW, THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, AS I HAVE INDICATED TO ALL OF THE JURORS, IS THAT IF A MURDER IS COMMITTED AND IT IS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, IF IT IS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT IS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE WHICH CALLS FOR, IF FOUND, EITHER LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE DEATH PENALTY.

MRS. BORNE: RIGHT.

THE COURT: MY QUESTION IS: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION
REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING
AN IMPARTIAL DECISION CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY TO THE
SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE ALLEGED IN THIS CASE?

MRS. BORNE: NO.

THE COURT: OKAY, NOW FOURTHLY: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MRS. BORNE: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE

DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE

IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AFTER A VERDICT

OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE

PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MRS. BORNE: COULD YOU JUST REPEAT?

THE COURT: LET ME EXPLAIN IT FIRST: IF THE JURY FINDS
THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND FINDS
THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, NAMELY, THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING
THE COURSE OF THE ROBBERY, THEN THERE IS A SECOND PHASE WHICH
IS THE PENALTY PHASE WHERE THE JURY, ON HEARING A LOT OF OTHER
EVIDENCE IN CONNECTION WITH MITIGATING OR AGGRAVATING
CIRCUMSTANCES -- MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES IN FAVOR OF THE
DEFENDANT, HIS BACKGROUND AND SO ON AND SO FORTH AND
AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, OTHER THINGS THAT HE MIGHT HAVE
DONE THAT WERE BAD AND SO FORTH -- THEN THE JURY DETERMINES
ONE OF TWO THINGS: EITHER LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOU THE
POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE DEATH PENALTY, DO YOU UNDERSTAND
THAT?

1 MRS. BORNE: UH-HUH. 2 THE COURT: NOW, THE QUESTION IS: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN 3 OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT --4 5 MRS. BORNE: NO. 6 THE COURT: -- WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? 7 YOU WOULD LISTEN TO ALL OF THE TESTIMONY FIRST; 8 IS THAT CORRECT? 9 (WHEREUPON, PROSPECTIVE JUROR BORNE NODS 10 HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.) 11 THE COURT: AND LASTLY: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE 12 OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT OCCUR IN THIS CASE, AND 13 THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT 14 YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 15 MRS. BORNE: YES. 16 THE COURT: HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS 17 CASE OR HEARD ANYTHING OR DISCUSSED ANYTHING? 18 MRS. BORNE: NO. -- EXCUSE ME. I DIDN'T KNOW A THING 19 ABOUT IT UNTIL I HAPPENED TO GET TIME MAGAZINE. 20 THE COURT: I SEE. THEN YOU READ TIME MAGAZINE, THAT 21 IS THE SOURCE WHICH YOU READ; THAT IS YOUR ONLY SOURCE, IS 22 THAT CORRECT? 23 MRS. BORNE: YES, ABSOLUTELY. 24 25 26 27

THE COURT: CAN YOU SAY FROM WHAT YOU READ THAT YOU 1 FORMED ANY OPINION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THIS DEFENDANT? 2 3 MRS. BORNE: NO. THE COURT: YOU HAVE GOT AN OPEN MIND COMPLETELY, HAVE 4 YOU NOT? 5 6 (WHEREUPON, PROSPECTIVE JUROR BORNE NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.) 7 8 THE COURT: AND YOU WILL KEEP IT UNTIL THE CASE IS FINALLY PRESENTED TO YOU AND YOU DISCUSS IT IN THE JURY ROOM 9 10 WITH THE OTHER JURORS; IS THAT RIGHT? 11 MRS. BORNE: CORRECT. 12 THE COURT: WHATEVER YOU MIGHT HAVE READ, YOU CAN PUT 13 IT COMPLETELY OUT OF YOUR MIND BECAUSE IT MAY OR MAY NOT BE TRUE, WHAT YOU HAVE READ, AND THEREFORE YOU CAN BE GUIDED ONLY 14 15 BY THE EVIDENCE AS IT IS PRESENTED IN THIS CASE; ISN'T THAT 16 RIGHT? 17 MRS. BORNE: YES. 18 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 19 MR. BARENS: I WILL DEFER TO MR. CHIER IN THIS 20 INSTANCE, YOUR HONOR. 21 MR. CHIER: MISS, IS IT MISS? 22 MRS. BORNE: MRS. 23 MR. CHIER: MRS. BORNE, DO YOU SUBSCRIBE TO TIME 24 MAGAZINE, MA'AM? 25 MRS. BORNE: NO. 26 MR. CHIER: DO YOU BUY IT OFF THE NEWSSTAND? 27 MRS. BORNE: YES.

MR. CHIER: AND DO YOU BUY IT MORE OR LESS REGULARLY?

THE COURT: PARDON ME. I ANTICIPATE THIS WILL TAKE AT LEAST THROUGH 12 O'CLOCK AND WE HAVE TWO OTHER MATTERS THAT I HAVE GOT TO DISPOSE OF, SO WOULD YOU MIND COMING BACK THIS AFTERNOON, MRS. BORNE, AT 1:45?

> (WHEREUPON, PROSPECTIVE JUROR BORNE NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, 1:45, MRS. BORNE.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT I MIGHT NOT BE HERE THIS AFTERNOON AND MR. HUNT WOULD PERMIT THAT, ALTHOUGH I MIGHT WELL BE HERE.

> (DEFENDANT HUNT NODS HIS HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

(AT 11:45 A.M. A RECESS WAS TAKEN UNTIL 1:45 P.M. OF THE SAME DAY.)

1 SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1986; 1:55 P.M. 2 DEPARTMENT WEST C HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE 3 (APPEARANCES AS HERETOFORE NOTED.) 4 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DIDN'T WE HAVE SOMEBODY HERE 6 ON THE STAND? 7 MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR. I BLEIEVE IT IS MISS 8 BORNE. 9 THE COURT: BORNE? INCIDENTALLY, IN HOVEY AT PAGE 10 80, THE FOOTNOTE --11 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BORNE ENTERS THE 12 COURTROOM.) 13 THE COURT: WELL, I WILL READ IT TO YOU LATER. ALL 14 RIGHT. 15 MR. CHIER: MS. BORNE, I REPRESENT MR. HUNT, THE 16 DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE. AND I AM GOING TO ASK YOU SOME 17 QUESTIONS IN A FEW MINUTES WHICH IN SOME INSTANCES, MAY SEEM 18 SOMEWHAT PERSONAL. 19 AND I WANT YOU TO UNDERSTAND WHY YOU ARE HERE AND 20 WHY I AM HERE AND WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE. 21 WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE ESSENTIALLY, IS TRYING TO 22 FIND OUT IF YOU HAVE SUCH STRONG FEELINGS FOR OR AGAINST THE 23 DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD VOTE AUTOMATICALLY FOR DEATH 24 OR FOR GUILT OR AUTOMATICALLY AGAINST -- AUTOMATICALLY NOT 25 GUILTY AND AUTOMATICALLY FOR LIFE, IF YOU WERE SELECTED AS 26 A JUROR IN THIS CASE. 27 AND SO, THE QUESTIONS THAT THE JUDGE ASKED YOU

WERE BASICALLY TO FIND OUT 1F YOU HAD REALLY STRONG FEELINGS

ONE WAY OR THE OTHER ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY.

BUT BEFORE WE GET TO THAT ISSUE, I WANTED TO PICK UP WHERE WE LEFT OFF ON THE TIME MAGAZINE ISSUE AND TO REMIND YOU THAT MR. HUNT, THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE, IS BEING CHARGED WITH A CRIME THAT CALLS FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

THE COURT: I HAVE ALREADY INDICATED THAT TO HER. WILL YOU PLEASE GET TO THE QUESTIONS? WE DON'T NEED ALL OF THIS SUMMARY AT THE MOMENT.

JUST GO AHEAD AND ASK HER ANY QUESTIONS YOU THINK ARE PERTINENT.

```
1
           MR. CHIER: MRS. BORNE, YOU INDICATED THAT YOU ARE NOT
2
     A SUBSCRIBER TO TIME MAGAZINE.
3
           MS. BORNE: THAT'S CORRECT.
4
           MR. CHIER: AND AS WE LEFT THE MATTER AT THE NOON RECESS
5
     I HAD ASKED YOU WITH WHAT REGULARITY DO YOU READ THE MAGAZINE
6
     AND WHAT IS YOUR ANSWER?
7
           MS. BORNE: PERIODICALLY.
8
           MR. CHIER: PERIODICALLY.
9
           MS. BORNE: CAN I REPHRASE THAT? I AM SORRY.
10
           MR. CHIER: SURE.
11
          MS. BORNE: WE SUBSCRIBED FOR MANY, MANY, MANY YEARS
12
     UNTIL VERY RECENTLY.
13
          MR. CHIER: OKAY.
14
           MS. BORNE: AND WE JUST STOPPED OUR SUBSCRIPTION.
15
           MR. CHIER: WHAT AREA DO YOU LIVE -- DO YOU LIVE IN THE
16
     SANTA MONICA AREA?
17
          MS. BORNE: MARINA DEL REY.
18
          MR. CHIER: OKAY. DO YOU SUBSCRIBE TO ANY NEWS
19
     PUBLICATIONS ON A REGULAR BASIS?
20
          MS. BORNE: YES.
21
          MR. CHIER: NEWSPAPERS?
22
          MS. BORNE: NO.
23
          MR. CHIER: MAGAZINES?
24
          MS. BORNE: YES.
25
          MR. CHIER: WHICH MAGAZINES DO YOU SUBSCRIBE TO?
26
          MS. BORNE: U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT.
27
          MR. CHIER: AND?
28
          MS. BORNE: LADIES' MAGAZINES.
```

MR. CHIER: OKAY. 1 MS. BORNE: HOME DECORATING MAGAZINES. 2 MR. CHIER: OKAY. HOW ABOUT NEWS TYPE MAGAZINES LIKE 3 NEWS WEEK --4 THE COURT: THAT WILL COME IN PROPERLY ON A GENERAL VOIR 5 DIRE. I JUST WANT YOU TO RESTRICT YOUR QUESTIONS TO THOSE 6 WHICH HAVE TO DO WITH WITHERSPOON. LET'S GET TO 1T. 7 MR. CHIER: YOUR HONOR --8 THE COURT: DON'T ARGUE WITH ME. LET'S GET TO THOSE 9 QUESTIONS. 10 MR. CHIER: I UNDERSTAND THAT THE PUBLICITY WAS GOING 11 TO GO ALONG WITH IT. 12 THE COURT: WELL, JUST ASK HER IF SHE HAS READ ABOUT 13 IT. THAT IS AS FAR AS YOU CAN GO. DON'T ASK HER WHAT 14 MAGAZINES SHE READS AND WHAT THE CONTENTS OF THE MAGAZINE IS, 15 EXCEPT IF THESE MAGAZINES CONTAINED ARTICLES ABOUT THIS CASE. 16 MR. CHIER: COULD I ASK YOU, MRS. BORNE, DID YOU PICK 17 UP THE ISSUE OF TIME MAGAZINE BECAUSE SOMEBODY MENTIONED TO 18 YOU THERE MIGHT BE A STORY IN THERE --19 20 MS. BORNE: YES. MR. CHIER: -- CONCERNING A CASE THAT WAS GOING TO BE 21 22 TRIED IN SANTA MONICA? 23 MS. BORNE: YES. MR. CHIER: SO IT WAS OUT OF CURIOSITY, AS MUCH AS 24 25 ANYTHING --26 MS. BORNE: YES. 27 MR. CHIER: -- THAT YOU PICKED IT UP? I ASSUME THAT YOU READ THE ARTICLE? 28

1 MS. BORNE: HALF AND HALF. 2 MR. CHIER: HALF AND HALF? 3 DID YOU READ THE FIRST HALF BUT NOT THE SECOND 4 HALF? 5 MS. BORNE: YES. 6 MR. CHIER: DID YOU THINK THAT THERE WAS SOMETHING WRONG 7 IN WHAT YOU WERE DOING? 8 MS. BORNE: YES. BASICALLY, YES. 9 MR. CHIER: DID YOU THINK IT MIGHT DISQUALIFY YOU AS 10 A JUROR IN THIS CASE IF YOU WERE TO CONTINUE READING THE 11 ARTICLE? 12 MS. BORNE: NO. 13 I JUST PERSONALLY DIDN'T WANT TO KNOW ANY MORE. 14 MR. CHIER: HAVE YOU HEARD OTHER PEOPLE, EITHER IN YOUR 15 FAMILY OR YOUR FRIENDS, DISCUSSING THAT PARTICULAR ARTICLE? 16 MS. BORNE: NO. 17 MR. CHIER: HAVE YOU HEARD PEOPLE DISCUSSING THE CASE? 18 MS. BORNE: NO. 19 MR. CHIER: DO YOU FEEL THAT AS A RESULT OF READING AS 20 MUCH AS YOU DID IN THAT ARTICLE THAT YOU HAVE LEARNED ABOUT 21 THINGS WHICH MAY OR MAY NOT EVEN BE RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE, BE 22 ADMISSIBLE IN EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE? 23 DO YOU REMEMBER WHAT YOU READ? 24 LET ME WITHDRAW THAT QUESTION. 25 MS. BORNE: YES, BECAUSE I DIDN'T READ THE WHOLE ARTICLE. 26 MR. CHIER: OKAY, COULD YOU SUMMARIZE FOR US WHAT YOU 27 REMEMBER ABOUT THE ARTICLE OR THE PORTION OF IT THAT YOU READ? 28 MS. BORNE: YES.

MR. HUNT IS 27 YEARS OLD AND HE ENJOYED SKIING. THERE WAS SOMETHING ABOUT GOING TO ASPEN, HAVING PARTIES AND HE WAS INVOLVED IN SECURITIES AND I JUST KIND OF SKIMMED THROUGH IT AND REALLY DON'T RECALL TOO MUCH MORE. 

MR. CHIER: DID YOU TAKE THE MAGAZINE HOME AFTER YOU 1 BOUGHT IT? 2 MS. BORNE: NO. 3 MR. CHIER: DID YOU READ IT AT WORK? 4 MS. BORNE: NO. 5 MR. CHIER: WHERE DID YOU READ IT? 6 MS. BORNE: BOOKSTORE. 7 MR. CHIER: I SEE. DID YOU ACTUALLY BUY IT OR JUST 8 SORT OF THUMB THROUGH IT ON THE NEWSSTAND? MS. BORNE: IN THE NEWSSTAND. I NEED TO REPHRASE THAT. 10 THIS MORNING, I WAS TOTALLY NERVOUS. I DID NOT BUY THAT 11 MAGAZINE. 12 MR. CHIER: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. AND CAN I ASK YOU THIS. 13 14 WHEN YOU SAY SOMEBODY MENTIONED THAT THERE MIGHT BE A STORY IN THERE THAT WOULD HAVE SOME RELATIONSHIP TO A TRIAL THAT 15 16 WAS GOING TO BE HELD HERE IN SANTA MONICA, WAS THAT ANOTHER PROSPECTIVE JUROR IN THIS CASE, MRS. BORNE? 17 MS. BORNE: YES. IT COULD HAVE BEEN. 18 19 MR. CHIER: OKAY. 20 MS. BORNE: IT WAS HERE. 21 MR. CHIER: HERE IN THE COURTHOUSE? 22 MS. BORNE: UH-HUH. 23 MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. 24 MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES? 25 MS. BORNE: YES. EXCUSE ME. MR. CHIER: NOW, LET ME ASK YOU THIS. DO YOU WANT 26 27 TO BE A JUROR ON THIS CASE? THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU MEAN, "DOES SHE WANT TO"? WOULD 28

YOU BE WILLING TO SERVE IF YOU ARE SELECTED? 1 MS. BORNE: YES. 2 MR. CHIER: WOULD YOU LIKE TO SERVE ON THIS PARTICULAR 3 CASE AS A JUROR? 4 MS. BORNE: YES. 5 MR. CHIER: AND UNDERSTANDING THAT IT IS A CASE WHERE 6 THE DEATH PENALTY IS BEING REQUESTED BY THE PEOPLE, IS IT 7 STILL YOUR DESIRE TO SERVE ON THIS JURY? 8 MS. BORNE: YES. 9 MR. CHIER: DO YOU HAVE A POSITION ABOUT THE DEATH 10 PENALTY? 11 THE COURT: I HAVE ASKED THE SIX QUESTIONS WHICH HAVE 12 BEEN PROPOUNDED TO HER. SHE MADE ANSWERS TO THOSE. YOU 13 ARE ASKING THE SAME QUESTIONS. 14 MR. CHIER: NO I AM NOT. 15 THE COURT: YES YOU ARE. NOW, GET ON TO SOMETHING 16 ELSE. 17 MR. CHIER: I AM ASKING HER WHAT HER ATTITUDE IS. 18 THE COURT: I ASKED THOSE QUESTIONS. DO YOU WANT ME 19 TO REREAD THEM TO HER AGAIN? 20 MR. CHIER: NO. THEY DON'T MEAN ANYTHING TO ME. 21 THE COURT: THEN, YOU BETTER GO OUT AND LEARN ABOUT 22 IT FIRST BEFORE YOU ASK FURTHER QUESTIONS. 23 YOU ARE THE ONES WHO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS FOR 24 ME TO ASK. 25 MR. CHIER: I DON'T THINK THEY MEAN ANYTHING TO THE 26 JURORS IN THAT CONTEXT AND --27

THE COURT: WELL, I DON'T CARE WHAT YOU THINK THEY

MEAN. YOU ASK OUESTIONS WHICH ARE PERTINENT. 1 2 FOLLOW MR. BARENS' LEAD AND ASK THE QUESTIONS 3 THE WAY HE DID. WE'LL GET SOMEWHERE. 4 MR. CHIER: DO YOU BELIEVE IN THE DEATH PENALTY? 5 THE COURT: PARDON ME? DO YOU BELIEVE IN THE DEATH 6 PENALTY? 7 MS. BORNE: YES I DO. 8 MR. CHIER: AND DO YOU BELIEVE -- DO YOU HAVE A BELIEF 9 AS TO WHEN IT IS APPROPRIATE TO INVOKE THE DEATH PENALTY 10 AND/OR WHEN THE DEATH PENALTY IS PARTICULARLY APPROPRIATE? 11 WHEN DO YOU THINK THE DEATH PENALTY IS PARTICULARLY APPROPRIATE? 12 MS. BORNE: WHEN SOMEONE IS PROVEN GUILTY. 13 MR. CHIER: OF WHAT? 14 MS. BORNE: OF WHAT THE TRIAL IS STANDING -- WHAT THEY 15 ARE STANDING FOR, WITHOUT TOTAL PROOF. 16 MR. CHIER: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT IN ALMOST EVERY CASE 17 WHERE IT IS PROVEN THAT A PERSON COMMITTED A MURDER IN THE 18 FIRST DEGREE, THAT THE DEATH PENALTY IS APPROPRIATE? 19 MS. BORNE: NO. 20 MR. CHIER: NOW IF A PERSON IS PROVED GUILTY OF MURDER 21 IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THAT MEANS THAT THERE IS NO SELF-DEFENSE 22 INVOLVED. THERE IS NO HEAT OF PASSION. IT MEANS THAT IT 23 WAS FOR THE MOST PART, A PREMEDITATED ACT. 24 DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 25 MS. BORNE: YES. 26 MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. NOW, IS IT YOUR BELIEF THAT 27 THE DEATH PENALTY IS NOT APPROPRIATE IN CASES WHERE ANOTHER 28

PERSON IS KILLED BY A DEFENDANT, IF THERE IS SOME ELEMENT

- 3

```
1
     OF SELF-DEFENSE OR HEAT OF PASSION? DO YOU UNDERSTAND MY
2
     QUESTION?
3
           MS. BORNE: WOULD YOU JUST REPEAT IT, PLEASE?
4
           MR. CHIER: LET ME SEE IF I CAN REPHRASE IT.
5
          MS. BORNE: YES.
6
          MR. CHIER: HAVE YOU EVER READ A STORY IN THE NEWSPAPER
7
     WHERE IT REPORTED A CRIMINAL ACT OF SOME KIND OR ANOTHER,
8
     A VIOLENT ACT?
9
           MS. BORNE: YES.
10
          MR. CHIER: AND YOU SAID TO YOURSELF, THAT PERSON OUGHT
11
     TO GET THE DEATH PENALTY?
12
          MS. BORNE: YES.
13
          MR. CHIER: HAVE YOU EVER SAID THAT?
14
          MS. BORNE: YES.
15
          MR. CHIER:
                       WHAT TYPES OF CASES CAUSE YOU TO REACT
16
     THAT WAY WHEN READING ABOUT THEM IN THE PAPER?
17
          MS. BORNE: THE NIGHT STALKER.
18
          MR. CHIER: THE NIGHT STALKER? OKAY.
19
                 DO YOU SUBSCRIBE TO OR BELONG TO ANY GROUP OR
20
     ORGANIZATION WHICH AS AN ORGANIZATION, HAS A POLICY FOR OR
21
     AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY?
22
          MS. BORNE: NO I DON'T.
23
          MR. CHIER: DO YOU FEEL, MS. BORNE, THAT THE FACT THAT
24
    THE DEATH PENALTY IS BEING ASKED FOR IN THIS CASE, WOULD
25
     CAUSE YOU TO BE MORE INCLINED TO VOTE GUILTY ON THE ISSUE
26
     OF GUILT OR INNOCENCE BEFORE EVEN REACHING --
27
          MS. BORNE: ABSOLUTELY NOT.
```

MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE

\_\_ 1.

```
ALTERNATIVE TO DEATH IN THIS CASE, IS LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY
     OF PAROLE? THAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE.
2
3
          MS. BORNE: YES.
          MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU HAVE ANY BELIEF OR
4
5
     SUSPICION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT DEATH (SIC) WITHOUT POSSIBILITY
6
     OF PAROLE ACTUALLY MEANS WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR
7
     DO YOU HAVE A LINGERING DOUBT AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THAT PERSON
8
     MIGHT GET OUT AT SOME FUTURE DATE IF THAT WERE THE PENALTY?
9
           MS. BORNE: I WOULD BELIEVE THAT WOULD BE THE PENALTY
10
     AS STATED IN THE BEGINNING.
11
          MR. CHIER: AS STATED?
12
          MS. BORNE: AS STATED.
13
          MR. CHIER: WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?
14
          MS. BORNE: (THERE WAS NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.)
15
          MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME. IS THAT YES?
16
          MS. BORNE: YES.
17
           MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, MAYBE SO THE WITNESS IS CLEAR
18
     ON WHY WE ARE INTERRUPTING HER, IF YOU COULD JUST INSTRUCT
19
     HER TO ANSWER OUT LOUD SO THE REPORTER CAN TAKE IT DOWN?
20
          THE COURT: YES. DO THAT.
21
          MS. BORNE: THANK YOU.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

1 FO

1 MR. CHIER: DID YOU VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, MRS. 2 BORNE? 3 MS. BORNE: YES. 4 THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE NOW. 5 MR. CHIER: PARDON ME, YOUR HONOR? 6 THE COURT: YOU MEAN WHEN IT WAS ON THE BALLOT. IS THAT 7 WHAT YOU ARE ASKING? 8 MR. CHIER: YES, YOUR HONOR. 9 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 10 MR. CHIER: AND DID YOU READ ANY OF THE LEGISLATIVE 11 MATERIALS THAT WENT ALONG WITH THAT PARTICULAR ISSUE ON THE 12 BALLOT TO SEE IN WHICH CASES THE DEATH PENALTY WOULD BE 13 APPLICABLE AND WHICH CASES IT WOULDN'T OR, ON THE OTHER HAND, 14 DID YOU THINK IT WAS JUST A GOOD IDEA TO HAVE A DEATH PENALTY 15 AS OPPOSED TO NOT HAVING ONE? 16 MS. BORNE: 1 THOUGHT IT WAS A GOOD IDEA. 17 MR. CHIER: TO HAVE A DEATH PENALTY? 18 MS. BORNE: YES, AS OPPOSED TO NOT HAVING ONE. 19 MR. CHIER: DID YOU THINK IT WAS A GOOD IDEA TO HAVE 20 THE DEATH PENALTY BECAUSE YOU WERE CONCERNED WITH THE AMOUNT 21 OF VIOLENT CRIME THAT WAS --22 MS. BORNE: YES. 23 MR. CHIER: -- TAKING PLACE? 24 MS. BORNE: YES. 25 MR. CHIER: AND DID YOU THINK IT WAS A GOOD IDEA TO HAVE 26 THE DEATH PENALTY BECAUSE OF THE AMOUNT OF STREET CRIME THAT 27 YOU WERE READING ABOUT AND SEEING ON TELEVISION? 28

MS. BORNE: YES.

MR. CHIER: OKAY. AND IT IS ALLEGED IN THIS CASE THAT JOE HUNT KILLED A PERSON BY THE NAME OF RON LEVIN IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

AND THE REST OF YOUR FELLOW JURORS CAN COME TO A UNANIMOUS DECISION AND FIND THAT MR. HUNT IS GUILTY OF THE FIRST DEGREE MURDER OF MR. LEVIN, WOULD YOU AT THAT POINT, WITHOUT HEARING ANY ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE ABOUT MR. HUNT, BE MORE OR LESS -- WOULD YOU BE INCLINED TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY IF YOU WERE TO DELIBERATE ON THE PENALTY AT THAT MOMENT?

THE COURT: YOU MEAN IF SHE FELT THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE TO BE TRUE?

MR. CHIER: YES.

THE COURT: THAT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MR. CHIER: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ASSUMING THAT YOU FOUND THAT

HE HAD COMMITTED THIS MURDER AND THAT IT WAS IN COURSE OF A

ROBBERY, AND THEN THERE WOULD BE THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE -
WELL, THEN THE NEXT PHASE IS THE PENALTY PHASE, YOU UNDERSTAND

THAT, DON'T YOU?

MS. BORNE: YES.

THE COURT: NOW WHAT IS YOUR QUESTION ON THAT?

MR. CHIER: WOULD YOU --

MS. BORNE: EXCUSE ME. THE QUESTION WAS WOULD I BE --

MR. CHIER: WOULD YOU FEEL THAT AT THAT POINT IN TIME,

HAVING NOW FOUND THAT THE MURDER OCCURRED --

MS. BORNE: YES.

MR. CHIER: -- THAT THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE TRUE

THAT IT OCCURRED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WOULD YOU AT THAT

POINT BE MORE INCLINED TO VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY THAN LIFE

WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. THAT IS AN UNFAIR QUESTION.

IF YOU WERE TO FIND HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND YOU FIND THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE TRUE, NAMELY, THAT IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN WE HAVE THE SECOND PHASE AND THAT IS THE PENALTY.

MR. CHIER: THE PENALTY PHASE, YES.

THE COURT: THE PENALTY PHASE, AND DURING THE PENALTY

PHASE OF THE CASE A LOT OF EVIDENCE CAN BE SUBMITTED ON BOTH

SIDES IN MITIGATION OF THE DEFENSE, IN OTHER WORDS, HIS

CHARACTER, HIS BACKGROUND AND EVERYTHING THAT MAY BE

CONSIDERED IN MITIGATION OR IN AGGRAVATION, ANY OTHER OFFENSES

HE MAY HAVE COMMITTED; DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. BORNE: YES.

THE COURT: AND YOU WILL WAIT UNTIL YOU HEAR ALL OF THAT TESTIMONY BEFORE YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND AS TO WHETHER YOU CAN SAY --

MS. BORNE: ABSOLUTELY, YES.

THE COURT: -- "I WILL PUT HIM TO DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER?"

MR. CHIER: SO YOU BELIEVE THAT THERE CAN BE FACTORS
THAT WOULD MITIGATE AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY, EVEN THOUGH
A PERSON COMMITTED A MURDER?

MS. BORNE: YES.

MR. CHIER: WHAT TYPE OF FACTORS WOULD YOU THINK MIGHT

26

27

28

MITIGATE AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY IN YOUR MIND, I MEAN AS FAR AS YOUR PERSONAL BELIEFS ARE CONCERNED? MS. BORNE: IN MY PERSONAL BELIEFS WOULD BE THE CIRCUMSTANCES AROUND THE WHOLE CASE, WHAT WOULD PROBABLY COME OUT IN COURT, THE REASONS, BEING UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES. MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. WOULD YOU FEEL THAT THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT MIGHT HAVE ANY BEARING ON IT? THE COURT: YOU MUST CONSIDER ALL OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES, HIS AGE, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS EDUCATION AND HIS PRIOR RECORD. MODE OF LIVING AND EVERYTHING ELSE. YOU HAVE TO CONSIDER EVERYTHING THAT MIGHT BE BROUGHT UP IN THE TRIAL. THOSE WHICH ARE FAVORABLE TO HIM AND ALSO ALL OF THE THINGS THAT ARE UNFAVORABLE TO HIM. YOU WILL BE LISTENING TO ALL OF THAT AND THEN YOU WILL MAKE UP YOUR MIND; ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU ARE MS. BORNE: ABSOLUTELY. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. CHIER: WOULD YOU CONSIDER WHETHER THE PERSON HAD ANY PRIOR CRIMINAL BACKGROUND THAT MIGHT HAVE ANY BEARING ON WHETHER HE LIVED OR DIED, ASSUMING THAT YOU FIND HIM GUILTY MR. CHIER: WOULD YOU CONSIDER WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT FELT MORALLY JUSTIFIED TO SOME EXTENT, WOULD YOU

MS. BORNE: I BELIEVE ALL FACTORS ARE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION.

CONSIDER THAT AS A FACTOR IN MITIGATION?

MR. CHIER: AFTER A CONSIDERATION OF ALL OF THE FACTORS 1 IN MITIGATION AND IN AGGRAVATION, THAT IS, ALL OF THE BAD 2 THINGS AND ALL OF THE GOOD THINGS, WHAT IT REALLY COMES DOWN 3 TO AS TO WHETHER A PERSON SHOULD LIVE OR DIE, MRS. BORNE, THE 5 BOTTOM LINE, WHAT DO YOU THINK REALLY MATTERS? MS. BORNE: OH, ON THE FACTS, THE TRUE FACTS THAT WE 6 7 HAVE BEEN ABLE TO OBTAIN AS FACTS, YOU KNOW, AS TRUE. 8 MR. CHIER: RIGHT, WE ARE ASSUMING THAT THE FACTS --9 MS. BORNE: OH --MR. CHIER: -- SURROUN DING THE OFFENSE --10 11 MS. BORNE: ARE CORRECT, YES. 12 MR. CHIER: -- ASSUMING THOSE FACTS ARE FOUND BY THE JURY TO BE TRUE, DO YOU BELIEVE IF THE JURY HAS FOUND ALL OF 13 14 THE FACTS TO BE TRUE AS ALLEGED BY THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY, THAT 15 THE PERSON SHOULD DIE? 16 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT TO THAT. IT IS 17 ACTUALLY ASKING HER TO PRE-JUDGE THE EVIDENCE. THE COURT: I AM WAITING FOR AN OBJECTION ON YOUR PART. 18 19 I DON'T WANT TO MAKE THEM ALL MYSELF. MR. WAPNER: SHE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT ALL OF THE FACTS ARE. 20 21 I DON'T THINK IT IS POSSIBLE FOR HER TO KNOW THE ANSWER TO 22 THAT QUESTION. 23 THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THAT OBJECTION. 24 25 26

2

27

1 MR. CHIER: HAVE YOU EVER KNOWN -- HOW LONG HAVE YOU KNOWN THAT YOU WERE GOING TO BE A PROSPECTIVE JUROR IN THE 2 3 DEATH PENALTY CASE, MRS. --4 THE COURT: WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES THAT MAKE? MR. CHIER: WELL, IT IS JUST A PRELIMINARY QUESTION. 5 THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION ON THE COURT'S 6 7 OWN MOTION. 8 THERE CAN ONLY BE A LIMITED INQUIRY WITH RESPECT TO IT AT THIS TIME. IT IS ONLY WHEN THE JURORS ARE IN THE 9 10 BOX AND FOR GENERAL VOIR DIRE THAT YOU CAN ASK A NUMBER OF THESE QUESTIONS. 11 12 BUT THIS IS STRICTLY LIMITED TO THEIR ATTITUDES 13 TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY. THAT IS ALL. 14 MR. CHIER: I JUST WANTED TO ASK MRS. BORNE IF SHE 15 HAD HAD AN OPPORTUNITY LAST WEEK OR SOMETIME TO THINK ABOUT 16 HER ATTITUDE TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY AND --17 THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION TO THAT. LET'S 18 GO ON, WILL YOU? 19 MR. CHIER: HAVE YOU DISCUSSED YOUR ATTITUDE WITH OTHER 20 PEOPLE, MRS. BORNE? 21 MS. BORNE: MY HUSBAND. 22 THE COURT: WELL, YOU UNDERSTAND MRS. BORNE, THAT IF 23 YOU ARE SELECTED AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE AND YOU ARE SWORN, 24 THEN YOU ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT ANYTHING 25 ABOUT THE CASE. DO YOU KNOW THAT? DON'T YOU? 26 MS. BORNE: YES. 27 THE COURT: IT IS ALL RIGHT FOR YOU TO DISCUSS IT WITH

28

YOUR HUSBAND.

MR. CHIER: WAS YOUR HUSBAND AWARE OF THE ARTICLE IN 1 TIME MAGAZINE? 2 THE COURT: WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES THAT MAKE? I WILL 3 SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION. LET'S GET ON, PLEASE. 4 MR. CHIER: DID YOU AND YOUR HUSBAND DISCUSS THE ARTICLE 5 IN TIME MAGAZINE, MRS. BORNE? 6 MS. BORNE: NO. 7 MR. CHIER: DO YOU KNOW WHETHER YOUR HUSBAND SUBSCRIBES 8 9 TO NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE --THE COURT: YOU DON'T HAVE TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION. 10 WHAT IS THE NEXT QUESTION? DID YOU SEE ANY ARTICLE IN 11 12 NEWSWEEK ABOUT THIS CASE? 13 MS. BORNE: SORRY? THE COURT: DID YOU SEE ANY ARTICLE IN NEWSWEEK ABOUT 14 15 THE CASE? MS. BORNE: NO. 16 THE COURT: LET'S GET ON. 17 MR. CHIER: MAY I HAVE A MOMENT, YOUR HONOR? 18 19 THE COURT: SURELY. 20 (THERE WAS A BRIEF PAUSE.) MR. CHIER: CAN YOU TELL ME PLEASE, MRS. BORNE, WITHOUT 21 22 HAVING ANY INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE COURT AND NOT HEARING 23 ANYTHING, ANY FACTS ABOUT THE CASE OTHER THAN WHAT YOU MIGHT 24 KNOW FROM THE TIME MAGAZINE ARTICLE, BUT JUST YOUR OWN PERSONAL 25 FEELINGS AT THIS TIME, WHETHER IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO SENTENCE SOMEBODY TO LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND 26

WHEN IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO SENTENCE SOMEBODY TO DEATH?

MS. BORNE: SORRY? PAROLE AND --

27

MR. CHIER: WHAT WOULD MAKE THE DIFFERENCE IN YOUR 1 2 MIND, AS TO WHETHER SOMEBODY WAS TO GET LIFE WITHOUT 3 POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE DEATH PENALTY, MRS. BORNE? 4 MS. BORNE: THAT'S A VERY HARD QUESTION TO ANSWER. 5 MR. CHIER: I UNDERSTAND THAT. 6 THE COURT: YOU DON'T HAVE TO ANSWER IT, IF THAT IS 7 YOUR BEST ANSWER. 8 LET'S GO ON TO SOMETHING ELSE. 9 MR. CHIER: ARE YOU WILLING TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION, 10 MRS. BORNE? THE COURT: SHE SAYS IT IS A HARD QUESTION TO ANSWER. 11 12 MR. CHIER: WELL, IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT SHE IS UNWILLING. 13 THE COURT: IF IT IS A HARD QUESTION TO ANSWER, SHE 14 DOESN'T KNOW HOW. LET'S GET ON. 15 MR. CHIER: EVEN HARD QUESTIONS CAN BE ANSWERED. 16 MS. BORNE: I WOULD RATHER NOT ANSWER THAT WITHOUT 17 HAVING SOME FACTS TO GO WITH. 1 JUST --18 MR. CHIER: WELL, DO YOU HAVE ANY GUT FEELINGS ABOUT 19 WHEN THE DEATH PENALTY SHOULD BE RETURNED AND WHEN LIFE 20 IMPRISONMENT IS APPROPRIATE? HOW DO YOU EMOTIONALLY --21 MS. BORNE: EMOTIONALLY, I BELIEVE PERHAPS THAT --22 TO MAKE IT THE QUICKEST WAY, IF SOMEBODY JUST UNMERCIFULLY 23 KILLS PEOPLE AT RANDOM ON THE STREET OR DURING A PHYSICAL 24 ATTACK OR A RAPE ATTACK, GETTING LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE WOULD 25 BE PERHAPS FOR SOMEBODY MENTALLY INCOMPETENT WHO IS COMMITTING 26 CRIMES AND --27 THE COURT: A SERIAL MURDERER? BUT IN ANY EVENT, 28 MRS. BORNE, IN THE LONG RUN, YOU WILL BE GUIDED BY THE COURT'S

INSTRUCTIONS? WOULD YOU NOT?

MS. BORNE: YES.

THE COURT: AS TO WHAT IS TO BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION
BEFORE YOU DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT HE IS GUILTY OF FIRST
DEGREE MURDER OR WHETHER THERE IS SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES AND
WHETHER OR NOT THERE ARE ANY MITIGATING OR AGGRAVATING
CIRCUMSTANCES IN CONNECTION WITH IT? IS THAT RIGHT?

MS. BORNE: YES.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. CHIER: WE ALL ASSUME THAT YOU WOULD FOLLOW THE INSTRUCTIONS, IF SELECTED AS A JUROR, MRS. BORNE.

WHAT I AM REALLY INQUIRING ABOUT, IS YOUR EMOTIONALITY TOWARDS THE DEATH PENALTY WHICH IS DIFFERENT FROM YOUR FOLLOWING THE INSTRUCTIONS.

THE DEATH PENALTY IS MORE APPROPRIATE IN CASES OF SERIAL MURDER, RANDOM MURDERERS, SENSELESS KILLINGS AND THAT TYPE OF THING?

MS. BORNE: THAT TYPE OF THING. I AM NOT THAT FAMILIAR WITH THE TYPES OF KILLINGS.

MR. CHIER: I UNDERSTAND. BUT CERTAINLY, YOU KNOW WHEN YOU READ THE NEWSPAPERS OR SEE THE NEWS, WE ALL HAVE REACTIONS.

MS. BORNE: YES. THAT IS MY --

MR. CHIER: ABOUT THE TYPE OF PERSON THAT IS ARRESTED AND IF TRUE, THEN WE FEEL THAT IN CERTAIN CASES, THE PEOPLE OUGHT TO DIE?

MS. BORNE: RIGHT.

MR. CHIER: I MEAN, WE ARE ALL HUMAN. I AM SURE YOU 1 2 HAVE HAD THOSE EXPERIENCES AS WELL AS I. 3 AND DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO RETURN, 4 IF YOU FOUND THE DEFENDANT ~- THIS ALL ASSUMES THAT YOU FIND 5 THE DEFENDANT GUILTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND? 6 IF YOU FIND THE DEFENDANT NOT GUILTY, THEN OF 7 COURSE. THE PROBLEM IS ENDED AT THAT POINT. SO ALL OF THAT 8 ASSUMES THAT THE DEFENDANT IS FOUND GUILTY AS CHARGED AND THAT THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE TRUE. 10 DO YOU FEEL THAT -- I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, 11 YOUR HONOR. I PASS FOR CAUSE AT THIS POINT. 12 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS? 13 MR. WAPNER: YES, BRIEFLY. 14 MRS BORNE, AFTER YOU READ WHATEVER PORTION OF 15 THE TIME MAGAZINE ARTICLE THAT YOU READ, DID YOU FORM ANY 16 OPINIONS ABOUT THIS CASE? 17 MS. BORNE: NO. I CERTAINLY DID NOT. 18 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. 19 MS. BORNE: MAY I JUST SAY THAT TO ME, IT IS A ONE 20 PERSON VIEWPOINT OF WHATEVER YOU READ. 21 THE COURT: THAT IS ALL WE ARE INTERESTED IN, JUST 22 YOUR POINT OF VIEW. 23 MR. WAPNER: YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT THE PERSON THAT 24 THE ARTICLE REFLECTS THE POINT OF VIEW -- OF THE PERSON WHO 25 WROTE IT? IS THAT RIGHT? 26 MS. BORNE: YES. 27 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND OTHER THAN WHAT YOU MAY HAVE

READ IN THAT ARTICLE, HAVE YOU HEARD ANYTHING ELSE ABOUT

1 THE CASE? 2 MS. BORNE: JUST MUMBLINGS WHEN --3 THE COURT: EXCEPT WHAT I INDICATED TO YOU WHEN ALL 4 OF THE JURORS WERE TOGETHER AND WE TOLD YOU WHAT THE CASE 5 WAS ALL ABOUT? 6 MS. BORNE: I HAVE NOT HEARD IT ON THE NEWS OR ~-7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 8 MR. WAPNER: YOU WERE SAYING ABOUT MUMBLING --9 MS. BORNE: ON THE FIRST DAY WE WERE CALLED THAT I 10 REPORTED TO JURY DUTY, SOMEBODY MENTIONED THAT IT WAS A BIG 11 CASE COMING UP. 12 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. YOU SAID THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO 13 SERVE ON THIS CASE. WHY IS THAT? 14 THE COURT: THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH WITHERSPOON. 15 I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION. 16 MR. CHIER: YOUR HONOR, MAY I BE HEARD WITH RESPECT 17 TO THAT? 18 THE COURT: NO. 19 MR. CHIER: I REQUEST PERMISSION TO BE HEARD. 20 THE COURT: AFTER THE JUROR IS GONE, I WILL LET YOU 21 MAKE YOUR OBJECTION FOR THE RECORD. 22 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I ASSUME THAT THE COURT IS 23 STATING THAT IS A QUESTION THAT IS MORE APPROPRIATE 24 AFTER --25 THE COURT: APPROPRIATELY ASKED ON THE GENERAL VOIR 26 DIRE. 27 MR. WAPNER: ON THE GENERAL VOIR DIRE. THANK YOU. 28

DID YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT THE JUDGE WAS EXPLAINING

TO YOU? I BELIEVE IT WAS YESTERDAY, ABOUT THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF THE TRIAL OR DO YOU UNDERSTAND NOW? MS. BORNE: BETTER. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL WHERE YOU MAKE A DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY OF THE MURDER AND WHETHER OR NOT THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE TRUE, IS A DECISION THAT YOU MAKE WITHOUT REGARD TO THE POSSIBLE PUNISHMENT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? MS. BORNE: OKAY. NO. THANK YOU. THAT CLEARS THAT UP. 

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WHAT THAT MEANS IS, THAT IF YOU ARE CHOSEN TO SERVE AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE AND YOU SIT AND LISTEN TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AND THEN THE JUDGE TELLS YOU --GIVES YOU THE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE LAW AND HE TELLS YOU TO GO INTO THE JURY ROOM, ONE OF THE THINGS HE IS GOING TO TELL YOU IS THAT WHEN YOU MAKE A DECISION ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED THIS CRIME, YOU HAVE TO MAKE THAT DECISION WITHOUT ANYTHING ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO THE DEFENDANT IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BORNE: YES I DO.

MR. WAPNER: AND IF THE JUDGE TELLS YOU THAT, CAN YOU FOLLOW THAT INSTRUCTION?

MS. BORNE: YES I CAN.

MR. WAPNER: DOES THAT MAKE SENSE TO YOU?

MS. BORNE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT HE IS BASICALLY TELLING YOU IS, THAT IN THE TRIAL TO DECIDE WHETHER THE DEFENDANT DID THIS CRIME OR WHETHER HE DIDN'T, YOU ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO THINK ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO HIM AT SOME POINT LATER ON. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BORNE: YES I DO.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. YOU KNOW NOW WHAT -- AND YOU OF COURSE WILL KNOW IF YOU ARE SITTING AS A JUROR IN THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THAT SHOULD THE DEFENDANT BE CONVICTED, YOU ARE GOING TO BE CALLED UPON TO DECIDE THE QUESTION OF WHETHER HE SHOULD GET LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE DEATH PENALTY. RIGHT? YOU KNOW THAT?

THAT IS IN YOUR MIND, AT LEAST THAT THAT MIGHT HAPPEN? RIGHT? MS. BORNE: THAT MIGHT HAPPEN. MR. WAPNER: KNOWING THAT THAT MIGHT HAPPEN, WOULD YOU REQUIRE ME -- WOULD YOU REQUIRE THE PEOPLE TO MEET A HIGHER STANDARD OF PROOF THAN YOU WOULD REQUIRE IN SOME OTHER CASE? MR. BARENS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: SORRY. WOULD YOU READ THE QUESTION BACK? MR. WAPNER: MAYBE I CAN REPHRASE IT BECAUSE I THINK IT IS THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE COIN OF A QUESTION THAT MR. CHIER ASKED. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. WAPNER: I THINK MR. CHIER ASKED YOU WHETHER OR NOT YOU WOULD BE MORE LIKELY TO CONVICT THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE BECAUSE OF THE POSSIBILITY THAT THERE IS A DEATH PENALTY INVOLVED. DO YOU REMEMBER HIM ASKING YOU QUESTIONS SOMETHING LIKE THAT? MS. BORNE: SOMETHING LIKE THAT. 

3 FO

MR. WAPNER: WHAT I WANT TO KNOW IS, WOULD YOU BE MORE
LIKELY TO ACQUIT THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE BECAUSE THE
POSSIBILITY EXISTS THAT THERE IS A DEATH PENALTY QUESTION DOWN
THE ROAD?

MS. BORNE: NO, SIR.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IF YOU SHOULD GET TO THE PENALTY PHASE OF THIS TRIAL AND YOU WERE REQUIRED TO DELIBERATE ON WHETHER OR NOT THE PENALTY, DEATH OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, THAT THAT DECISION WOULD HAVE TO BE MADE INDIVIDUALLY BY YOU AS WELL AS INDIVIDUALLY BY 11 OTHER PEOPLE?

MS. BORNE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: ARE YOU CAPABLE OF MAKING THAT DECISION?

MS. BORNE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY RESERVATIONS ABOUT THAT?

MS. BORNE: NO.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, PASS FOR CAUSE?

MR. BARENS: PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MRS. BORNE.

YOU KNOW WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO IS GO THROUGH THIS WHOLE

PROCEDURE THAT WE HAVE GONE THROUGH WITH YOU AND ALL OF THE

OTHER PROSPECTIVE JURORS WHO HAVE BEEN SUMMONED IN THIS CASE

AND THAT WILL TAKE SOME TIME, OBVIOUSLY. YOU SEE HOW LONG

IT HAS TAKEN WITH YOU. SO WHAT WE WILL DO IS TO ASK YOU TO

COME BACK -- WHAT IS IT, NOVEMBER 2ND?

MR. BARENS: DECEMBER, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: I AM SORRY. DECEMBER 2ND, COME BACK ON

WAS APPROPRIATE.

1 DECEMBER 2ND. GO TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AND YOU BE THERE 2 AT 10:30. DECEMBER 2ND, MAKE A NOTE OF THAT, AT 10:30. 3 IF THERE IS ANY CHANGE OF ANY KIND, WE WILL 4 CALL YOU. WE HAVE GOT YOUR TELEPHONE NUMBER. 5 INCIDENTALLY, DON'T TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT WHAT 6 HAS HAPPENED HERE. 7 MS. BORNE: OH, NO, I WON'T. 8 MR. WAPNER: IN THIS CONNECTION, ALTHOUGH OBVIOUSLY THE 9 JUROR IS PRETTY WELL AWARE, WOULD YOU CAUTION HER, AS WELL 10 AS THE OTHER JURORS, NOT TO READ ANYTHING OR TO LISTEN TO 11 ANYTHING HAVING TO DO WITH THIS CASE? 12 MS. BORNE: OH, NO, I WOULD NOT. I HAVE BEEN ON A JURY 13 BEFORE. 14 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU HAVE BEEN ON A JURY BEFORE? 15 MS. BORNE: YES. 16 THE COURT: YOU ARE ADMONISHED NOT TO TALK TO ANYBODY 17 ABOUT THIS CASE OR TO READ ANYTHING ABOUT IT OR LISTEN TO 18 ANYTHING ABOUT IT. 19 (WHEREUPON, PROSPECTIVE BORNE EXISTS THE 20 COURTROOM.) 21 (WHEREUPON THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE 22 HELD WITHOUT THE PRESENCE AND HEARING OF 23 ANY PROSPECTIVE JUROR:) 24 MR. BARENS: WE HAD THE MATTER OF THAT ONE QUESTION, 25 YOUR HONOR. 26 THE COURT: YES, GO AHEAD. 27 MR. CHIER: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE MR. WAPNER'S QUESTION

THE COURT: HOLD IT ONE MINUTE, PAT.

THE BAILIFF: YES, YOUR HONOR.

PARTICULAR JUROR, KNOWING THAT THIS IS A DEATH PENALTY CASE,
WANTS TO OR IS ANXIOUS TO SERVE ON THIS JURY, I THINK THAT
IS HIGHLY PROBATIVE AND HIGHLY RELEVANT AND I THINK COUNSEL
SHOULD BE ABLE TO INQUIRE. IT LEADS IN A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME,
LOGICALLY, TO FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS AS TO WHETHER THEY THINK
THE DEATH PENALTY IS NOT USED SELDOM ENOUGH, WHETHER THIS IS
A CRUSADER TYPE OF JUROR AND IT LEADS ULTIMATELY IN SHORT
ORDER TO REVELATIONS CONCERNING THAT PERSON'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS
THE DEATH PENALTY.

THE COURT: I AM NOT GOING TO LIMIT THAT QUESTION OR ANY QUESTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE GENERAL VOIR DIRE OF THE JURY, THAT CAN BE ASKED AT THAT TIME. YOU CAN MAKE UP YOUR MIND AS TO WHETHER OR NOT YOU WANT THAT PARTICULAR JUROR OR NOT AT THAT TIME.

ALL THIS IS TO DO IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THIS IS A DEATH-QUALIFIED JUROR AND THIS IS ALL I AM GOING TO DO AND I AM REFERRING TO THE HOVEY CASE AT PAGE 80, FOOTNOTE 136:

"THIS COURT DOES NOT PRESCRIBE ANY

PARTICULAR FORM IN WHICH TO FRAME QUESTIONS TRIAL

COUNSEL OR THE COURT MAY ASK ABOUT ATTITUDES

TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY. HOWEVER, THEY ARE

CAUTIONED TO AVOID ANY QUESTIONS WHICH MAY

SUGGEST THAT A PARTICULAR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE

DEATH PENALTY IS 'DISFAVORED.' ALSO, WHEN

QUESTIONS ARE POSED CONCERNING OPPOSITION TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, TRIAL COUNSEL AND THE COURT WOULD BE WELL-ADVISED TO STRIVE FOR BREVITY --AND TO PHRASE THE QUESTIONS 'IN THE TERMS WITHERSPOON SO UNMISTAKABLY SUGGESTS. " 

1		BREVITY IS NOT ONLY THE SOUL OF WIT BUT IS ALSO
2	THE SOUL OF	INTERROGATION IN CONNECTION WITH WITHERSPOON.
3	ALL RIGHT?	
4		(WHEREUPON, PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRANNON
5		ENTERS THE COURTROOM.)
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		•
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 THE COURT: LET ME SEE, YOUR NAME IS BRANNON, IS IT? 2 MS. BRANNON: YES, SIR. 3 THE COURT: 1S THAT MISS OR MRS.? 4 MS. BRANNON: BRANNON, YES. 5 THE COURT: MISS BRANNON? 6 MS. BRANNON: LORI BRANNON, YES, MISS. 7 THE COURT: MISS BRANNON, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A 8 NUMBER OF QUESTIONS. I WANT YOU TO LISTEN CAREFULLY TO THE 9 QUESTIONS AND ANSWER THEM EITHER YES OR NO. IF YOU DON'T 10 UNDERSTAND OR WANT TO HAVE IT REREAD, I WILL READ IT TO YOU, 11 ALL RIGHT? 12 MS. BRANNON: SURE. 13 THE COURT: SO YOU LISTEN CAREFULLY. 14 ONE. 15 DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY 16 THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS 17 TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT? 18 MS. BRANNON: NO. 19 THE COURT: TWO: 20 DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY 21 THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN 22 WHEN THE PROSECUTION ONLY PROVES THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER 23 IN THE SECOND DEGREE OR ANY OTHER KIND OR MANSLAUGHTER? 24 MS. BRANNON: NO. 25 THE COURT: THREE: 26 DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY 27 THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION CONCERNING 28

THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE ALLEGED IN

THIS CASE?

YOU HEARD, I TOLD YOU THAT IF THERE IS A VERDICT FOUND OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE BY THE JURY SELECTED IN THIS CASE, THEY THEN WILL HAVE TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. NOW, COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. NOW, COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY IS WHAT IS KNOWN AS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE WHICH, IF FOUND TO BE TRUE, QUALIFIES THE CASE FOR EITHER LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE GAS CHAMBER OR DEATH; DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. BRANNON: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: SO LET ME ASK THE QUESTION TO YOU AGAIN.

MS. BRANNON: OKAY.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE ALLEGED IN THIS CASE?

MS. BRANNON: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THREE -- FOUR:

DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH

PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE IT AFTER

A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING

OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY

BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. BRANNON: OKAY. THAT, I DON'T UNDERSTAND.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IF THE JURY IN THIS CASE FINDS
THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND FINDS
THAT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY,

THEN WE HAVE A SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL WITH THE SAME JURY. THAT SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL IS KNOWN AS THE PENALTY PHASE. 2 THEN THE JURY WILL HAVE TO DETERMINE ONE OF TWO THINGS: 3 EITHER LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE 4 OR DEATH. 5 MS. BRANNON: OKAY. 6 THE COURT: NOW, SO THE QUESTION IS, IS YOUR OPINION 7 CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY SUCH THAT YOU AUTOMATICALLY WOULD 8 VOTE TO IMPOSE IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND THE FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, 10 11 REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY 12 PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 13 MS. BRANNON: NO. 14 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, NEXT: 15 DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH 16 PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF 17 MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE 18 REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY 19 20 PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 21 MS. BRANNON: NO. 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

3A

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE 2 OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT OCCUR IN THIS CASE AND 3 THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT 4 YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 5 MS. BRANNON: YES. 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. HAVE YOU HEARD ABOUT THIS CASE 7 AT ALL. OTHER THAN WHAT I HAVE TOLD YOU ABOUT IN THIS COURT, 8 HAVE YOU READ ABOUT IT ANYWHERE? 9 MS. BRANNON: JUST YESTERDAY WAS THE FIRST NOTIFICATION. 10 THE COURT: WHEN YOU WERE IN COURT AND WHEN I GAVE YOU 11 AN IDEA AS TO WHAT THE CASE IS ALL ABOUT? 12 MS. BRANNON: YES. 13 THE COURT: YOU HAVEN'T READ ABOUT IT IN A NEWSPAPER 14 OR SEEN IT ON TELEVISION OR ANYTHING? 15 MS. BRANNON: NO. 16 THE COURT: YOU HAVEN'T DISCUSSED THIS WITH ANY THIRD 17 PARTY? 18 MS. BRANNON: NO. 19 THERE WAS DISCUSSION OUT IN THE HALLWAYS BUT --20 THE COURT: YOU WOULDN'T PERMIT THAT --21 MS. BRANNON: NO, I WOULD NOT. 22 THE COURT: -- TO INFLUENCE YOU IN ANY WAY? 23 MS. BRANNON: NO, I WOULD NOT. 24 THAT WAS THE OPINION OF SOMEONE ELSE. 25 THE COURT: I SEE, ALL RIGHT. 26 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 27 MISS BRANNON, JUST PICKING UP WITH THE JUDGE'S

LAST QUESTION. YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT WE ARE DOING NOW? SINCE

1 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA HAVE ASKED THAT MY CLIENT 2 GET THE DEATH PENALTY. WE HAVE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT 3 YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY BUT BECAUSE WE ARE 4 DISCUSSING THE DEATH PENALTY NOW, I TRUST THERE IS NOTHING 5 ABOUT THAT THAT MAKES YOU THINK THAT MY CLIENT IS GUILTY OF 6 MURDER OR ANYTHING ELSE OR HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG. 7 MS. BRANNON: NOT AT ALL. 8 MR. BARENS: AND YOU WOULDN'T MAKE ANY DECISIONS LIKE 9 THAT UNTIL YOU HAVE HEARD EVIDENCE ON THOSE QUESTIONS, WOULD 10 YOU? 11 MS. BRANNON: THAT'S RIGHT. 12 MR. BARENS: NOW, DO YOU HAVE AN ATTITUDE ABOUT THE DEATH 13 PENALTY AS FAR AS A GENERAL CONCEPT? 14 MS. BRANNON: IT IS A FORM OF JUSTICE. 15 NO, I HAVE REALLY NO OPINION. 16 I DO SUPPORT THE SYSTEM, ALTHOUGH I HAVEN'T REALLY 17 THOUGHT IN DEPTH ABOUT IT, YOU KNOW, A LOT. 18 MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THERE ARE INSTANCES WHERE A 19 DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL MATTER SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY? 20 MS. BRANNON: YES, I DO. 21 MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL ME IF ANY INSTANCES COME 22 TO YOUR MIND OR FACT SITUATIONS THAT WOULD JUSTIFY THE DEATH 23 PENALTY FOR YOU? 24 MS. BRANNON: PERHAPS A TYPE OF SERIAL KILLER, THAT TYPE 25 OF THING. 26 MR. BARENS: IF DURING THIS TRIAL YOU CAME TO A 27 CONCLUSION --

THE COURT: PARDON ME. YOU ARE NOT GOING TO LIMIT YOUR

IDEA AS TO WHETHER THE DEATH PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED ONLY IF THE FACTS IN THE CASE CORRESPOND TO THIS SERIAL KILLING CONCEPT, ARE YOU? MS. BRANNON: I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND THAT. I AM SORRY. THE COURT: ARE YOU GOING TO --MS. BRANNON: OKAY, 1 DO UNDERSTAND YOU. NO. 

MR. BARENS: NOW MISS BRANNON, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT
YOU HAVE A CHOICE AS A JUROR, WERE YOU TO GET TO A PENALTY
PHASE IN THIS CASE, BETWEEN LIFE AND DEATH? LIFE BEING LIFE
WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? YOU UNDERSTAND IT?

MS. BRANNON: YES. IT WAS EXPLAINED TO ME YESTERDAY.

MR. BARENS: AND DO YOU BELIEVE THAT LIFE WITHOUT

POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE MEANS THAT THE DEFENDANT WILL NOT GET

OUT OF JAIL FOR THE REST OF HIS LIFE?

MS. BRANNON: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND YOU DON'T HAVE ANY LINGERING DOUBT.

THAT EVEN THOUGH WE TELL YOU THAT, THAT SOMEHOW OR ANOTHER,

THE DEFENDANT MIGHT BE LET OUT?

MS. BRANNON: I KNOW THAT, UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: YOU KNOW WHAT? SORRY?

MS. BRANNON: WELL, MAYBE I MISUNDERSTOOD YOUR QUESTION.

I AM SAYING YES, THERE ALWAYS ARE CHANCES OF PAROLE, AS I

HAVE HEARD IN OTHER CASES.

SO I KNOW THAT IF SOMEONE IS SENTENCED TO LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, THAT THERE ARE CHANCES. UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: SO, IF HIS HONOR TELLS YOU THAT WHEN WE SAY IT IN THIS COURTROOM, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, IT MEANS JUST THAT? NO PAROLE. WOULD YOU BELIEVE THAT?

MS. BRANNON: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULDN'T HAVE ANY DOUBTS IN THE BACK
OF YOUR MIND, THINKING THAT EVEN THOUGH HIS HONOR HAD TOLD
YOU THAT, THAT THERE WAS SOME WAY THAT CIRCUMSTANCES COULD
DEVELOP WHERE THE DEFENDANT WOULD BE RELEASED?

MS. BRANNON: I AM SURE THERE COULD BE, SURE.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THERE COULD BE?

MS. BRANNON: YES, SURE.

MR. BARENS: WOULD THAT INFLUENCE YOU IN DETERMINING
WHETHER OR NOT YOU SHOULD VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY OR LIFE
WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MS. BRANNON: NO.

MR. BARENS: IT WOULD NOT?

MS. BRANNON: IT WOULD NOT.

MR. BARENS: THEREFORE, YOU WOULD BE AS OPEN-MINDED IN YOUR VOTE FOR LIFE OR DEATH, EVEN THOUGH YOU HAVE SOME SUSPICION THAT PAROLE IS ALWAYS POSSIBLE, EVEN THOUGH WE ALL TELL YOU IT ISN'T?

MS. BRANNON: YES.

MR. BARENS: DID YOU VOTE IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY

A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO WHEN IT WAS ON THE BALLOT, HERE IN

CALIFORNIA?

MS. BRANNON: YES I DID.

BE PUT TO DEATH IN THAT CIRCUMSTANCE.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL ME WHY YOU VOTED YES?

MS. BRANNON: I DO BELIEVE IN CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

I BELIEVE THAT IF SOMEONE IS FOUND GUILTY OF THE CRIME THAT

IS CONSIDERED FOR THAT TYPE OF SENTENCING, THAT THEY SHOULD

MR. BARENS: NOW, I AM TRYING TO FIND OUT WHAT THE CIRCUMSTANCES ARE THAT WE ARE TALKING OF.

MS. BRANNON: WELL, ANY CIRCUMSTANCE THAT QUALIFIES
THEM FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. BARENS: SUPPOSING YOU HAD A PREMEDITATED MURDER
WHERE YOU CONCLUDED IT WAS A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE THAT

HAD OCCURRED AS A RESULT OF PREMEDITATION AND THAT IT OCCURRED 14A - 31 DURING THE COMMISSION OF A ROBBERY CONSTITUTING SPECIAL 2 CIRCUMSTANCES, WOULD YOU IN THAT INSTANCE, ALWAYS VOTE THAT 3 THE DEFENDANT BE PUT TO DEATH? 4 MS. BRANNON: NO. 5 MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL ME WHEN YOU WOULD NOT VOTE 6 THAT THE DEFENDANT --7 MS. BRANNON: I REALLY COULDN'T. I COULDN'T ANSWER 8 THAT. I WOULDN'T KNOW HOW TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION. 9 MR. BARENS: BUT YOU ARE SAYING THAT IT COULD HAPPEN? 10 YOU COULD? 11 12 MS. BRANNON: SURE. MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU, IF HIS HONOR TOLD YOU TO CONSIDER 13 THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT, WOULD THAT MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN 14 YOUR VOTE? 15 16 MS. BRANNON: NO. MR. BARENS: IT WOULD NOT? 17 THE COURT: WHEN THE COURT TELLS YOU THAT YOU MAY CONSIDER 18 IT, YOU WILL LISTEN TO THE JUDGE? 19 20 MS. BRANNON: RIGHT. YES. THE COURT: THERE ARE A LOT OF THINGS YOU CAN CONSIDER 21 IN FAVOR OF THE DEFENDANT, A LOT OF THINGS YOU CAN CONSIDER 22 AGAINST HIM, ALSO. 23 24 BUT THOSE THINGS YOU HAVE TO CONSIDER ARE ALL TAKEN TOGETHER AND THEN YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND. DO YOU UNDER-25 26 STAND THAT? 27 MS. BRANNON: YES. I DO.

MR. BARENS: SO IF I TOLD YOU THAT YOU HAD TO CONSIDER

4A-4

THINGS OTHER THAN JUST CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CRIME, PERHAPS
THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT AND PRIOR CRIMINAL RECORD AND LACK
THEREOF IN DETERMINING WHETHER HE LIVED OR DIED, WOULD YOU
HONESTLY CONSIDER THOSE FACTORS?

MS. BRANNON: YES I WOULD.

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULDN'T BE SO OVERWHELMED BY THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CRIME THAT YOU WOULD PUT EVERYTHING ELSE OUT OF YOUR MIND, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHAT HIS HONOR TOLD YOU?

MS. BRANNON: YES I COULD.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF AN OPEN-MINDED PERSON?

MS. BRANNON: YES. I AM.

MR. BARENS: NOW, IN A CLOSE CASE, SAY WE HAD A CLOSE DECISION IN YOUR MIND, ON THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE, WOULD YOU BE TEMPTED TO VOTE GUILTY, THINKING IN YOUR MIND, WELL, I WILL GIVE THE DEFENDANT LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? I WON'T GIVE HIM THE DEATH PENALTY, SO I WILL VOTE GUILTY. I WILL COMPROMISE ON THE OTHER END.

MS. BRANNON: NO.

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULDN'T THINK THAT, WOULD YOU?

MS. BRANNON: NO.

MR. BARENS: IN THINKING ABOUT A FIRST DEGREE MURDER
WITH PREMEDITATION AND PERHAPS SHOOTING AND IT WAS DONE DURING
THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, AS WE JUST TALKED ABOUT THOSE, THAT
CONSTELLATION OF CONCEPTS, DO YOU HAVE A BIAS AS YOU SIT
HERE NOW OR A PREFERENCE AS TO WHAT SHOULD HAPPEN TO THE
DEFENDANT IN THAT TYPE OF SETTING?

44-5 MS. BRANNON: NO. MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD WAIT UNTIL ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ABOUT THAT DEFENDANT WAS IN BEFORE YOU WOULD MAKE A DECISION? MS. BRANNON: YES I WOULD. MR. BARENS: LASTLY, YOU MENTIONED EARLY-ON THAT THERE HAD BEEN SOME DISCUSSION IN THE HALL I PRESUME, AMONGST YOURSELF AND OTHER JURORS CONCERNING THIS CASE? MS. BRANNON: NOT MYSELF, NO. MR. BARENS: YOU OVERHEARD THOSE DISCUSSIONS? MS. BRANNON: UH-HUH. MR. BARENS: DO YOU RECALL WHAT YOU OVERHEARD? MS. BRANNON: JUST THAT THE GUY WHO --THE COURT: WHAT? MS. BRANNON: JUST THAT THE FELLOW IN THE ROOM WHO WAS ACCUSED OF MURDER -- AND THOSE TYPES OF STATEMENTS. 4B FO 

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT FUNDAMENTAL TO 1 OUR LEGAL SYSTEM IN THIS COUNTRY FOR 600 YEARS OF ANGLO-2 3 SAXON JURISPRUDENCE, IS THAT AN ACCUSATION AGAINST A DEFENDANT 4 DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING? 5 MS. BRANNON: UH-HUH. 6 MR. BARENS: THAT IS WHAT THE GOVERNMENT PROVES AGAINST 7 YOU? 8 MS. BRANNON: UH-HUH. 9 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ANYBODY CAN BE 10 ACCUSED? 11 MS. BRANNON: IT IS SOMEONE'S OPINION, RIGHT. 12 MR. BARENS: PASS FOR CAUSE. 13 THE COURT: RIGHT. MR. WAPNER, DO YOU HAVE ANY 14 OUESTIONS? 15 MR. WAPNER: JUST BRIEFLY. THANK YOU. 16 MS. BRANNON, WHEN YOU HEARD DISCUSSIONS IN THE 17 HALLWAY THAT THAT IS THE PERSON, ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT SOMEBODY 18 SEEING THE DEFENDANT IN THE HALLWAY AND POINTING HIM OUT? 19 MS. BRANNON: THEY WERE LOOKING THROUGH THE DOOR. I 20 DON'T KNOW WHO THEY WERE SPEAKING OF. 21 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING ABOUT 22 THE CASE? 23 MS. BRANNON: NO I HAVE NOT. 24 MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU DISCUSSED IT WITH ANYBODY OR 25 FORMED ANY OPINIONS ABOUT IT? 26 MS. BRANNON: NO I HAVE NOT. 27 MR. WAPNER: WHEN MR. BARENS WAS ASKING YOU QUESTIONS 28 ABOUT PREMEDITATED ROBBERY/MURDERS, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THERE

```
1
     CAN BE LOTS OF DIFFERENT FACTUAL SCENARIOS THAT MIGHT FIT
2
     INTO THAT?
3
          MS. BRANNON: UH-HUH.
4
           THE COURT: DOES THAT MEAN YES?
5
           MS. BRANNON: YES.
6
           MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES?
7
           MS. BRANNON: YES.
8
           MR. WAPNER: OKAY. SO. ARE YOU WILLING TO LISTEN TO
9
    THE PARTICULAR FACTS OF THIS CASE AND MAKE A DECISION ON
10
    WHETHER OR NOT THE DEATH PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED, BASED
11
     PARTLY ON WHAT THE FACTS ARE IN THIS CASE?
12
          MS. BRANNON: PARTIALLY? I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND.
13
           MR. WAPNER: OKAY. I WILL EXPLAIN IT AGAIN.
14
                 WILL YOU MAKE YOUR DECISION ON WHETHER OR NOT
15
    TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY IN THIS CASE, BASED ON THE FACTS
16
    IN THIS CASE, WITHOUT COMPARING IT TO THE FACTS IN SOME OTHER
17
    CASE?
18
          MS. BRANNON: NO, I WON'T.
19
          MR. WAPNER: OKAY. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THAT TO ME?
20
          MS. BRANNON: I THINK THAT -- WAIT. I SHOULD HAVE
21
    SAID YES. IT WOULD JUST BE THE FACTS IN THIS CASE THAT I
22
    WOULD JUDGE MY OPINION ON, NOT ANOTHER CASE. IS THAT WHAT
23
    YOU ARE ASKING?
24
          MR. WAPNER: THAT IS BASICALLY WHAT I AM ASKING YOU.
25
          MS. BRANNON: OKAY.
26
          MR. WAPNER: SO WHEN THE JUDGE WAS ASKING YOU ABOUT
27
    SERIAL KILLERS, YOU HEARD THAT WHEN THE JUDGE READ YOU THE
```

CHARGES IN THIS CASE, THAT THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE IS

ONLY CHARGED WITH KILLING ONE PERSON?

2 MS. BRANNON: RIGHT.

1

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. CAN YOU IN THAT CIRCUMSTANCE --NOW, I AM ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR CASE, WHERE THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED WITH KILLING ONE PERSON, IS IT POSSIBLE FOR YOU TO BRING BACK A VERDICT OF DEATH?

MS. BRANNON: YES I COULD.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IF THE TRIAL GETS TO THAT POINT AND THAT YOU ARE SITTING AND LISTENING TO THE PENALTY PHASE AND DELIBERATING ON THE PENALTY PHASE, THAT YOU HAVE TO MAKE AN INDIVIDUAL DECISION THAT THE DEATH PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED?

MS. BRANNON: TO JUSTIFY MY ANSWER? I UNDERSTAND THAT, UH-HUH.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. SO WHAT I AM SAYING IS, IF YOU ARE CHOSEN AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE AND YOU GO INTO THE JURY ROOM AND THE JURY HAS TO DECIDE THE QUESTION OF GUILT OR INNOCENCE -- SORRY, THE QUESTION OF DEATH OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, THAT THE ENTIRE JURY HAS TO MAKE THAT DECISION BUT THE JUDGE IS GOING TO TELL YOU THAT EACH, INDIVIDUAL JUROR HAS TO EXPRESS THEIR OWN OPINION?

IN OTHER WORDS, YOU HAVE TO COME TO YOUR OWN DECISION IN YOUR OWN MIND. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BRANNON: YES I DO.

MR. WAPNER: YOU COULD DO THAT?

MS. BRANNON: YES I CAN.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I PASS FOR CAUSE.

THE COURT: DO YOU PASS FOR CAUSE?

24

25

26

27

THE COURT: DO YOU PASS FOR CAUSE? 1 2 MR. BARENS: I PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AS YOU KNOW MISS BRANNON, WE 3 ARE IN THE PROCESS NOW OF ASKING QUESTIONS OF ALL OF THE 4 JURORS THAT HAVE BEEN ASKED OF YOU. THAT WILL TAKE SOME 5 TIME, OBVIOUSLY, AS YOU CAN SEE HOW LONG IT HAS TAKEN WITH 6 YOU. 7 8 MS. BRANNON: YES. THE COURT: SO, WHAT I WOULD ASK YOU TO DO IS TO COME 9 BACK TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM ON DECEMBER 2ND. BY THAT 10 TIME, WE WILL HAVE GONE THROUGH THE JURORS. COME BACK AT 11 12 10:30, OKAY? 13 AND IN THE MEANTIME, YOU ARE NOT TO READ ANYTHING 14 ABOUT THE CASE OR DISCUSS IT WITH ANYBODY. DON'T LISTEN 15 TO THE RADIO OR ANYTHING. 16 MS. BRANNON: SURE. I UNDERSTAND. 17 THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. YOU WILL BE EXCUSED. 18 MS. BRANNON: YOU ARE WELCOME. THANK YOU. 19 THE COURT: THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AT 10:30 ON 20 DECEMBER 2ND. 21 MS. BRANNON: OKAY. THANK YOU. 22 THE COURT: WE HAVE YOUR TELEPHONE NUMBER. IF IT IS 23 CHANGED, WE WILL LET YOU KNOW. 24 MS. BRANNON: OKAY. RIGHT. THANK YOU. 25 THE COURT: THANK YOU. 26 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRANNON EXITED 27 THE COURTROOM.)

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I DO HAVE A POINT FOR THE

YOUR HONOR, LET ME DISCUSS WITH THE COURT A

YOUR HONOR, WHEN I AM SPEAKING TO A JUROR OR MR. WAPNER IS AND YOUR HONOR SAYS TO THE JUROR, "IF I WERE TO TELL YOU THAT YOU HAD TO CONSIDER THE DEFENDANT'S AGE AND PRIOR CRIMINAL BACKGROUND," YOUR HONOR IS OBVIOUSLY THE AUTHORITY FIGURE IN THE COURTROOM AND THEY INEVITABLY ARE GOING TO SAY YES TO YOU.

THE COURT: WELL, WHAT ELSE DO YOU EXPECT THEM TO SAY, NO?

MR. BARENS: YES.

THE COURT: IT IS A FACT ALSO THAT IN THE PENALTY PHASE YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO SHOW THESE FACTORS.

MR. BARENS: ABSOLUTELY, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WHAT IS WRONG WITH THAT?

MR. BARENS: THE PROBLEM I HAVE, YOUR HONOR, IS THAT NO MATTER HOW THAT PERSON REALLY THINKS, INVARIABLY THEY ARE NEVER GOING TO SAY NO TO YOU. BUT THEY WOULD SAY NO TO ME AND THEY WOULD SAY NO TO MR. WAPNER.

AND WHAT WE HAVE HAPPENING HERE, IF YOUR HONOR WOULD PERMIT ME TO FIRST INQUIRE OF THE WITNESS -- THE JUROR, "WOULD YOU CONSIDER AGE AND PRIOR CRIMINAL BACKGROUND?"

THE COURT: THEY DON'T KNOW THE LAW. THEY DON'T KNOW
WHETHER THEY OUGHT TO CONSIDER IT. SOMEBODY, WITHOUT KNOWING
IT IS PROPER, WILL SAY "NO, I WOULD'T CONSIDER THAT."

THE JUDGE HAS TO TELL THEM THEY MUST CONSIDER IT AND THEN THEY WILL.

MR. BARENS: WHAT I AM SEARCHING FOR, YOUR HONOR, I AM SEARCHING FOR THEIR ATTITUDE TO DELIBERATING THOSE CONSIDER-ATIONS, TO BEGIN WITH.

THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU ASK THEM: YOU WILL HEAR AT

THE PENALTY PHASE THAT THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT, SO ON, ARE

MATTERS YOU COULD PROPERLY CONSIDER, AND WOULD YOU FOLLOW THAT?

ASK THEM IN THAT WAY. THAT WILL BE PERFECTLY ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: COULD I HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO INQUIRE
ON THAT, IF I AM DO SO, YOUR HONOR, PRIOR TO YOUR HONOR ASKING

THE QUESTION?

THE COURT: IF YOU ASK IT THAT WAY, THERE WOULDN'T BE ANY OCCASION FOR MY ASKING IT THEN.

MR. BARENS: I THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, LET'S HAVE THE NEXT ONE NOW.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRYANTPURVEY ENTERS

THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: YOUR NAME IS BRYANTPURVEY, IS THAT TWO NAMES,

YOUR SINGLE NAME AND YOUR MARRIED NAME, IS THAT THE IDEA?

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRYANTPURVEY NODS

HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES OF QUESTIONS
I WANT YOU TO LISTEN TO THEM VERY CAREFULLY, I AM SURE THAT
YOU WILL. JUST ANSWER THE QUESTIONS YES OR NO. IF IT IS
UNCLEAR TO YOU, ASK ME TO REPEAT IT AND I WILL DO THAT.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY
THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS
TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: NO.

THE COURT: NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN WHEN THE PROSECUTION ONLY PROVES THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE OR MANSLAUGHTER?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: NO.

THE COURT: BEFORE I ASK YOU THE NEXT QUESTION, I THINK
YOU WILL REMEMBER THAT I TOLD THE ENTIRE PANEL WHEN THEY WERE
IN HERE THAT THERE ARE AT LEAST TWO PHASES OF A MURDER TRIAL
WHERE THE DEATH PENALTY IS ASKED FOR BY THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

IF THE JURY IN THIS CASE FINDS THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEY THEN HAVE TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, YOU HAVE TO MAKE A FINDING OF THAT.

NOW, THE FINDING THAT THE MURDER WAS COMMITTED

IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY IS KNOWN AS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE;

DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

(MS. BRYANTPURVEY NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: THEN THEY HAVE TO FIND WHETHER OR NOT IT

WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WHICH IS KNOWN AS A SPECIAL

CIRCUMSTANCE.

ALL RIGHT, I WILL ASK THE QUESTION: DO YOU HAVE
ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT
YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION CONCERNING THE TRUTH
OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE ALLEGED IN THIS CASE?
MS. BRYANTPURVEY: NO.

THE COURT: NEXT: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING
THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE
IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE
WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE
THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: COULD YOU REPATE THAT, PLEASE?

THE COURT: YES.

I TOLD YOU THERE ARE TWO PHASES IN MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, IF THEY FIND THEM, THEN YOU HAVE ANOTHER TRIAL WHICH IS THE PENALTY PHASE WHERE YOU DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT IT SHOULD BE DEATH OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE: DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: NOW, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING
THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE
IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE
WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, REGARDLESS OF ANY
EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE
TRIAL?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: NO.

THE COURT: NEXT: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING
THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE
IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AFTER A VERDICT
OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL
CIRCUMSTANCES REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED
AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: NO.

BODY IN CONNECTION WITH THAT, WOULD YOU? WOULD YOU BE

INFLUENCED BY ANYTHING ANYBODY SAID OR ANYTHING YOU HEARD OR

27

YOU WERE TOLD ABOUT THIS OR WHAT YOU OVERHEARD? 2 MS. BRYANTPURVEY: I HADN'T HEARD. I CAN'T SAY IF I 3 WOULD HAVE BECAUSE I HAVEN'T HEARD ANYTHING. 4 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE FACT THAT YOU HEARD IT WAS 5 IN THE PAPERS, THAT WOULDN'T IN ANY WAY AFFECT YOU? 6 MS. BRYANTPURVEY: OH, NO. 7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. BARENS: THE DEFENSE PASSES FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 10 MR. WAPNER: MS. BRYANTPURVEY, DID YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT 11 THE JUDGE TOLD YOU YESTERDAY ABOUT THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF 12 THE TRIAL? 13 MS. BRYANTPURVEY: YES. 14 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. IF YOU ARE ON THIS JURY AND IF YOU 15 GET TO THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL, YOU ARE GOING TO BE 16 CALLED UPON, ALONG WITH 11 OTHER PEOPLE, TO MAKE A DECISION 17 ON WHETHER OR NOT THE DEATH PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED; DO YOU 18 UNDERSTAND THAT? 19 MS. BRYANTPURVEY: YES. 20 MR. WAPNER: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THAT IS A DECISION YOU 21 HAVE TO COME TO IN YOUR OWN INDIVIDUAL DECISION ABOUT THAT; 22 DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 23 MS. BRYANTPURVEY: YES. 24 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK YOU CAN DO THAT? 25 MS. BRYANTPURVEY: I AM NOT SURE. 26 THE COURT: HOW DO YOU MEAN YOU ARE NOT SURE? 27 MS. BRYANTPURVEY: I WOULD HAVE TO HEAR THE --

THE COURT: YES, SURE, YOU HAVE TO HEAR ALL OF THE

EVIDENCE 1S, THAT 1S NOT WHAT I AM GETTING AT.

LET'S ASSUME THAT YOU SIT ON THE CASE AND YOU HEAR ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON WHAT WE CALL THE GUILT PHASE AND YOU GO INTO THE JURY ROOM WITH THE OTHER JURORS AND YOU DECIDE, ALONG WITH THE OTHER JURORS, THAT A MURDER HAS BEEN COMMITTED, THAT IT IS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY; DO YOU UNDERSTAND ME SO FAR?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY, AND IF YOU MAKE THAT DECISION ON THE GUILT PHASE, THEN WHAT HAPPENS IS YOU COME BACK INTO COURT, YOU LISTEN TO MORE EVIDENCE, EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY THE PROSECUTION AND THE DEFENSE IN AGGRAVATION OR IN MITIGATION AND THEN YOU HEAR THE LAWYERS TALK TO YOU AGAIN AND THEN YOU GO BACK TO THE JURY ROOM AND THEN YOU ARE ASKED TO MAKE AN INDIVIDUAL DECISION ALONG WITH 11 OTHER PEOPLE WHO HAVE TO MAKE INDIVIDUAL DECISIONS AS TO WHAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

(WHEREUPON, MS. BRYANTPURVEY NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE TO ANSWER OUT LOUD.

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: YES.

16A-1

1 2

.

1 1

MR. WAPNER: AND YOU ARE GOING TO BE PRESENTED WITH
TWO CHOICES. THAT IS, YOU WILL HAVE THE CHOICE OF EITHER
IMPOSING THE DEATH PENALTY OR IMPOSING LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY
OF PAROLE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AFTER YOU HAVE LISTENED TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE GUILT PHASE AND ON THE PENALTY PHASE, IF THE EVIDENCE IN YOUR MIND WARRANTS IT, ARE YOU THE TYPE OF PERSON WHO IS CAPABLE OF VOTING THAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IF THE EVIDENCE WARRANTS IT, ARE YOU THE KIND OF PERSON WHO COULD SAY AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME, THAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: YES.

MR. WAPNER: MAY I HAVE A MOMENT?

THE COURT: YES.

MR. WAPNER: BEFORE YOU WERE PRESENTED WITH THIS QUESTION BY THE JUDGE YESTERDAY, HAD YOU GIVEN ANY THOUGHT TO THE DEATH PENALTY, ONE WAY OR THE OTHER?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: NO I HAD NOT.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU RECALL THE ISSUE OF WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD HAVE A DEATH PENALTY IN CALIFORNIA BEING ON THE BALLOT A FEW YEARS AGO?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: I REMEMBER IT BEING DISCUSSED YES.

I REMEMBER IT BEING ON THE BALLOT.

BUT I DON'T REMEMBER IF I VOTED FOR IT OR NOT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THANK YOU. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINIONS
ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY ONE WAY OR ANOTHER THAT YOU THINK
MIGHT AFFECT YOU IN THIS CASE GENERALLY IN FAVOR OR GENERALLY
AGAINST IT?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: I REALLY HAVE NO SPECIFIC OPINION
ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY RELIGIOUS OR PHILOSOPHICAL OR MORAL CONVICTIONS AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: I CAN'T SAY I DO, NO.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. PASS FOR CAUSE.

MR. BARENS: THE DEFENSE PASSES FOR CAUSE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MISS BRYANTPURVEY, YOU WILL

CONSTITUTE ONE OF THE JURORS WHO MIGHT BE CALLED IN THIS

CASE ON OUR JURY. AS YOU SEE, WE HAVE A LOT OF OTHER JURORS

TO INTERVIEW. IT TAKES SOME TIME, AS YOU NOTICE.

WE ANTICIPATE ALL OF THE QUESTIONING FOR ALL OF THE JURORS MIGHT GO AS LONG AS DECEMBER 2ND.

SO WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO -- IT MIGHT BE CONCLUDED BY THAT TIME. WE'LL ASK YOU TO COME BACK TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM ON DECEMBER 2ND AT 9 A.M. -- NO. THAT WILL BE AT 10:30 A.M.

MEANTIME, DON'T TALK TO ANYBODY AT ALL ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED HERE AND THE QUESTIONS ASKED OF YOU AND SO ON AND SO FORTH.

ALL RIGHT? WE WILL SEE YOU BACK HERE AT THAT TIME. IF BY ANY CHANCE THAT TIME OR DATE WILL BE DELAYED OR CHANGED IN ANY WAY, WE'LL GET IN TOUCH WITH YOU BY TELEPHONE. WE HAVE YOUR TELEPHONE NUMBER.

MS. BRYANTPURVEY: OKAY. THE COURT: THANK YOU. MR. WAPNER: SHOULD WE CAUTION HER NOT TO READ OR LISTEN TO ANYTHING? THE COURT: YES. DON'T READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THE CASE. IF YOU SEE A NEWSPAPER, DON'T READ THE ARTICLE. IF IT IS TELEVISION, TURN IT OFF. TURN TO SOME OTHER STATION. MS. BRYANTPURVEY: OKAY. (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRYANTPURVEY EXITED THE COURTROOM.) .6B FO 

6B - 1

\_.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BETTY BURNS ENTERED THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: MISS BURNS, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES

OF QUESTIONS. I WANT YOU TO LISTEN VERY CAREFULLY TO THEM.

AND I WILL ASK YOU TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS YES OR NO. AND

IF THEY ARE UNCLEAR AND YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND, ASK ME TO REPEAT

IT AND I WILL DO SO. ALL RIGHT?

MS. BURNS: YES.

THE COURT: MY FIRST QUESTIONS TO YOU IS:

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY
THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION
AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. BURNS: NO I DON'T.

THE COURT: SECOND:

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY
THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN
WHEN THE PROSECUTION ONLY PROVES THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF
MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE OR MANSLAUGHTER?

AGAIN, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN WHEN THE PROSECUTION ONLY PROVED THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE?

MS. BURNS: NO.

THE COURT: NOW, BEFORE I ASK THE NEXT QUESTION, YOU

HAVE HEARD WHEN I EXPLAINED THE CASE TO THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS

THE OTHER DAY, I TOLD THEM THAT THE CHARGE AGAINST THE

DEFENDANT IS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND THAT A MURDER

WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY AND THAT THE

JURY HAS TO DETERMINE FIRST, IF THERE WAS A MURDER IN THE
FIRST DEGREE AND IF THERE WAS A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE,
WHETHER OR NOT THAT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY QUALIFIES

THE CASE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY AND ALSO LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY

OF PAROLE. AND A MURDER HAVING BEEN COMMITTED IN THE COURSE

OF A ROBBERY -- IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY ARE WHAT IS KNOWN

AS SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE JURY DETERMINES FIRST IF IT IS MURDER IN

THE FIRST DEGREE AND IF THEY DETERMINE THAT, THEN THEY

DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE WAS PRESENT,

NAMELY, IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BURNS: YES.

THE COURT: NOW, MY QUESTION TO YOU IS, DO YOU HAVE

ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT

YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION CONCERNING THE TRUTH

OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ALLEGED IN THIS CASE?

MS. BURNS: NO.

THE COURT: NEXT, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING
THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE
THE DEATH PENALTY AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN
THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES,
REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY
PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. BURNS: NO.

THE COURT: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY
OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE

COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WE THEN HAVE A SECOND PHASE, THE SO-CALLED PENALTY PHASE? THAT IS WHERE YOU DETERMINE SHOULD IT BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BURNS: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW NEXT, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. BURNS: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, YOU DO UNDERSTAND, DON'T YOU, THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT OCCUR IN THIS CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

CORRECT?

MS. BURNS: YES.

THE COURT: OKAY. NOW, HAVE YOU READ OR HEARD ANYTHING ON THE RADIO OR TELEVISION OR SEEN ANYTHING ABOUT THIS CASE?

MS. BURNS: NO I HAVE NOT.

THE COURT: HAVE YOU HEARD ANY DISCUSSION FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE JURY ROOM OR OUTSIDE THE JURY ROOM OF ANYBODY TALKING ABOUT ANYTHING HAVING TO DO WITH THIS CASE?

MS. BURNS: NO. I HEARD ONCE OR TWICE, SOMEBODY START TO AND I SAID, "DON'T."

THE COURT: VERY GOOD. AND THAT IS THE PROPER ATTITUDE.

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

1 IT WILL BE THE SAME ATTITUDE THAT YOU SHOULD HAVE AFTER YOU 2 GET THROUGH WITH THIS QUESTIONING. 3 DON'T DISCUSS IT WITH ANYBODY AND DON'T READ 4 ANYTHING ABOUT IT. 5 MS. BURNS: UH-HUH. 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 7 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 8 MRS. BURNS, JUST PICKING UP WHERE THE JUDGE LET 9 OFF, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT EVEN THOUGH WE ARE HERE TALKING 10 ABOUT YOUR VIEWS ON THE DEATH PENALTY, WE ARE DOING THAT 11 BECAUSE THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN THIS CASE 12 HAVE ASKED FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. BUT YOU UNDERSTAND THAT 13 WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH THIS EXERCISE TO FIND OUT YOUR VIEWS 14 ON IT. BUT THAT DOESN'T MAKE YOU THINK MR. HUNT HAS DONE 15 ANYTHING WRONG, DOES IT? 16 MS. BURNS: NO. 17 MR. BARENS: SO YOU WOULD NOT MAKE ANY DECISION ABOUT 18 THAT, WOULD YOU, UNTIL AFTER YOU HAD HEARD THE EVIDENCE? 19 MS. BURNS: NO. 20 MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY 21 AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION? 22 MS. BURNS: WELL, IT IS DIFFICULT TO SAY. I WOULD 23 THINK, DEPENDING UPON THE CIRCUMSTANCES, HOW HEINOUS A CRIME 24 IT MIGHT BE --25 MR. BARENS: WHEN YOU SAY DEPENDING UPON THE 26 CIRCUMSTANCES, WOULD YOU CONSIDER MORE THAN JUST THE 27 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CRIME?

MS. BURNS: WELL, I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN BY THE

"CIRCUMSTANCES". 1 MR. BARENS: WELL, LET'S SAY HIS HONOR TOLD YOU IN 2 AN INSTRUCTION, THAT IN MAKING YOUR DECISION ON WHETHER MY 3 CLIENT LIVED OR DIED, IF WE EVER GOT TO THAT, THAT YOU HAD 4 TO CONSIDER HIS AGE OR HIS LACK OF CRIMINAL BACKGROUND, IF 5 THAT BE THE CASE OR CIRCUMSTANCES ABOUT HIS BELIEF OF BEING 6 MORALLY JUSTIFIED IN HIS ACTIONS. WOULD YOU CONSIDER ALL 7 OF THAT OR WOULD YOU JUST CONSIDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE 8 CRIME? 9 MS. BURNS: WELL, I THINK EVERYTHING HAS TO BE TAKEN 10 INTO CONSIDERATION. 11 MR. BARENS: SO YOU COULD CONSIDER THE TOTALITY ABOUT 12 THE DEFENDANT, AS WELL? 13 MS. BURNS: YES. 14 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT AS A JUROR, IF 15 WE EVER GET TO THE PENALTY PHASE, YOU HAVE TWO CHOICES. 16 DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF 17 PAROLE? 18 THE COURT: BEFORE WE GET TO IT, YOU SAY? 19 MR. BARENS: I SAID IF WE EVER GET TO THAT, YOUR HONOR. 20 THE COURT: OKAY. YOU MEAN WHEN YOU GET TO IT? IS 21 THAT WHAT YOU MEAN? 22 23 MR. BARENS: NOT WHEN YOU GET TO IT, YOUR HONOR. 24 THE COURT: YOU MEAN IF THERE IS A --25 MR. BARENS: IF WE GET TO IT, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: IF THERE IS A FINDING OF MURDER IN THE 26

FIRST DEGREE AND A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THEN

YOU GET TO THE SECOND PHASE. IS THAT WHAT YOU MEAN?

27

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

17 FO

25

26

27

28

MR. BARENS: YES. I BELIEVE YOUR HONOR MIGHT WISH TO WITHDRAW THE WORD "WHEN" FOR THE JUROR'S BENEFIT.

THE COURT: WHEN AND IF.

MR. BARENS: WELL, WHEN WILL NOT BE DETERMINED, YOU UNDERSTAND, MRS. BURNS, UNLESS YOU AS A JUROR, BELIEVE IN YOUR HEART THAT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, GUILT WAS FIRST ESTABLISHED. YOU UNDERSTAND THAT, DON'T YOU?

MS. BURNS: YES. I UNDERSTAND THAT.

MR. BARENS: NOW, I MENTIONED TO YOU THE TWO CHOICES THAT YOU HAVE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE REALLY MEANS THAT, THAT THE DEFENDANT WOULD SERVE THE REST OF HIS LIFE IN JAIL WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? DO YOU HONESTLY HAVE ANY LINGERING DOUBT, EVEN THOUGH THE JUDGE MIGHT TELL YOU THAT, THE DEFENDANT MIGHT BE NONE-THELESS PAROLED?

MS. BURNS: WELL, SOMETIMES YOU READ IN THE NEWSPAPERS THAT CIRCUMSTANCES CHANGE AFTER.

MR. BARENS: BUT IF HIS HONOR TOLD YOU THAT THAT IS THE LAW IN CALIFORNIA, THAT IF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE PROVED ALONG WITH THE FIRST DEGREE MURDER. IT MEANS LITERALLY THAT, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? WOULD YOU BELIEVE THAT?

MS. BURNS: IF HE TELLS ME THAT, I WOULD BELIEVE HIM.

- 1

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: I WOULD TOO, MA'AM.

NOW, DO YOU RECALL WHEN THE ISSUE OF WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD HAVE THE DEATH PENALTY IN CALIFORNIA WENT ON THE BALLOT; DID YOU VOTE IN THAT ELECTION?

MS. BURNS: YES, I DO.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU RECALL HOW YOU VOTED ON THAT ISSUE?

MS. BURNS: YES, I DO.

MR. BARENS: HOW DID YOU VOTE?

MS. BURNS: I VOTED FOR IT.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU KNOW WHY YOU VOTED FOR THAT; WAS THERE SOMETHING ON YOUR MIND?

MS. BURNS: WELL, I THINK THERE ARE CIRCUMSTANCES WHEN PEOPLE SHOULD BE PUNISHED FOR THEIR WRONGDOING.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TRY TO INDICATE SOME OF THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES TO ME?

MS. BURNS: WELL, SOME OF THE CASES --

THE COURT: WAIT, WAIT. I WON'T PERMIT THAT QUESTION

BECAUSE THAT MIGHT SEEM TO LIMIT HER ONLY TO ONLY THOSE

PARTICULAR CASES --

MR. BARENS: OH, NO.

THE COURT: -- AND NOT TO WHAT MIGHT BE PRESENT IN THIS CASE. DON'T ASK THAT QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: IN THE EVENT YOU HEARD A CASE WHERE A

PREMEDITATED MURDER TOOK PLACE DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY

AND SOMEONE WAS SHOT TO DEATH, WOULD YOU BELIEVE THAT THAT

DEFENDANT SHOULD BE GIVEN THE DEATH PENALTY?

THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE NOW. THERE IS A PENALTY PHASE

28

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

OF IT WHERE MITIGATING AND AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES ARE TO 1 2 BE FIRST ADDUCED IN THE TRIAL BEFORE THAT CONCLUSION CAN BE 3 REACHED. 4 MR. BARENS: I AM ASKING, YOUR HONOR, AS A BIAS OR 5 PREFERENCE IN A CONCEPTUAL STAGE, HOW THE JUROR WOULD FEEL 6 ABOUT THAT, WOULD THERE BE A PREDISPOSITION IS WHAT I AM 7 LOOKING FOR, YOUR HONOR. 8 THE COURT: YOU MEAN WOULD SHE AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR 9 THE DEATH PENALTY WITHOUT LISTENING TO ANY TESTIMONY WITH 10 RESPECT TO MITIGATING OR AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, IS THAT 11 WHAT YOU ARE ASKING? 12 MR. BARENS: RESPECTFULLY, I WAS ATTEMPTING TO ASK THAT 13 QUESTION WITHOUT USING THE WORD "AUTOMATICALLY". 14 MS. BURNS: I WOULD NOT VOTE AUTOMATICALLY FOR A DEATH 15 PENALTY BECAUSE 1 WOULD HAVE TO KNOW THE COMPLETE CIRCUMSTANCES 16 OF THE WHOLE TRIAL. I COULDN'T JUST --17 MR. BARENS: INCLUDING THE CIRCUMSTANCES ABOUT THE 18 DEFENDANT AS A PERSON? 19 MS. BURNS: YES. 20 MR. BARENS: DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF AN OPEN-MINDED 21 PERSON? 22 MS. BURNS: I THINK SO. 23 MR. BARENS: DO YOU BELIEVE IN THE CONCEPT OF AN EYE 24 FOR AN EYE? 25 MS. BURNS: NOT REALLY. 26 MR. BARENS: PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

MR. WAPNER: MAY I HAVE JUST A MOMENT, PLEASE?

1 MRS. BURNS, DID YOU UNDERSTAND THE JUDGE YESTERDAY 2 WHEN HE WAS EXPLAINING TO YOU ABOUT THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF 3 THE TRIAL THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE? 4 MS. BURNS: YES, I BELIEVE SO. 5 MR. WAPNER: OKAY, THE FIRST PART OF THE TRIAL IS 6 CONCERNED WITH GUILT, WHETHER THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR WHETHER 7 HE IS NOT GUILTY; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 8 MS. BURNS: YES. 9 MR. WAPNER: AND DURING THAT PART OF THE TRIAL, AS THE 10 JUDGE TOLD YOU YESTERDAY, YOU CAN'T CONSIDER THE POSSIBLE 11 PUNISHMENT; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 12 (WHEREUPON, MS. BURNS NODS HER HEAD UP 13 AND DOWN.) 14 MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE TO ANSWER OUT LOUD SO SHE CAN WRITE 15 IT DOWN. 16 MS. BURNS: OH, YES. 17 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. 18 IF HE TELLS YOU THAT YOU CAN'T CONSIDER PUNISHMENT 19 DURING THE FIRST PHASE OF A TRIAL, WILL YOU FOLLOW THOSE 20 INSTRUCTIONS?F 21 MS. BURNS: YES. 22 MR. WAPNER: OKAY, YOU KNOW NOW, BECAUSE WE ARE TALKING 23 ABOUT IT, THAT THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT SOMEWHERE DOWN THE 24 LINE YOU MIGHT BE CALLED ON TO DETERMINE THE QUESTION OF THE 25 POSSIBLE PENALTY, RIGHT? 26 MS. BURNS: YES. 27

MR. WAPNER: BUT HE IS GOING TO TELL YOU THAT YOU HAVE

GOT TO PUT THAT OUT OF YOUR MIND IN DETERMINING GUILT OR

7 A

INNOCENCE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BURNS: YES.

MS. BURNS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY, THEN IF THE DEFENDANT IS FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IF THE JURY DETERMINES THAT THAT IS A MURDER THAT HAPPENED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, ONLY THEN DO YOU GET TO THAT QUESTION OF WHETHER OR NOT THE PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE DEATH OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

THE COURT: THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT I TOLD HER BEFORE. YOU DON'T HAVE TO REPEAT IT.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IF YOU DELIBERATE ON THE PENALTY PHASE, THAT YOU ARE GOING TO BE CALLED ON TO RENDER AN INDIVIDUAL DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE DEATH PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED?

MS. BURNS: YES, I THINK SO.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WHEN I SAY "INDIVIDUAL," IT IS NOT COMING DOWN TO A JURY OF ONE PERSON. IT IS GOING TO BE TWELVE PEOPLE, BUT THE JUDGE TELLS YOU THAT DURING THE TRIAL, THAT WHEN YOU DECIDE A CASE, YOU CAN'T JUST LET THE OTHER PEOPLE DECIDE WHAT THEY WANT AND YOU SAY, "OKAY, I WILL GO ALONG WITH IT" YOU HAVE TO RENDER YOUR INDIVIDUAL OPINION.

MS. BURNS: YES, OF COURSE.

MR. WAPNER: AND IF THE JUDGE TELLS YOU THAT YOU HAVE TO MAKE UP YOUR INDIVIDUAL MIND, YOU ARE GOING TO FOLLOW THAT?

MS. BURNS: CERTAINLY.

MR. WAPNER: THE POINT OF ASKING YOU ALL OF THAT, OR
TELLING YOU THIS, IS BECAUSE I WANT YOU TO UNDERSTAND IF YOU
GET TO THAT POINT OF THE TRIAL WHERE THE PENALTY IS BEING
CONSIDERED, YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO MAKE UP YOUR OWN MIND
AS TO WHETHER OR NOT YOU THINK THE PENALTY SHOULD BE DEATH
OR SHOULD BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WINTOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF
PAROLE; IF THAT IS THE CASE, DO YOU THINK YOU COULD MAKE THAT
DECISION?

MS. BURNS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY RESERVATIONS ABOUT THAT?

MS. BURNS: NO.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY RELIGIOUS OR MORAL OR PHILOSOPHICAL OPINIONS AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. BURNS: NO.

MR. WAPNER: JUST TO CLARIFY SOMETHING MR. BARENS WAS ASKING YOU ABOUT: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THERE ARE MURDERS IN THE COURSE OF ROBBERIES AND THEN THERE ARE MURDERS IN THE COURSE OF ROBBERIES. IN OTHER WORDS, THE FACTS IN ANY PARTICULAR ROBBERY-MURDER COULD BE A LOT DIFFERENT.

MS. BURNS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: SO FOR EXAMPLE, YOU COULD HAVE A ROBBERY-MURDER WHERE ONE WIND WENT UP TO THE OTHER ONE ON THE STREET WITH A KNIFE AND WANTED TO ROB HIM OF HIS BOTTLE OF WINE AND ENDED UP STICKING HIM WITH A KNIFE AND THE GUY ENDED UP DEAD, WHICH MIGHT BE ON ONE END OF THE SPECTRUM, AND THE OTHER END OF THE SPECTRUM, YOU MIGHT HAVE --

MR. BARENS: I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THAT HYPOTHETICAL TOTALLY. THERE IS A SUGGESTION IN THE FIRST INSTANCE THAT THE WINO WAS HIMSELF UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF SOMETHING OF SOME KIND AND I DON'T LIKE THAT.

THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION.

MR. WAPNER: MRS. BURNS, DID YOU UNDERSTAND THE POINT

1 WAS TRYING TO GET?

MS. BURNS: YES, THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: THAT THE FACTS OF ANY PARTICULAR ROBBERY-

MS. BURNS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: YOU ARE WILLING TO TRY THIS CASE AND THE 1 POSSIBLE PUNISHMENT IN THIS CASE BASED UPON THE FACTS IN THIS 3 CASE? MS. BURNS: YES. 4 MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER. 5 PASS FOR CAUSE. 6 MR. BARENS: PASS FOR CAUSE. 7 THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MRS. BURNS. WE HAVE 8 TO GO THROUGH THIS WHOLE PROCESS WITH ALL OF THE PROSPECTIVE 9 10 JURORS. YOU CAN SEE HOW LONG THAT WILL TAKE. 11 MS. BURNS: YES. THE COURT: WE HAVE 80 OR 90 OR WHATEVER NUMBER WE HAVE. 12 IT IS ANTICIPATED WE MIGHT FINISH ABOUT DECEMBER 2ND SO WHAT 13 I WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS TO COME BACK TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM 14 15 ON DECEMBER 2ND, 10:30 A.M. IF BY ANY CHANCE WE ARE NOT COMPLETED BY THAT TIME, 16 WE WILL GIVE YOU A CALL. WE HAVE GOT YOUR NUMBER. 17 IN THE MEANTIME, DON'T TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT THIS. 18 19 MS. BURNS: NO. THE COURT: OR IF THERE IS ANYTHING ON THE RADIO OR 20 TELEVISION OR NEWSPAPERS ABOUT THIS CASE, DON'T READ IT OR 21 22 LISTEN TO IT, ALL RIGHT? 23 MS. BURNS: FINE. 24 THE COURT: THANKS VERY MUCH. 25 DON'T TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT IT EITHER. MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, WOULD YOU CARE FOR A RECESS? 26 WITH THE COURT'S PERMISSION, I WOULD ASK TO BE 27 EXCUSED FOR THE BALANCE OF THE SESSION THIS AFTERNOON TODAY.

```
THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
1
2
                MR. HUNT AGREES WITH THAT.
3
           THE DEFENDANT: YES.
4
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, I WILL EXCUSE YOU RELUCTANTLY.
5
          MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. WE WOULD BEGIN AT 10:30
6
     TOMORROW MORNING?
7
           THE COURT: YES.
8
           MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
9
                (RECESS.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN 1 2 OPEN COURT WITHOUT THE PRESENCE OF 3 MR. BARENS:) THE COURT: THIS IS THE MATTER OF THE PEOPLE VERSUS 4 5 HUNT. THE DEFENDANT IS PRESENT WITH COUNSEL. (PROSPECTIVE JUROR CAMIRE ENTERED THE 6 COURTROOM.) 7 8 THE COURT: YOUR NAME IS CAMIRE? MS. CAMIRE: MISS CAMIRE. 9 10 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT IS MISS? 11 MS. CAMIRE: MISS. 12 THE COURT: MISS CAMIRE, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES OF QUESTIONS. I WANT YOU TO LISTEN TO THEM VERY CAREFULLY. 13 THEN ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS YES OR NO. AND IF THE QUESTION 14 15 IS UNCLEAR. ASK ME TO REPEAT IT AND I WILL. 16 MS. CAMIRE: OKAY. 17 THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION 18 19 AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT? 20 MS. CAMIRE: DID YOU SAY PARTIAL OR IMPARTIAL? 21 THE COURT: IMPARTIAL. 22 MS. CAMIRE: THANK YOU. 23 THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH 24 PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION 25 AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT? 26 MS. CAMIRE: YES. 27 THE COURT: WHAT IS THAT OPINION? 28 MS. CAMIRE: I DON'T BELIEVE IN THE DEATH PENALTY.

8-1

28

1 THE COURT: AND UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD YOU EVER 2 VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY? 3 MS. CAMIRE: NO. I NEVER WOULD. 4 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 5 MR. CHIER: MAY I INQUIRE, YOUR HONOR? 6 THE COURT: ANYTHING MORE THAN THAT THAT YOU WANT TO 7 FIND OUT? 8 MR. CHIER: YES. 9 THE COURT: GO AHEAD THEN. 10 MR. CHIER: MISS CAMIRE, THE QUESTIONS I AM ABOUT TO 11 ASK YOU, THERE IS NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWER OR NO FAIR OR 12 UNFAIR ANSWER. WHAT WE ARE DOING, IS LOOKING FOR JURORS --13 THE COURT: WOULD YOU ASK THE QUESTION, PLEASE. DON'T 14 MAKE ANY SPEECHES. ASK THE QUESTION THAT YOU WANT TO ASK 15 DIRECTLY. 16 MR. CHIER: I NEED SOME --17 THE COURT: YOU DON'T NEED ANY INTRODUCTIONS. JUST 18 ASK THE QUESTION. 19 MR. CHIER: WELL, MY QUESTION DOES, JUDGE --20 THE COURT: NO. I WANT YOU TO ASK A DIRECT QUESTION. 21 MR. CHIER: MS. CAMIRE, IS IT MY UNDERSTANDING THAT 22 YOU ARE SO OPPOSED TO THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD BE 23 UNABLE TO RETURN A VERDICT OF DEATH, AS OPPOSED TO LIFE 24 WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE IN ANY POSSIBLE SITUATION? 25 MS. CAMIRE: I FEEL THAT I COULD NEVER RETURN A DECISION 26 THAT SOMEONE SHOULD BE PUT TO DEATH FOR A CRIME.

MR. CHIER: AND THAT THERE ARE NO CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER
WHICH YOU WOULD FEEL THAT YOU COULD -- HAVE YOU EVER REACTED

TO A NEWS ARTICLE OR A TELEVISION NEWS STORY BY SAYING THAT THE PERSON OUGHT TO BE PUT TO DEATH, FOR EXAMPLE?

MS. CAMIRE: NO I HAVE NOT.

MR. CHIER: SO THAT IN RESPONSE TO HIS HONOR'S QUESTION, YOU ARE SO OPPOSED TO THE DEATH PENALTY THAT IT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM BEING AN IMPARTIAL JUROR IN THIS CASE BECAUSE YOU WOULD TEND TO VOTE NOT GUILTY IN ORDER TO NOT HAVE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. CAMIRE: IF THE DECISION OF THE OTHER JURORS WERE TO SAY THAT THAT IS THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE, WAS THE DEATH PENALTY, I MAY SAY THAT TO JUST --

1 THE COURT: WELL, WOULD YOU BE INFLUENCED BY WHAT OTHER 2 PEOPLE DO? 3 MR. CHIER: YOUR HONOR, SHE HASN'T FINISHED HER ANSWER. 4 THE COURT: WOULD YOU BE QUIET? 5 MR. CHIER: SHE HASN'T FINISHED HER ANSWER. 6 THE COURT: YES, SHE HAS. 7 WOULD YOU, BECAUSE THE OTHER JURORS ARE VOTING 8 FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, WOULD YOU VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY 9 BECAUSE THE OTHER JURORS ARE VOTING FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. 10 WOULD YOU VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY BECAUSE OF THAT REASON? 11 MS. CAMIRE: NO, I WOULD NOT. 12 THE COURT: WHAT WERE YOU GOING TO SAY TO US? 13 MS. CAMIRE: I WAS SAYING IF THE OTHER JURORS SAID THAT 14 THAT IS THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE, THE ONLY DECISION THAT THEY COULD 15 COME TO, THAT I WOULD NOT GO THROUGH WITH IT. 16 IF I FELT THE PERSON WERE GUILTY AND THEY SAID 17 IT IS, YOU KNOW, THE DEATH PENALTY OR A VERDICT OF NOT GUILTY, 18 I WOULD TEND TO GO MORE FOR THE NOT GUILTY BECAUSE I FEEL THAT 19 NO CRIME WOULD BE WORTHY OF PUTTING SOMEONE TO DEATH. 20 THE COURT: I SEE. NO MATTER, UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES 21 IF THE DEATH PENALTY WERE A POSSIBILITY, YOU WOULD NEVER VOTE 22 FOR THE DEATH PENALTY; IS THAT RIGHT? 23 MS. CAMIRE: I WOULD NEVER VOTE FOR IT. 24 THE COURT: YOU WOULDN'T EVEN VOTE THE DEFENDANT GUILTY 25 IF IT MEANT IT MIGHT ENTAIL THE DEATH PENALTY, WOULD YOU? 26 MS. CAMIRE: --27 THE COURT: IN OTHER WORDS --

MS. CAMIRE: IF IT DID NOT ENTAIL THE DEATH PENALTY AND

```
I FELT THAT THE PERSON WERE GUILTY, THEN I WOULD, I COULD SAY
1
    GUILTY IF I WERE SURE THAT HE WOULD NOT BE PUT TO DEATH.
2
          MR. CHIER: LET ME ASK YOU THIS, MISS CAMIRE: YOU KNOW
    THE ISSUE OF GUILT OR INNOCENCE IS SEPARATE FROM THE ISSUE
4
    OF PENALTY; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?
5
                 (NO AUDIBLE REPLY .)
6
          MR. CHIER: IN A MURDER CASE, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT
7
    THERE ARE TWO PHASES TO THIS CASE?
8
          MS. CAMIRE: UH-HUH.
9
          MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME. IS THAT YES?
10
          MS. CAMIRE: YES. EXCUSE ME.
11
          MR. CHIER: THE FIRST PHASE IS A DETERMINATION AS TO
12
     WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY OF MURDER
13
14
     IN THE FIRST DEGREE.
           MS. CAMIRE: I UNDERSTAND THAT.
15
           MR. CHIER: IF YOU REACH THE DECISION THAT HE IS GUILTY
16
     OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND THAT THE MURDER OCCURRED
17
     IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN IT IS NECESSARY TO HAVE A
18
19
     PENALTY PHASE.
20
          MS. CAMIRE: UH-HUH.
          MR. CHIER: WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IS: ARE YOU SO
21
     OPPOSED TO THE DEATH PENALTY THAT EVEN THOUGH THIS IS A DEATH
22
     PENALTY CASE, AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE PHASE YOU WOULD
23
     AUTOMATICALLY VOTE NOT GUILTY BECAUSE THERE WAS A POSSIBLE
24
     DEATH PENALTY DOWN THE ROAD SOMEWHERE?
25
26
                 DO YOU UNDERSTAND MY QUESTION?
           MS. CAMIRE: YES, I UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION COMPLETELY.
27
```

I DON'T FEEL THAT I COULD SERVE WITH -- IT IS

1 AGAINST MY CONSCIENCE TO BE IN A POSITION TO DECIDE SOMEONE'S POSSIBLE DEATH. 3 DID I ANSWER CLEARLY ENOUGH? 4 MR. CHIER: YES, YOU DID. 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. YOU MAY 6 GO TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AND TELL THEM YOU ARE AVAILABLE 7 FOR SOME OTHER TRIAL. 8 MS. CAMIRE: THANK YOU. THE COURT: YOU ARE EXCUSED FROM THIS TRIAL. 10 THE COURT FINDS THAT THERE IS CAUSE FOR EXCUSING 11 THIS JUROR IN THIS CASE. 12 THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR --13 MS. CAMIRE: YOU ARE WELCOME. 14 THE COURT: -- THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR FRANKNESS. 15 MISS CAMIRE. 16 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, IT IS LIKE CLOSING THE BARN 17 DOOR AFTER THE HORSE IS ALREADY OUT. BUT SO THE RECORD IS CLEAR 18 THERE IS A CHALLENGE OF THIS JUROR FOR CAUSE. 19 THE COURT: YES. I DON'T HAVE TO WAIT FOR THE CHALLENGE, 20 DO 1? 21 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR CAMPBELL ENTERS THE 22 COURTROOM.) 23 THE CLERK: THIS IS MARK CAMPBELL. 24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. CAMPBELL, IS THAT IT? 25 MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR. 26 THE COURT: MR. CAMPBELL, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES 27 OF QUESTIONS AND YOUR ANSWERS TO THOSE QUESTIONS WILL BE YES 28

OR NO.

```
1
                 IF YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND ANY OF THE QUESTIONS, ASK
2
     ME TO REPEAT THEM AND I WILL BE VERY HAPPY TO DO THAT, ALL
3
     RIGHT?
4
          MR. CAMPBELL: OKAY.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

9 A

THE COURT: THE FIRST QUESTION: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MR. CAMPBELL: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN IF THE PROSECUTION HAS NOT PROVED THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE?

MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR.

THE COURT: BEFORE 1 ASK YOU THE THIRD QUESTION, YOU WERE HERE, OF COURSE, WITH THE OTHER JURORS WHEN 1 TOLD THEM THAT IN THIS CASE THE PROSECUTION HAD ASKED FOR THE DEATH PENALTY AND THAT THERE ARE VARIOUS PHASES OF THE TRIAL.

THE FIRST PHASE IS TO DETERMINE FIRST WHETHER THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER AND IF HE IS GUILTY OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER, THEN THEY ARE TO DETERMINE WHAT WE CALL THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES. THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE THAT THE MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: NOW THIS IS MY QUESTION -- THEN THE JURY, OF COURSE, SAYS TRUE OR NOT TRUE ON THE VERDICT FORMS THAT WILL BE PRESENTED TO YOU.

MY QUESTION IS: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING

THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL

DECISION CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL

CIRCUMSTANCE ALLEGED IN THIS CASE?

1 MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR. THE COURT: NEXT: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING 2 THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE 3 4 IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE 5 WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 6 7 MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR. THE COURT: LASTLY, OR FIVE, RATHER: DO YOU HAVE SUCH 8 AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY 9 10 VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING 11 12 OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY 13 BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 14 MR. CAMPBELL: NO. SIR. 15 THE COURT: AND LASTLY: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE 16 OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT OCCUR IN THIS CASE, AND 17 THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT 18 YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 19 MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR. 20 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YOU MAY INQUIRE. 21 MR. CHIER: MR. CAMPBELL, ARE YOU --22 THE COURT: EXCUSE ME. THIS GENTLEMAN IS MR. CHIER, 23 HE REPRESENTS THE DEFENDANT, HE IS ONE OF HIS ATTORNEYS. 24 MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR. 25 MR. CHIER: ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. CHIER: LET ME ASK YOU HOW YOU WOULD ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTION: I AM A PERSON WHO IS STRONGLY IN FAVOR

MR. CAMPBELL: UNDER THE PROPER CIRCUMSTANCES, YES.

26

27

```
1
     OF THE DEATH PENALTY, MILDLY IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY,
2
     NOT IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY OR I HAVE NO OPINION.
3
          MR. CAMPBELL: I WOULD SAY UNDER THE PROPER CIRCUMSTANCES,
4
     I AM STRONGLY IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

0 A - 1

1 2

3

4

5 6

7

9

8

10 11

12

13

14

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWER?

MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR.

MR. CHIER: I AM SIMPLY SEEKING TO FIND OUT IF YOU HAVE ANY NOTION AT THIS TIME AS YOU SIT THERE, AS TO WHAT WOULD BE THE APPROPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES FOR THE IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. CAMPBELL: NOT OFFHAND, SIR. JUST THAT I KNOW I AM IN FAVOR OF IT. I KNOW THAT UNDER THE RIGHT CIRCUMSTANCES, I WOULD ASSUME MYSELF, IF THE FACTS SHOWED THAT ACCORDING TO THE RULES THAT WERE GIVEN AS A JUROR, I WOULD VOTE FOR IT.

THE COURT: I DID TELL YOU OF COURSE, THAT THERE ARE TWO PHASES, THE GUILT PHASE AND THEN THERE IS A PENALTY PHASE? MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: AFTER THE JURY FINDS, IF THEY DO, THAT HE IS GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THEN YOU ARE TO DETERMINE THE PENALTY PHASE.

THERE IS A NEW TRIAL, IN EFFECT, REALLY. THERE IS A NEW TRIAL AS TO THE MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES AND THE THINGS WHICH ARE IN FAVOR OF THE DEFENDANT AND THE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, THE FACTS WHICH ARE UNFAVORABLE TO THE DEFENDANT.

ALL OF THOSE WOULD BE BROUGHT OUT AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL. AND YOU ARE TO LISTEN TO ALL OF THEM. THEN YOU ARE TO MAKE YOUR DETERMINATION WHETHER IT IS LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE DEATH PENALTY. YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

```
MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR.
1
2
           THE COURT: YOU HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL ALL OF THE FACTS
    HAVE BEEN ADDUCED IN THE PENALTY PHASE BEFORE YOU MAKE UP
3
    YOUR MIND. ALL RIGHT?
4
5
          MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR.
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
6
           MR. CHIER: HAVE YOU READ OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT THIS
7
8
    CASE, MR. CAMPBELL?
9
           MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR.
10
           THE COURT: I MEANT TO ASK HIM THAT. I AM SORRY.
     I DIDN'T DO THAT.
11
12
           MR. CHIER: DO YOU SUBSCRIBE TO THE LOS ANGELES TIMES?
13
           MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR.
14
           MR. CHIER: WHAT IS THE NEWSPAPER THAT YOU SUBSCRIBE
15
     TO, SIR?
           MR. CAMPBELL: I DO NOT SUBSCRIBE TO ONE. I READ OFTEN,
16
17
     THE VALLEY NEWS.
18
           MR. CHIER: WHICH ONE?
19
           MR. CAMPBELL: THE VALLEY NEWS.
20
           MR. CHIER: THE VALLEY NEWS?
21
           MR. CAMPBELL: YES.
22
           MR. CHIER: AND DO YOU LIVE IN THE VALLEY AREA?
23
           MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR, THE VAN NUYS AREA, SIR.
24
           MR. CHIER: AND DO YOU EVER READ NEWSWEEK OR TIME ON
25
     A REGULAR BASIS?
26
           MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR, NOT ON A REGULAR BASIS.
27
           MR. CHIER: HAVE YOU HEARD ANY OF THE OTHER JURORS
28
     DISCUSSING THIS CASE AT ALL?
```

```
1
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

MR. CAMPBELL: NO. SIR, NOT IN ANY DETAIL, JUST TO THE FACT THAT IT INVOLVES A ROBBERY/MURDER. NO DETAILS.

MR. CHIER: AND WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT TO BE RIGID. WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR. I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS PAROLE.

THE COURT: SOMETIMES THERE MAY BE PAROLE, BUT IN A CASE OF THIS KIND WHERE THERE IS THE DEATH PENALTY, ONLY TWO POSSIBLE VERDICTS, PAROLE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF --I MEAN LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH.

LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, THAT IS WHAT THE JURY WILL HAVE TO DECIDE OR DEATH. GO AHEAD.

MR. CHIER: WOULD THE COURT ALLOW ME FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS WITH THE JURORS?

THE COURT: JUST IN CASE YOU DON'T KNOW HOW, I AM ASKING IT. GO AHEAD.

MR. CHIER: HAS ANYTHING THE COURT HAS JUST SAID BIASED YOU OR CAUSED YOU TO BELIEVE THAT HE IS BIASED AGAINST ME, MR. CAMPBELL?

MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR.

THE COURT: DON'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION.

GO AHEAD, ASK PROPER QUESTIONS, WILL YOU?

MR. CHIER: MR. CAMPBELL, IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING PRIOR TO COMING HERE TODAY, THAT LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, IS NOT THAT AT ALL, BUT THAT THERE IS A POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE IN EVERY CASE?

MR. CAMPBELL: I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION EXACTLY.

28

MR. CHIER: THE TERM "LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF 1 2 PAROLE" --3 MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR. MR. CHIER: I UNDERSTAND THAT PRIOR TO THE JUDGE'S 4 5 QUESTIONS OF YOU, THAT YOU UNDERSTOOD THAT TO MEAN THERE WAS SOME POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE IN SOME CASES? 6 7 MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR. I PROBABLY MISUNDERSTOOD THE 8 JUDGE. I BELIEVE THAT MEANS WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. 9 MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. AND DO YOU FEEL THAT THERE 10 ARE CERTAIN TYPES OF CASES THAT ARE GENERALLY SPEAKING, MORE 11 DESERVING OF THE DEATH PENALTY THAN OTHERS? 12 MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR. MR. CHIER: COULD YOU TELL ME WHAT TYPES OF CASES YOU 13 14 FEEL ARE MORE APPROPRIATELY FITTED FOR THE DEATH PENALTY? 15 MR. CAMPBELL: I WOULD SAY PREMEDITATED, VIOLENT CRIMES. 16 MR. CHIER: WHEN YOU SAY "VIOLENT" DO YOU MEAN -- WHAT 17 DO YOU MEAN BY THAT, SIR? 18 MR. CAMPBELL: I WOULD SAY OFFHAND, CRIMES INVOLVING 19 MUTILATION OR CRIMES THAT WERE VERY BLOODY. 20 MR. CHIER: TORTURE? 21 MR. CAMPBELL: SAVAGE TYPES OF CRIMES, YES, SIR. 22 MR. CHIER: WOULD YOU BE MORE INCLINED IN A CASE, IF 23 YOU WERE SITTING ON A JURY, WHICH JURY FOUND THE DEFENDANT 24 GUILTY OF A PREMEDITATED, DELIBERATE MURDER, COMMITTED IN 25 THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WOULD YOU FEEL IN THAT CASE, THAT 26 NOTHING ABOUT THE PERSON'S LIFE WOULD MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE

AND THAT HE SHOULD PROBABLY GET THE DEATH PENALTY?

THE COURT: WELL, I AM GOING TO INSTRUCT THE JURY AT

THE CONCLUSION OF THE CASE, IF THE JURY FINDS MURDER OF THE FIRST DEGREE WITH SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ON THE PENALTY PHASE, THAT THERE ARE WHAT IS KNOWN AS MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES, WHICH THEY HAVE A RIGHT TO PROVE, WHICH WOULD BE IN FAVOR OF THE DEFENDANT AND AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH WOULD BE AGAINST HIM. NOW, IF I WERE TO TELL YOU THAT THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT AND HIS BACKGROUND AND EVERYTHING ELSE MAY BE CONSIDERED IN MITIGATION, WILL YOU FOLLOW THAT, WILL YOU NOT? MR. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR. I WOULD CONSIDER EVERYTHING. MR. CHIER: COULD I HAVE THE QUESTION THAT I ASKED READ BACK, MISS REPORTER, PLEASE? (THE RECORD WAS READ BY THE REPORTER.) 

20 -

WORK PATROL FUNCTIONS.

1 MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR. 1 FEEL THAT IT WOULD MAKE 2 A DIFFERENCE. 3 MR. CHIER: WHAT SORT OF THINGS DO YOU THINK WOULD 4 MAKE A DIFFERENCE? 5 MR. CAMPBELL: PERHAPS, OFFHAND, I MIGHT --6 MR. CHIER: TO YOU? 7 MR. CAMPBELL: I MIGHT CONSIDER FAMILY SITUATION. 8 ECONOMIC HARDSHIP. PERHAPS THAT MAY HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO 9 THIS PERSON'S FRAME OF MIND OR SOMETHING AT THE TIME. 10 IT WOULD BE THE EMOTIONAL MOTIVATION AND THE 11 THINGS THAT WERE APPARENT AS TO WHAT BROUGHT HIM TO THAT 12 PARTICULAR INCIDENT. 13 MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS 14 OF THIS WITNESS. I PASS FOR CAUSE. 15 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANY QUESTIONS? 16 MR. WAPNER: JUST BRIEFLY. 17 MR. CAMPBELL, DID YOU READ ANY ARTICLES IN THE 18 NEWSPAPER IN THE VALLEY NEWS AT ANY TIME ABOUT SOMETHING 19 CALLED THE BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB? DO YOU EVER RECALL ANYTHING 20 ABOUT THAT? 21 MR. CAMPBELL: NO, SIR. 22 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I PASS FOR CAUSE. 23 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 24 MR. CAMPBELL: YOUR HONOR, MAY I SAY SOMETHING THAT 25 WAS NOT DISCUSSED? BUT I THINK IT IS RELEVANT. I AM A 26 RESERVE DEPUTY SHERIFF FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY. 27 I HAVE BEEN FOR ABOUT FIVE YEARS. I ACTIVELY

0B-2

1 THE COURT: ON THE GENERAL VOIR DIRE, IF YOU ARE
2 SELECTED AND YOU ARE IN THE BOX, THAT QUESTION WILL BE ASKED
3 OF YOU. ALL RIGHT?

THAT WILL BE EVALUATED BY COUNSEL. WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF, AS YOU SEE, ASKING ALL OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS QUESTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ASKED OF YOU. THAT WILL TAKE CONSIDERABLE TIME, AS YOU SEE YOURS TOOK SOME TIME, TOO.

BEFORE WE GET THROUGH THE ENTIRE LIST, IT WILL
PROBABLY NOT BE BEFORE DECEMBER 2ND. I WILL ASK YOU TO COME
BACK TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM ON DECEMBER 2ND.

IF IT IS GOING TO BE LATER THAN THAT, THEN WE HAVE YOUR TELEPHONE NUMBER. WE WILL CALL YOU.

COME BACK AT 10:30 IN THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM.

AND IN THE MEANTIME, YOU ARE NOT TO TALK TO
ANYBODY ABOUT THIS CASE NOR HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ASKED OF YOU
NOR READ ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE THAT WE ARE HERE ON. THANK
YOU.

THAT WILL BE DECEMBER 2ND IN THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AT 10:30.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR CAMPBELL EXITED THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: I HEARD NO CHALLENGE FOR CAUSE. THAT IS, FROM EITHER SIDE.

MR. CHIER: NOT AT THIS TIME.

MR. WAPNER: THE PEOPLE PASS FOR CAUSE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR CLEMENTS ENTERED THE COURTROOM.)

0B-3

THE COURT: IS THAT MISS CLEMENTS?

MS. CLEMENTS: YES.

THE COURT: MISS CLEMENTS, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A
SERIES OF QUESTIONS. I WANT YOU TO ANSWER EACH ONE OF THE
QUESTIONS YES OR NO. IF ANY OF THE QUESTIONS IS UNCLEAR,
ASK ME TO REPEAT IT. I WILL BE VERY HAPPY TO DO SO.

MS. CLEMENTS: ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH

PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION

AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. CLEMENTS: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN WHEN THE PROSECUTION ONLY PROVES THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE OR SOME LESSER OFFENSE.

MS. CLEMENTS: NO.

THE COURT: NOW, BEFORE I ASK YOU THE THIRD QUESTION, YOU OF COURSE, WERE HERE AT THE TIME I OUTLINED THE NATURE OF THE CASE.

THIS IS A MURDER CASE, AS YOU KNOW. THIS IS

A CASE IN WHICH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY IS ASKING FOR THE DEATH
PENALTY. AND IF THE JURY FINDS THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF
MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND
THEY HAVE TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THAT MURDER WAS
COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT WILL BE A
FINDING WHICH THEY WILL HAVE TO MAKE.

AND THAT IS KNOWN AS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FINDING OF WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE

0B-4

2 3

1

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

OF A ROBBERY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CLEMENTS: YES.

THE COURT: SO THIS QUESTION IS, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE ALLEGED IN THIS CASE?

MS. CLEMENTS: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NEXT, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. CLEMENTS: WOULD YOU MIND SAYING THAT AGAIN? THE COURT: YES. ALL RIGHT. YOU KNOW THAT THE FIRST TRIAL -- THE FIRST PHASE OF THE TRIAL IS THE GUILT PHASE WHERE YOU DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT HE IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY? MS. CLEMENTS: YES.

THE COURT: AND IF SO, YOU DETERMINE WHETHER IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

MS. CLEMENTS: RIGHT.

THE COURT: NOW, IF THE JURY FINDS YES, THAT IT WAS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN THERE IS A SECOND PHASE WHERE THE SAME JURY DETERMINES WHAT THE PENALTY SHOULD BE, SHOULD IT BE LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR SHOULD IT BE DEATH.

MS. CLEMENTS: UH-HUH.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: NOW YOU REMEMBER THAT ON THE FIRST PHASE OF THIS, THE JURY MAKES THE DETERMINATION WHETHER OR NOT THERE ARE ANY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES IF THEY FIND IT TO BE MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CLEMENTS: YES.

THE COURT: NOW DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL, WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. CLEMENTS: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. CLEMENTS: NO.

THE COURT: AND LASTLY: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT OCCUR IN THIS CASE, AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. CLEMENTS: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING AT ALL, DO YOU KNOW ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS CASE EXCEPT WHAT I TOLD YOU IN OPEN COURT?

MS. CLEMENTS: I SAW MY -- MY PANEL WAS CALLED TWO WEEKS

28

MS. CLEMENTS: YES.

AGO AND I DID SEF SOME TELEVISION CAMERAS BECAUSE I THOUGHT 1 2 THEN THAT I WAS ON ANOTHER JURY. 3 THE COURT: YOU MEAN YOU SAW THE CAMERAS HERE? MS. CLEMENTS: YES. THE COURT: BUT YOU DIDN'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE? 6 MS. CLEMENTS: NO, I REALLY HAVEN'T. 7 THE COURT: DID YOU KNOW IT WAS A MURDER CASE? MS. CLEMENTS: NO. THE COURT: DID YOU KNOW ANYTHING ELSE ABOUT IT EXCEPT 9 10 FOR THE FACT IT WAS A MURDER CASE? 11 MS. CLEMENTS: NO. 12 THE COURT: DID YOU TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT IT AT ALL? 13 MS. CLEMENTS: ONLY THAT APPARENTLY EVERYBODY SAID, 14 "OH, THAT MUST BE THE CASE THAT WAS IN THE NEWSPAPER 15 YESTERDAY" AND I SAID, "OH, I DIDN'T READ IT. THE TRASH MAN 16 PICKED IT UP." 17 BY THAT TIME, I FOUND OUT I WAS GOING TO BE ON 18 THE PANEL. 19 THE COURT: YOU UNDERSTAND, OF COURSE, THAT IF YOU ARE 20 SELECTED AS A JUROR THAT DURING THE COURSE OF THE TRIAL YOU 21 ARE NOT TO TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT ANY ASPECTS OF THIS CASE. 22 MS. CLEMENTS: NO. 23 THE COURT: YOU ARE NOT TO TALK ABOUT ANY ASPECT OF IT, 24 ALL RIGHT? 25 MS. CLEMENTS: NO. 26 MR. CHIER: MY NAME IS RICHARD CHIER, MRS. CLEMENTS. 27 IS IT MRS.?

```
MR. CHIER: 1 AM ONE OF MR. HUNT'S ATTORNEYS.
1
                 I WOULD LIKE TO FIRST QUESTION YOU A LITTLE BIT
2
    ABOUT THIS PUBLICITY ASPECT AND ASK YOU IF YOU -- YOU SAW SOME
3
     TELEVISION CAMERAS IN THE HALLWAY?
          MS. CLEMENTS: I WAS ON A CASE DOWN THE HALL AND I SAW
5
     THE EQUIPMENT THERE AND THEN I LATER SAW SOME SEVERAL SHOTS
6
     OF THE HALLWAY ON THE 6:00 O'CLOCK NEWS THAT NIGHT.
7
8
           MR. CHIER: DID YOU HEAR ANY OF THE COMMENTARY, THE
    NARRATIVE THAT ACCOMPANIED IT?
9
          MS. CLEMENTS: THERE WAS PRACTICALLY NO COMMENTARY ON
10
     THE PROGRAM THAT I SAW. I COULDN'T -- I REMEMBER LOOKING AT
11
     IT AND THINKING, "WELL, I DON'T KNOW MUCH MORE THAN I DID WHEN
12
13
     I TURNED IT ON."
           MR. CHIER: DID YOU HEAR GOSSIP AMONG THE OTHER JURORS
14
     THAT THERE WAS A MURDER CASE ABOUT TO COMMENCE?
15
           MS. CLEMENTS: JUST THERE HAD BEEN A HUGE -- I WAS THERE
16
     WHEN THEY CALLED THE FIRST PANEL.
17
          THE COURT: DID YOU HEAR THE OTHER JURORS, THE PROSPECTIVE
18
     JURORS DISCUSSING THE CONTENTS OF THAT ARTICLE?
19
          MS. CLEMENTS: NO. JUST THAT THERE HAD BEEN ONE THE
20
21
     PREVIOUS DAY.
           MR. CHIER: DO YOU REMEMBER WHAT PAPER THE ARTICLE HAD
22
23
     APPEARED IN?
           MS. CLEMENTS: OH, IT WAS IN THE TIMES.
24
           MR. CHIER: AND YOU ARE A SUBSCRIBER TO THE TIMES?
25
26
           MS. CLEMENTS: YES.
           MR. CHIER: ARE YOU A SUBSCRIBER OF THE TIME MAGAZINE?
27
28
           MS. CLEMENTS: NO.
```

MR. CHIER: NEWSWEEK? MS. CLEMENTS: NO. MR. CHIER: WHAT CONCLUSIONS DID YOU DRAW, IF ANY, WHEN YOU SAW THERE WAS MEDIA ATTENTION ATTRACTED BY THIS CASE? 

1 A

28

THE COURT: A CONCLUSION AS TO WHAT, AS TO THE GUILT 1 2 OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT? 3 MR. CHIER: AMONG OTHER THINGS, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: BY MERELY SEEING CAMERAS OUTSIDE? 5 MR. CHIER: I AM TRYING TO FIND OUT WHAT WAS SUGGESTED 6 TO THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR BY THE FACT THAT THERE WAS MEDIA 7 ATTENTION. 8 THE COURT: DOES THAT MEAN ANYTHING TO YOU? 9 MS. CLEMENTS: NOT REALLY, NO. 10 I AM SORRY. I DON'T REALLY KNOW WHAT YOU WISH 11 ME TO ANSWER. 12 I ASSUMED IT WAS AN IMPORTANT CASE BECAUSE THE 13 LAST TIME I WAS A JUROR, I MANAGED TO SERVE MY TERM WITHOUT 14 ANY CAMERAS IN THE HALL. 15 MR. CHIER: WHEN YOU SAY "IMPORTANT CASE," WHAT DO 16 YOU MEAN BY IMPORTANT CASE, MISS CLEMENTS? 17 MS. CLEMENTS: PUBLICITY ATTRACTED. 18 MR. CHIER: ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY? 19 MS. CLEMENTS: YES. 20 MR. CHIER: ARE YOU A PERSON WHO COULD BE CHARACTERIZED 21 AS STRONGLY IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY? 22 MS. CLEMENTS: IF IT IS MERITED, YES. 23 MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. 24 DID YOU VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY WHEN IT WAS 25 ON THE BALLOT? 26 MS. CLEMENTS: I DID.

MR. CHIER: AND DID YOU READ THE LEGISLATIVE MATERIAL

WHICH ACCOMPANIED THE BALLOT WHICH DESCRIBED THE CIRCUMSTANCES

1 UNDER WHICH THE DEATH PENALTY WOULD BE CHARGEABLE -- UNDER 2 THE CIRCUMSTANCES IT WOULD BE CHARGEABLE? 3 DO YOU UNDERSTAND MY QUESTION? 4 MS. CLEMENTS: NOT QUITE. 5 MR. CHIER: DID YOU VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY BECAUSE 6 YOU THOUGHT IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA TO HAVE A DEATH PENALTY 7 BECAUSE THERE WAS A LOT OF VIOLENT CRIME AND IT SEEMED LIKE 8 A GOOD ANSWER? 9 MS. CLEMENTS: I VOTED FOR IT BECAUSE I FELT IT IS 10 A DETERRENT. 11 I READ THE MATERIAL BUT I COULDN'T REQUOTE IT 12 AT THIS PARTICULAR TIME. 13 MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT, I AM NOT GOING TO ASK YOU TO 14 DO THAT. 15 ACTUALLY, THESE ARE ATTITUDINAL QUESTIONS THAT 16 I AM ASKING. WHETHER YOU NOTED AT THAT TIME WHETHER THERE 17 WERE ANY PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE THE DEATH PENALTY 18 WOULD BE CHARGEABLE OR YOU JUST THOUGHT IT WAS A GOOD THING 19 TO HAVE A DEATH PENALTY BECAUSE IT WAS A DETERRENT? 20 MS. CLEMENTS: YES, I THINK IT IS. 21 MR. CHIER: TO WHAT TYPES OF CRIME? 22 MS. CLEMENTS: TO VIOLENT MURDER. 23 MR. CHIER: IN YOUR MIND IS THERE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN 24 A VIOLENT MURDER AND SOME OTHER KIND OF MURDER? 25 MS. CLEMENTS: NO. I THINK ALL MURDER IS VIOLENT. 26 I CHOSE THAT POORLY. I AM SORRY. 27 MR. CHIER: YOU CHOSE THAT WORD DELIBERATELY? 28 MS. CLEMENTS: POORLY.

I THINK ALL MURDER IS VIOLENT. 1 MR. CHIER: AND DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ALL VIOLENT MURDERERS 2 SHOULD RECEIVE THE DEATH PENALTY? 3 THE COURT: WELL, WAIT A MINUTE NOW. YOU WILL FOLLOW THE LAW IN THIS CASE AS THE COURT 5 WILL GIVE IT TO YOU? 6 MS. CLEMENTS: YES, I EXPECT TO. 7 THE COURT: WILL YOU NOT? 8 MS. CLEMENTS: I AM SORRY. I DON'T MEAN TO BE 9 EVADING THIS. 10 THE COURT: MERELY BECAUSE THERE IS A MURDER AND IT 11 MAY BE EVEN MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, UNDER THE LAW IT 12 DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THE DEATH PENALTY WOULD BE ASKED 13 OR CAN BE IMPOSED UPON HIM. 14 THE DEATH PENALTY CAN BE IMPOSED ONLY IN CERTAIN, 15 16 WHAT WE CALL SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ATTENDING A MURDER, LIKE IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE WHERE IT IS ALLEGED THAT THE MURDER 17 18 WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. 19 AMONG OTHER KINDS OF CRIMES, IF A MURDER IS 20 COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF CERTAIN CRIMES LIKE MAYHEM OR 21 RAPE OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, THEN IT QUALIFIES FOR THE DEATH 22 PENALTY BUT NOT EVERY MURDER IS DEATH QUALIFIED. 23 MS. CLEMENTS: I UNDERSTAND. 24 THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND? 25 MS. CLEMENTS: I UNDERSTAND. 26 THE COURT: AND YOU WILL BE GUIDED BY WHAT THE LAW 27 IS ON THE SUBJECT?

28

MS. CLEMENTS: YES.

```
THE COURT: AND THE LAW IN THIS CASE IS IF A MURDER
1
    HAS BEEN COMMITTED IN THE FIRST DEGREE DURING THE COURSE
2
    OF A ROBBERY, THAT QUALIFIES FOR EITHER LIFE IMPRISONMENT
3
    OR DEATH.
4
          MS. CLEMENTS: I UNDERSTAND.
          THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND?
6
                ALL RIGHT, NOW YOU MAY ASK. NOW SHE UNDERSTANDS
7
    IT, YOU CAN ASK YOUR NEXT QUESTION.
8
          MR. CHIER: DID YOU NOT UNDERSTAND MY QUESTION,
9
    MRS. CLEMENTS, THAT I ASKED YOU?
10
          THE COURT: WILL YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION?
11
12
          MS. CLEMENTS: I THOUGHT I ANSWERED IT.
                WOULD YOU ASK IT AGAIN AND I WILL TRY TO REPEAT,
13
14
    TO ANSWER YOU BETTER.
15
          MR. CHIER: YOU SAID THAT YOU THOUGHT THAT ALL MURDER
16
    WAS VIOLENT.
          MS. CLEMENTS: I FEEL THAT THE DEFINITION OF MURDER
17
18
    IS A VIOLENT DEATH.
19
          MR. CHIER: AND THAT IF THE LAW PROVIDES THAT THERE
20
    MAY BE A DEATH PENALTY FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER COMMITTED
21
    IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THE DEATH PENALTY IS THE ONLY
22
    APPRORIATE PENALTY FOR SUCH AN ACT, CORRECT?
23
          THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE.
24
          MS. CLEMENTS: I --
25
          THE COURT: IT COULD BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE
26
    POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.
27
          MR. CHIER: YOUR HONOR --
```

THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU STATE THE LAW CORRECTLY?

```
MR. CHIER: I AM NOT STATING THE LAW THAT THE
1
2
    COURT --
                 WILL YOU STOP LECTURING THE JURORS WHILE I AM
3
    TRYING TO INTERROGATE THEM ABOUT THEIR ATTITUDES?
4
          THE COURT: I WILL DEAL WITH YOU AFTERWARD. GO AHEAD.
5
          MS. CLEMENTS: I AM SORRY. I AM SORRY.
6
7
          THE COURT: IS HE CONFUSING YOU?
8
          MS. CLEMENTS: YES.
                 I AM SORRY. I WAS TRYING TO ANSWER YOUR QUESTION.
9
    WHAT IS IT YOU WISH ME TO SAY?
10
                I DO FEEL THAT FIRST DEGREE MURDER THAT IS
11
     PUNISHABLE BY THE DEATH PENALTY MAY BE PUNISHED BY THE DEATH
12
13
     PENALTY, YES, I APPROVE OF THAT.
          MR.CHIER: DO YOU FEEL THERE ARE ANY EXTENUATING
14
15
     CIRCUMSTANCES?
          MS. CLEMENTS: THE CASES OF WHICH I AM THINKING, THERE
16
     WERE NO EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.
17
                 I AM SURE THERE ARE OCCASIONALLY AND MANY TIMES,
18
     BUT I DON'T KNOW. I HAVEN'T BEEN ON MANY -- ON ANY MURDER
19
20
     JURIES.
          THE COURT: MRS. CLEMENTS, IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE
21
22
     IF YOU ARE A JUROR, WE POINTED OUT THERE ARE TWO PHASES. FIRST,
     THERE IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY
23
24
     OR NOT GUILTY AND AT THE SAME TIME WHETHER OR NOT THERE WAS
25
     SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES AND IF THAT IS DETERMINED BY THE JURY,
     THEN THERE IS THE SECOND PHASE AFTER THAT WHERE THE SAME
26
     JURY WILL BE CALLED UPON TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE
27
     PENALTY SHOULD BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY
```

OF PAROLE OR DEATH. 1 MS. CLEMENTS: UH-HUH. 2 THE COURT: AND IN THAT PARTICULAR TRIAL, WHICH IS 3 A SEPARATE TRIAL WITH THE SAME JURY, THERE WILL BE EVIDENCE 4 IN WHAT WE CALL MITIGATION, MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES --5 MS. CLEMENTS: YES. 6 THE COURT: -- FACTORS WHICH ARE FAVORABLE TO THE 7 DEFENDANT OF ANY KIND, ALL RIGHT? 8 MS. CLEMENTS: YES. 9 THE COURT: AND THEN THERE WILL BE FACTORS IN 10 AGGRAVATION OF THE DEFENDANT, AGAINST HIM. 11 NOW YOU WILL LISTEN TO ALL OF THAT AND THEN YOU 12 WILL HAVE TO MAKE UP YOUR MIND WHETHER OR NOT IT SHOULD BE 13 EITHER OF THOSE TWO PENALTIES, LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT 14 THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH, AND WILL YOU BE WILLING 15 16 TO DO THAT? MS. CLEMENTS: YES. 17 THE COURT: THEN YOU WILL MAKE UP YOUR MIND AFTER YOU 18 HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE WHETHER IT SHALL BE DEATH 19 OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT; IS THAT CORRECT? 20 MS. CLEMENTS: I WOULD LIKE TO ASK ONE QUESTION. I 21 AM NOT THAT FAMILIAR WITH THE PENALTIES. DOES CALIFORNIA 22 HAVE A LAW OF LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF 23 24 PAROLE? 25

THE COURT: THAT IS CORRECT, WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. IN A DEATH CASE, IT IS ONE OF THE TWO, IT IS EITHER LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH.

26

27

GO AHEAD.

MS.

CLEMENTS: UH-HUH.

806

THE

COURT: THAT IS THE LAW IN CALIFORNIA.

Θ

**5** 

7

芯

5

6

19

20

24

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. CHIER: AT THE TIME THAT YOU VOTED FOR THE DEATH
PENALTY, DID YOU KNOW THAT THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE DEATH PENALTY
WAS LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MS. CLEMENTS: 1 AM SURE 1 DID. 1 WOULD STILL HAVE VOTED FOR IT.

MR. CHIER: WHAT TYPE OF FACTS WOULD YOU CONSIDER WOULD BE IN MITIGATION OF A FIRST DEGREE MURDER COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. CLEMENTS: I AM SORRY. I COULDN'T -- YOU MEAN THAT

1 WOULD EXCUSE? I COULDN'T GIVE AN EXAMPLE. IT WOULD DEPEND

UPON THE PROVOCATION, 1 WOULD IMAGINE OR THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

MR. CHIER: CAN YOU THINK OF ANY SITUATION WHICH A MURDER OCCURS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WHERE THERE WOULD BE EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES MILITATING AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. CLEMENTS: I SUPPOSE IF THERE WAS A ROBBERY WITHOUT THE INTENT TO KILL, I WOULD GO FOR THE LIFE IMPRISONMENT.

MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. SUPPOSE THAT THERE WERE INTENT
TO KILL? CAN YOU THINK OF ANY CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH WOULD
MILITATE AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY IN SUCH A CASE?

MS. CLEMENTS: I CAN'T AT THIS MINUTE. BUT I HAVE NOT BEEN PRESENTED WITH ANY POSSIBILITIES.

MR. CHIER: AS YOU SIT THERE NOW, COULD YOU CONCEIVE

OF A SITUATION WHICH WOULD --

THE COURT: HOW COULD SHE POSSIBLY INVENT SITUATIONS
UNLESS THEY WERE PRESENTED TO HER? THEN SHE WOULD CONSIDER
THEM. THAT IS A SILLY QUESTION. 1 WILL SUSTAIN IT.

1 MS. CLEMENTS: SORRY? THANK YOU. 2 MR. CHIER: IS IT YOUR IMPRESSION THAT THERE ARE SOME 3 CRIMES IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR WHICH THE DEATH 4 PENALTY IS MANDATORY? 5 MS. CLEMENTS: WELL, I THINK ON THE BOOKS, THERE ARE. 6 BUT I REALIZE THEY HAVE NOT BEEN APPLIED IN MANY, MANY YEARS. 7 SO I DON'T THINK THEY ARE MANDATORY. 8 MR. CHIER: IS IT YOUR IMPRESSION THAT A SENTENCE OF 9 LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE IS SOMETHING MORE THAN 10 THAT? THAT THERE IS ALWAYS SOME POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? 11 MS. CLEMENTS: THAT IS MY IMPRESSION. 12 THE COURT: SUPPOSE I TELL YOU THAT THERE IS A SENTENCE --13 MS. CLEMENTS: SORRY. I DIDN'T MEAN TO SAY THAT I 14 DIDN'T BELIEVE YOU. 15 THE COURT: SUPPOSE YOU ARE TOLD THAT THERE IS NO 16 POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THAT THIS IS THE LAW AND IF ANYBODY 17 IS SENTENCED -- THE JURY MAKES A FINDING THAT IT SHOULD 18 BE -- SENTENCE SHALL BE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, 19 YOU WILL ACCEPT THAT AS BEING TRUE? 20 MS. CLEMENTS: YES, I WILL. 21 THE COURT: NO POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? 22 MS. CLEMENTS: UH-HUH. 23 THE COURT: IS THAT CORRECT? 24 MS. CLEMENTS: UH-HUH. 25 MR. CHIER: I HAVE A MOTION TO MAKE OUT OF THE PRESENCE 26

THE COURT: HAVE YOU FINISHED WITH HER? 28

MR. CHIER: NO.

OF THE JUROR.

1 THE COURT: WELL, FINISH WITH HER FIRST. 2 MR. CHIER: I CANNOT, WITHOUT MAKING A MOTION. 3 THE COURT: I WANT YOU TO FINISH WITH HER. ASK HER ANY 4 OTHER QUESTIONS THAT YOU WANT TO ASK HER. 5 MR. CHIER: I AM NOT ABLE TO, YOUR HONOR. 6 THE COURT: WELL, ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? 7 MR. CHIER: I AM NOT ABLE TO ASK ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS 8 AT THIS TIME. 9 THE COURT: FINE. ANY QUESTIONS, MR. WAPNER? 10 MR. WAPNER: YES. THANK YOU. 11 DID YOU UNDERSTAND THE JUDGE WHEN HE EXPLAINED 12 TO YOU ABOUT THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF THE TRIAL? 13 MS. CLEMENTS: I THINK SO. 14 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. NOW, SO THE FIRST -- WHAT WE HAVE 15 BEEN CALLING THE FIRST PHASE, IS THE GUILT PHASE WHERE YOU 16 DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THERE WAS A MURDER AND WHETHER OR 17 NOT THIS DEFENDANT --18 THE COURT: I HAVE EXPLAINED ALL OF THAT, MR. WAPNER. 19 MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. I WILL GO ON TO OTHER PORTIONS, 20 YOUR HONOR. 21 DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IF YOU GET TO THE PENALTY 22 PHASE IN THIS CASE, YOU ARE GOING TO BE CALLED UPON TO MAKE 23 AN INDIVIDUAL DECISION AS TO WHAT PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED? 24 MS. CLEMENTS: AS A MEMBER OF THE JURY, YES. 25 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WHEN I SAY "INDIVIDUAL" DECISION, 26 I AM INCLUDING AS A MEMBER OF THE JURY 1 AM NOT SAYING THAT 27 THEY ARE GOING TO DISMISS THE OTHER 11 AND YOU ARE GOING TO 28 HAVE TO DO IT YOURSELF. BUT THE JUDGE WILL INSTRUCT YOU THAT

2B

AS THE JURY DELIBERATES, EACH INDIVIDUAL JUROR HAS TO RENDER 1 2 HIS OR HER OWN OPINION. 3 MS. CLEMENTS: I KNOW THAT. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. YOU HAVE SERVED ON JURIES BEFORE? 4 5 MS. CLEMENTS: YES. 6 MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. 7 MS. CLEMENTS: MUNICIPAL. MR. WAPNER: IN THAT REGARD, IN TERMS OF RENDERING YOUR 8 OWN, INDIVIDUAL OPINION, THE INSTRUCTIONS ARE GOING TO BE PROBABLY VERY SIMILAR TO THE ONES THAT YOU GOT IN THE MUNICIPAL 10 11 COURT. CAN YOU MAKE A DECISION IN THIS CASE ABOUT WHAT 12 PENALTY TO IMPOSE, BASED ON THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF 13 14 THIS CASE? MS. CLEMENTS: DIDN'T YOU SAY BASED ON THE EVIDENCE AND 15 16 THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES? 17 MR. WAPNER: YES. 18 MS. CLEMENTS: WHY, OF COURSE. 19 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WHAT I AM GETTING AT IS, INSTEAD 20 OF -- WELL, LET ME TRY TO REPHRASE IT. 21 I AM TRYING TO GIVE YOU THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE COIN MR. CHIER WAS ASKING YOU ABOUT. DO YOU THINK THAT THE 22 23 DEATH PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED IN EVERY CASE OF ROBBERY/MURDER, 24 REGARDLESS OF WHAT THE FACTS ARE? 25 MS. CLEMENTS: I HATE TO SAY YES, BECAUSE THERE COULD 26 ALWAYS BE EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES. 27 1 CANNOT MAKE YOU UP A CASE AND SAY YES, I WOULD

EXCUSE HIM IF THIS AND THIS AND THIS.

MR. WAPNER: LET ME MAYBE, GIVE YOU SOME EXAMPLES SO THAT I CAN EXPLAIN TO YOU WHAT I AM TRYING TO GET AT. WHAT I AM TRYING TO GET TO YOU, IS THAT THERE MIGHT BE A POSSIBILITY THAT ONE CASE OF ROBBERY/MURDER MIGHT HAVE SUBSTANTIALLY DIFFERENT FACTS THAN ANOTHER ONE. SO FOR EXAMPLE. SOMEBODY -- LET'S JUST POSIT THIS HYPOTHETICAL. SOMEBODY ON SKID ROW APPROACHES ANOTHER GUY ON SKID ROW WITH A KNIFE AND SAYS, "GIVE ME THAT BOTTLE OF WINE," AND THE GUY SAYS, "NO. I AM NOT GIVING YOU THAT BOTTLE." HE THEN THREATENS HIM WITH THE KNIFE. THE GUY WON'T GIVE HIM THE BOTTLE OF WINE. THE GUY STICKS HIM WITH THE KNIFE AND TAKES THE BOTTLE OF WINE AND THE GUY DIES. THE COURT: I PREVIOUSLY SUSTAINED AN OBJECTION TO THAT QUESTION, HAD I NOT? MR. WAPNER: WELL, I WAS TRYING TO CLARIFY IT TO --

THE COURT: THERE IS NOTHING TO -- NOTHING THAT IS ANY DIFFERENT THAN WHAT WE SAID BEFORE.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. PERHAPS WE CAN USE --

THE COURT: MR. -- WHAT WAS HIS NAME AGAIN? THE

GENTLEMAN ASSOCIATED WITH YOU? MR. BARENS WAS HERE AT THE

TIME. I SUSTAINED THE OBJECTION TO THAT QUESTION.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, THE OBJECTION WAS BASED ON SOME FEELING THAT I MIGHT BE SUGGESTING THAT THEY WERE INTOXICATED, WHICH I ATTEMPTED TO WITHDRAW FROM THE HYPOTHETICAL.

THE COURT: 1 DON'T THINK THE HYPOTHETICAL IS RELEVANT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. MS. CLEMENTS, IF YOU LISTENED TO
THE FACTS IN THE CASE ON THE GUILT PHASE OF THE CASE AND YOU
MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OF MURDER
AND YOU MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES
ARE TRUE, WHICH IN THIS CASE MEANS THAT YOU WILL HAVE DECIDED
THE MURDER OCCURRED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, AT THAT
POINT, YOU WILL GET TO THE PENALTY PHASE.

ARE YOU WILLING THEN, TO LISTEN TO THE EVIDENCE

THAT IS PRESENTED IN THE PENALTY PHASE AND WAIT UNTIL YOU HEAR

THAT EVIDENCE AND MAKE UP YOUR OWN MIND ABOUT WHAT PENALTY

YOU SHOULD IMPOSE?

MS. CLEMENTS: OF COURSE.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY.

THE COURT: I ALREADY ASKED THOSE TWO QUESTIONS.

MR. WAPNER: YOU DID. WHAT I WAS TRYING TO GET AT IS,

IF YOU MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THERE WAS A MURDER IN THE

COURSE OF A ROBBERY IN THIS CASE, IS YOUR MIND THEN GOING TO

BE CLOSED TO THE POSSIBILITY THAT YOU COULD PICK SOME PENALTY

```
1
     OTHER THAN DEATH? DO YOU SEE WHAT I AM GETTING AT, OR NOT?
2
           THE COURT: I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION EITHER.
3
           MS. CLEMENTS: 1 FEEL VERY STUPID. 1 DON'T SEE HOW 1
4
     CAN ANSWER THAT WITHOUT HAVING HEARD THE EVIDENCE. THAT
 5
     PRESUMABLY WILL BE COMING IN.
 6
           MR. WAPNER: OKAY. YOU HAVE SAID BEFORE THAT THERE MAY
7
     BE A CASE OF A ROBBERY/MURDER WHERE YOU WOULDN'T IMPOSE THE
8
     DEATH PENALTY. IS THAT WHAT YOU SAID?
9
           MS. CLEMENTS: I THINK ANY CIRCUMSTANCES CAN BE
10
     EXTENUATING. BUT I WAS NOT APPLYING IT TO THIS. YOU ARE,
11
     ARE YOU NOT?
12
          MR. WAPNER: WHAT I AM TRYING TO SAY -- WHAT I AM TRYING
13
     TO DO IS APPLY YOUR PREVIOUS STATEMENT TO THIS PARTICULAR CASE.
14
                 WHAT I AM TRYING TO GET AT IS, WHETHER OR NOT,
15
     ONCE YOU FOUND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER AND THE SPECIAL
16
     CIRCUMSTANCES ARE TRUE, WILL YOU HAVE CLOSED YOUR MIND AS TO
17
     THE POSSIBLE PENALTY OR ARE YOU WILLING TO LISTEN TO THE FACTS
18
     THAT MIGHT BE PRESENTED IN AGGRAVATION AND THE FACTS IN
19
     MITIGATION AND THEN DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IN
20
     THIS CASE, SHOULD GET LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR
21
     SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY?
22
           MS. CLEMENTS: I DON'T THINK I OR ANY JUROR WOULD MAKE
23
     A DECISION UNTIL THEY HAD HEARD ABSOLUTELY ALL THE EVIDENCE.
24
           MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THANK YOU. NOTHING ELSE.
25
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANY QUESTIONS?
26
          MR. CHIER: I HAVE SOME QUESTIONS, YES.
27
          THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
```

MR. CHIER: WHAT I AM SENSING FROM YOU, MISS CLEMENTS,

28 THE C

THE COURT: THAT WAS ALREADY ANSWERED.

IS THAT YOU HAVE SUCH STRONG FEELINGS AGAINST THE FIRST DEGREE,

DELIBERATE MURDER, THAT IT WOULD WEIGH HEAVILY ON YOUR MIND

IN A PENALTY PHASE AND THAT IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT FOR YOU TO

CHOOSE A PENALTY OTHER THAN DEATH. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU ARE

SAYING, MISS CLEMENTS?

MISS CLEMENTS: NO. 1 DON'T THINK I DID SAY THAT. I

SAID I BELIEVED IN THE DEATH PENALTY IF I FEEL THE CIRCUMSTANCES

MERIT IT.

MR. CHIER: RIGHT. BUT WITHOUT GOING INTO THE EVIDENCE
IN THIS CASE, AT THIS PARTICULAR JUNCTURE AND JUST TALKING
ABOUT THE ATTITUDES, VISCERAL ATTITUDES, IS YOUR ATTITUDE THAT
IT WOULD BE -- IS IT YOUR BELIEF IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT
FOR THERE TO BE SHOWN TO YOU CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH WOULD MITIGATE
AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY, IF YOU FOUND THE PERSON GUILTY OF
DELIBERATE, FIRST DEGREE MURDER IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. CLEMENTS: I WOULDN'T SAY THAT I WOULD -- YOU ARE IMPLYING THAT I WOULD APPLY THE DEATH SENTENCE IN EVERY CASE. THAT IS NOT TRUE.

THE COURT: I ASKED THAT IN QUESTION NUMBER 4. DO YOU
HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU
WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY
OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE,
REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY
PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. CLEMENTS: NO.

THE COURT: ISN'T THAT TRUE?

MS. CLEMENTS: YES.

MR. CHIER: 1 AM NOT TALKING ABOUT AUTOMATICALLY --THE COURT: LET'S GO ON TO SOMETHING ELSE, PLEASE. MR. CHIER: DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU WOULD BE MORE DEATH-PRONE THAN LIFE IMPRISONMENT-PRONE? MS. CLEMENTS: 1 AM SORRY. I COULDN'T ANSWER THAT. I MEAN, IT WOULD DEPEND UPON WHAT WAS PRESENTED IN THE CASE. THIS IS PURPORTEDLY GOING TO BE A THREE-MONTH CASE. I COULDN'T GIVVE YOU AN ANSWER TO THAT NOW. 

MR. CHIER: WELL, IF THE COURT TOLD YOU ALL OF THE 1 2 THINGS TO BE CONSIDERED IN MITIGATION AND AGGRAVATION, WOULD 3 YOU CONSIDER THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT AS A FACTOR IN MITIGATION? THE COURT: SUPPOSE THE COURT TOLD YOU THAT YOU MAY 4 5 CONSIDER THAT, WOULD YOU CONSIDER THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT 6 AND HIS BACKGROUND IF THE COURT TOLD YOU THAT YOU MAY CONSIDER THAT IN MITIGATION? 8 MS. CLEMENTS: I DON'T THINK I WOULD. I AM SORRY. 9 THE COURT: YOU WOULDN'T FOLLOW THE LAW? 10 MS. CLEMENTS: IF THAT IS THE LAW --11 THE COURT: IF I TOLD YOU THAT YOU MAY CONSIDER IT. 12 MS. CLEMENTS: IF YOU TOLD ME. 13 THE COURT: YES, THAT YOU MAY CONSIDER IT. 14 MS. CLEMENTS: I WOULD HONOR YOUR REQUEST. 15 THE COURT: YES, I AM SURE YOU WOULD. 16 MR. CHIER: IF THE COURT TOLD YOU YOU COULD BUT YOU 17 WOULDN'T HAVE TO CONSIDER THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT, THAT 18 IT WAS STRICTLY UP TO YOU, WOULD YOU CONSIDER THE DEFENDANT'S 19 YOUTH AS A FACTOR IN MITIGATION? 20 MS. CLEMENTS: HOW OLD IS THE DEFENDANT? 21 MR. CHIER: 27. 22 MS. CLEMENTS: I WOULD BE GUIDED BY THE JUDGE'S 23 DIRECTIONS. 24 MR.CHIER: WELL, THE JUDGES DIRECTIONS WOULD ONLY --25 THE COURT: I SAID YOU MAY CONSIDER THAT AND YOU WILL 26 ACCEPT THAT, WILL YOU? 27 MS. CLEMENTS: YES.

THE COURT: LET'S GET ON.

MR. CHIER: THAT DOESN'T ANSWER THE QUESTION. 1 THE COURT: SHE ANSWERED THE QUESTION. 2 MS. CLEMENTS: I THINK THEN -- I THINK THE DEFENDANT 3 IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT HE HAS DONE. 4 MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION. I THINK HE IS ASKING THE JUROR 5 TO PREJUDGE THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE AS TO WHAT SHE WOULD 6 OR WOULD NOT DO. 7 THE COURT: THAT IS WHY I SUSTAINED THE OBJECTION. 8 THAT IS ONE OF THE FACTORS SHE SHOULD CONSIDER, NOT WHETHER 9 SHE WOULD NOT CONSIDER IT. 10 MR. CHIER: THE INSTRUCTION IS SHE CAN CONSIDER IT, 11 NOT THAT SHE HAS TO. 12 THE COURT: THAT SHE CAN CONSIDER IT, THAT IS WHAT 13 I TOLD HER. 14 MR. CHIER: NOT THAT SHE HAS TO, YOUR HONOR. 15 WOULD YOU CONSIDER WHETHER OR NOT A DEFENDANT 16 HAD ANY CRIMINAL BACKGROUND AS A FACTOR IN --17 THE COURT: IF I TOLD YOU THAT THAT WAS ONE OF THE 18 19 FACTORS IN MITIGATION THAT YOU MAY CONSIDER IF YOU WANT TO, WOULD YOU CONSIDER THAT, WOULD YOU? 20 MS. CLEMENTS: YES. 21 MR. CHIER: DO YOU THINK IT WOULD MAKE A DIFFERENCE 22 TO YOU WHETHER HE WAS YOUNG OR OLD? 23 THE COURT: YOU ARE ASKING HER TO MAKE A DETERMINATION 24

AT THIS TIME. I AGREE WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY. I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION.

MR. CHIER: I HAVE A CHALLENGE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WHAT?

25

26

27

MR. CHIER: I HAVE A CHALLENGE. 1 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU HAVE ANY CHALLENGE? 3 MR. WAPNER: I WOULD PASS THIS JUROR FOR CAUSE. 4 I GUESS WE CAN HEAR THIS OUT OF HER PRESENCE. 5 THE COURT: I WILL MAKE A DETERMINATION NOW. MR. WAPNER: WELL, YOUR HONOR --6 7 THE COURT: WOULD YOU LET ME MAKE MY DETERMINATIONS 8 WITHOUT YOUR INPUT IN IT? I DON'T NEED IT NOW. 9 IF THERE IS ANYTHING TO PUT ON THE RECORD, WE 10 WILL HAVE IT ON THE RECORD AFTER SHE LEAVES. 11 MR. CHIER: THANK YOU. 12 MS. CLEMENTS: SHALL I LEAVE? 13 THE COURT: NOT YET. 14 MS. CLEMENTS: ALL RIGHT. 15 THE COURT: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT WE ARE GOING THROUGH 16 THIS RITUAL WITH YOU AND WITH ALL OF THE OTHER PROSPECTIVE 17 JURORS. 18 MS. CLEMENTS: I DO. 19 THE COURT: YOU UNDERSTAND IT WILL TAKE SOME TIME? 20 MS. CLEMENTS: I UNDERSTAND. 21 THE COURT: YOU NOTICE HOW LONG IT HAS TAKEN WITH YOU. 22 IT IS ANTICIPATED WE WILL BE FINISHED WITH THIS 23 PROCESS OF INTERROGATING THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS BY ABOUT 24 DECEMBER 2ND, SO WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS TO COME BACK 25 TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM ON DECEMBER 2ND. IF IT IS GOING 26 TO BE LATER THAN THAT, AND WE DON'T FINISH AS WE ANTICIPATED 27 ON DECEMBER 2ND, WE HAVE YOUR TELEPHONE NUMBER AND WE WILL

CALL YOU AND TELL YOU WHEN TO COME BACK, ALL RIGHT?

MS. CLEMENTS: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: IN THE MEANTIME, YOU ARE NOT TO TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT THE CASE OR YOU ARE NOT TO READ ANYTHING ABOUT IT IF THERE IS ANYTHING TO BE READ OR TO LISTEN TO ANYTHING ON THE RADIO OR SEE ANYTHING ON TELEVISION.

AND DO NOT DISCUSS IT WITH ANYBODY, ALL RIGHT?

MS. CLEMENTS: VERY WELL.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, BEFORE MRS. CLEMENTS LEAVES
THE BUILDING FOR THE DAY, COULD WE HAVE THE BAILIFF ASK HER
TO WAIT OUT IN THE HALLWAY?

THE BAILIFF: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YOU DO THAT.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR CLEMENTS EXITED THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, I WILL HEAR FROM YOU, MR. CHIER.

FIRST, AND BY THE WAY, LET ME ADMONISH YOU.

I DON'T WANT YOU ASKING QUESTIONS OF ANY OF THESE PROSPECTIVE

JURORS AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY THINK I AM PREJUDICED AGAINST

YOU: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. CHIER: I CAN UNDERSTAND THAT.

THE COURT: IF YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO STATE ON THE RECORD,
YOU STATE IT ON THE RECORD AND NOT IN FRONT OF THE JURORS.

DON'T ASK QUESTIONS OF THAT KIND. IT IS HIGHLY IMPROPER
AND PREJUDICIAL AND DON'T YOU EVER DO IT AGAIN. NOW I AM
WARNING YOU: DON'T YOU EVER DO IT AGAIN. IT IS IMPROPER.

MR. CHIER: YOUR HONOR, I THINK YOUR CONDUCT TOWARD

28 | ME --

THE COURT: IT IS CONTEMNATIOUS AND IT IS CONTEMPTABLE AND I DON'T WANT YOU TO DO IT.

MR. CHIER: I THINK YOUR CONDUCT TOWARDS ME HAS BEEN --

THE COURT: ANYTHING I HAVE DONE WITH RESPECT TO YOU IS SOMETHING YOU HAVE RICHLY DESERVED.

I DON'T WANT YOU TO DO ANYTHING LIKE THE THINGS
YOU DID AGAIN.

MR. CHIER: I AM DEFENDING AN INNOCENT MAN HERE.

THE COURT: I DON'T WANT TO HEAR ANY SPEECHES FROM YOU IN THAT CONNECTION.

I AM JUST MAKING A WARNING TO YOU TO JUST ASK

PROPER QUESTIONS. IF I OBJECT TO IT AND I DON'T THINK YOU

SHOULD ASK A QUESTION, LET IT REST AT THAT. DON'T ASK A

JUROR WHETHER OR NOT HE OR SHE THINKS I AM PREJUDICED AGAINST

YOU.

5

MR. CHIER: I WANT TO SAY THAT IN FRONT OF THE ONE JUROR, YOU TREATED ME WITH ABUSE. YOU THREATENED TO HAVE ME ARRESTED. YOU TOLD ME TO SHUT UP.

THE COURT: LISTEN, I HAVE TOLD YOU SOMETHING OUTSIDE OF THE PRESENCE OF THE JUROR. NOW GO AHEAD. WHAT IS IT YOU WANT TO SAY?

MR. CHIER: I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A RECORD WITHOUT BEING INTERRUPTED, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: MAKE A RECORD, GO AHEAD.

MR. CHIER: I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT EVERY SINGLE JUROR
THAT I HAVE VOIR DIRED ON THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY,
YOUR HONOR HAS INTERRUPTED IN THE MIDDLE OF MY QUESTIONS.
YOU HAVE LED THE JURORS. YOU HAVE INSTRUCTED THE JURORS.

THE COURT: THAT IS A MATTER OF RECORD. YOU DON'T HAVE TO MAKE IT FOR THE RECORD, IT IS ALREADY IN THERE.

MR. CHIER: I AM REQUESTING THAT YOUR HONOR NOT DO THAT ANY MORE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YOU ARE REQUESTING IT, I WILL.

HONOR YOUR REQUEST IF IT IS JUSTIFIED.

MR. CHIER: THIS WOMAN HERE IS CLEARLY --

THE COURT: LET'S NOT ARGUE ANY FURTHER ABOUT IT.

WHAT HAVE YOU GOT WITH RESPECT TO A CHALLENGE FOR CAUSE AS TO THIS WOMAN?

MR. CHIER: THIS WOMAN IS CLEARLY BIASED FOR CAUSE.

SHE IS CHALLENGEABLE FOR CAUSE. EVERY TIME THAT I ATTEMPTED

TO ESTABLISH HER BIAS AND HER EXCLUDABILITY, YOUR HONOR

LECTURED HER ON THE LAW AND SOUGHT FROM HER A COMMITMENT

TO FOLLOW THE LAW, WHICH UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES NO JUROR

IN THEIR RIGHT MIND WOULD EVER TELL YOUR HONOR THAT THEY WOULDN'T FOLLOW THE LAW AND IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE FOR ME TO FOLLOW UP OBVIOUS LEADS THAT WERE POINTING TOWARD HER BIAS IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PRONENESS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YOU HAVE MADE YOUR RECORD AGAIN.

ALL RIGHT, YOUR CHALLENGE IS REJECTED. I FIND THAT THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR IS QUALIFIED AND COMPETENT TO ACT AS A TRIAL JUROR IN THIS CASE.

MR. CHIER: THIS IS THE TIME FOR THE COUNSEL TO VOIR DIRE THE JURORS, NOT FOR THE COURT TO INSTRUCT THE JURY OR TO EDUCATE THEM CONCERNING THE LAW.

THE COURT: I AM POINTING OUT TO YOU AGAIN THAT THE SUPREME COURT HOLDS THAT THERE IS NOT UNLIMITED POWER TO ASK QUESTIONS.

IT ONLY HAS TO DO WITH THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. CHIER: AND THAT IS WHAT I AM TRYING TO FIND OUT.

THE COURT: YOU HAVEN'T.

YOU HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL THERE IS GENERAL VOIR DIRE IF SHE IS ACCEPTED AND YOU CAN ASK QUESTIONS OF THAT KIND THEN, YOU DO THAT AT A LATER TIME.

YOU DON'T HAVE UNLIMITED POWER.

MR. CHIER: MY QUESTIONS WENT ONLY --

THE COURT: THIS IS NOT SOMETHING THAT IS UNLIMITED AND YOU CAN GO INTO ANY KIND OF QUESTIONS YOU WANT.

MR. CHIER: MY QUESTIONS ARE ONLY LIMITED TO THEIR DEATH PRONENESS.

THE COURT: THEY ARE NOT. THAT IS WHY I HAVE INTERRUPTED

24

25

26

27

1 | YOU.

IT IS A VERY SERIOUS THING, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER YOU ARE DELIBERATELY TRYING TO PROVOKE ME AND GOAD ME INTO SOME KIND OF ERROR IN THIS CASE BUT I AM NOT GOING TO STAND FOR IT, I AM TELLING YOU THAT RIGHT NOW.

YOU ASK THE QUESTIONS THE WAY YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO. I DON'T DO IT WITH YOUR COLLEAGUE.

MR. CHIER: NO, YOU DON'T, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: HE KNOWS HOW TO ASK A QUESTION.

MR. CHIER: I FEEL THE WAY YOU HAVE TREATED ME IN THIS

CASE --

THE COURT: THEN YOU CAN WITHDRAW FROM IT IF YOU DON'T WANT TO STAY IN THE CASE.

MR. CHIER: ON THE CONTRARY, YOUR HONOR, I THINK YOU ARE SO BIASED TO ME THAT IT IS YOU THAT SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM THE CASE.

THE COURT: I AM NOT BIASED TOWARDS YOU OR ANYTHING.

I AM JUST BIASED TO THE MOTIONS THAT YOU MAKE, WHICH ARE COMPLETELY UNFOUNDED AND EVERYTHING ELSE.

MR. CHIER: I THINK IT IS YOU THAT SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM THE CASE.

YOU TOLD ME TO SHUT UP AND I HAD NO STANDING.

THE COURT: I WANT YOU TO SHUT UP BECAUSE THIS IS

EXACTLY WHAT YOU ARE DOING, YOU ARE DELIBERATELY TRYING TO

GOAD THE COURT INTO MAKING SOME KIND OF ERROR AND I WANT

YOU TO STOP IT.

WHAT IS IT YOU HAVE TO SAY?

MR. WAPNER: ONLY AS TO THE CHALLENGE FOR CAUSE, I DON'T BELIEVE THIS JUROR IS CHALLENGABLE FOR CAUSE BECAUSE I DON'T BELIEVE THAT SHE STATED AN UNMISTAKABLE BELIEF THAT SHE WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE EITHER FOR DEATH OR FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT AND A MERE BIAS OR TENDENCY ONE WAY OR THE OTHER IS NOT ENOUGH.

YOU ARE ALWAYS GOING TO GET JURORS WHO HAVE SOME
IDEAS ONE WAY OR THE OTHER BUT THIS JUROR CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED
SHE IS WILLING TO LISTEN TO ALL OF THE FACTS IN THE CASE AND
MAKE A DECISION BASED ON THE FACTS IN THIS CASE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, COUNSEL HEARD THAT AND I THINK
YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY CORRECT ABOUT THAT. I DON'T THINK THERE
IS ANY BASIS FOR CHALLENGE FOR CAUSE TO THIS JUROR OR ANY
OTHER BASIS FOR CHALLENGE FOR CAUSE TO BE MADE.

THE BAILIFF: ARE WE SUPPOSED TO GET THROUGH TODAY?
WHAT DO YOU WANT ME TO DO?

THE COURT: LET'S TAKE ONE MORE AND I HOPE IT IS SHORT.

THE BAILIFF: SHOULD I TELL THE OTHERS TO COME BACK

TOMORROW?

THE COURT: YES, TELL THEM TO COME BACK TOMORROW AFTER-NOON -- WAIT A MINUTE. WE HAVE A MOTION TOMORROW.

THE BAILIFF: WE ONLY HAVE SIX JURORS COMING BACK
TOMORROW AFTERNOON. WE DON'T HAVE ANY COMING IN THE MORNING.
DO YOU WANT ME TO TELL THEM TO COME BACK TOMORROW AFTERNOON?

MR. WAPNER: YES, YES.

THE COURT: YES, TOMORROW AFTERNOON. TELL THEM TO BE HERE AT 1:45.

ιη Σ WILL JUST TAKE ONE MORE.

THE BAILIFF: 1:45?

THE COURT: YES, PLEASE

ω

THE BAILIFF: JUDGE, AS FAR AS MISS CLEMENTS IS CONCERNED,

DO YOU WANT HER 10 8 E BACK DECEMBER 2ND AT WHAT TIME?

6

H H H

COURT:

DECEMBER

2ND

AT

10:30

Z

THE

MORNING

Z

S

I H E JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM ON DECEMBER 2ND, UNLESS SHE 1S CALLED

OTHERWISE

7

27

26

24

23

22

20

ᄚ

5

16

14

12

<u></u>

70

 $\vec{\omega}$ 

28

1 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR CLEWS ENTERS THE 2 COURTROOM.) 3 THE CLERK: STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD. HAVE A SEAT, 4 PLEASE. 5 MR. CLEWS: RONALD CLEWS. 6 THE COURT: MR. CLEWS, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES 7 OF QUESTIONS AND THE ANSWERS SHOULD BE YES OR NO. IF IT IS 8 UNCLEAR TO YOU, ASK ME TO REPEAT IT TO YOU AND I WILL BE 9 VERY HAPPY TO DO SO. 10 MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR. OKAY. THE COURT: THE FIRST QUESTION I AM GOING TO ASK YOU 11 12 15 AS FOLLOWS: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH 13 PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION 14 AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT? 15 MR. CLEWS: NO. 16 THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH 17 PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, 18 EVEN WHEN THE PROSECUTION ONLY PROVES THE DEFENDANT GUILTY 19 OF MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE OR MANSLAUGHTER? 20 MR. CLEWS: I AM NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION. 21 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 22 DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY 23 THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN 24 WHEN THE PROSECUTION ONLY PROVES THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER 25 IN THE SECOND DEGREE OR MANSLAUGHTER? DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 26 MR. CLEWS: COULD YOU DO IT AGAIN, PLEASE?

THE COURT: I WILL DO IT AGAIN. NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY
OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO

VOTE FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, EVEN IF THE PEOPLE DO NOT PROVE FIRST DEGREE MURDER?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

THE COURT: NOW, BEFORE I ASK YOU THE THIRD QUESTION,

1 THINK THAT YOU HAVE HEARD WHEN 1 VOIR DIRED THE ENTIRE

PANEL, 1 TOLD THEM ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE CASE?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

THE COURT: I TOLD THEM THAT THIS IS A MURDER CASE WHERE THE DEATH PENALTY HAS BEEN ASKED BY THE PEOPLE AND THAT IF THE JURY FINDS THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN WE ARE TO MAKE A SPECIAL FINDING, ANOTHER FINDING AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

NOW, IF THE MURDER IS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY WITH SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THEY HAVE GOT TO MAKE A SEPARATE FINDING AS TO WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS COMMITTED -
IF THEY FIND HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, WHETHER IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND SO THE JURY, IF THEY FIND
HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THEY ARE TO
DETERMINE WHETHER IT IS TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED
AS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.
ALL RIGHT. SO, THE THIRD QUESTION IS: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION
REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING
AN IMPARTIAL DECISION CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE
SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE ALLEGED IN THIS CASE?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

THE COURT: OKAY. NOW, THE NEXT QUESTION IS: DO YOU
HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU
WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE IT AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY
OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE,
REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY
PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IF YOU FIND THE

DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND YOU MAKE

A FINDING THAT IT WAS DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN

WE HAVE A SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL WITH THE SAME JURY ON OTHER.

EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED TO YOU? YOU ARE TO DETERMINE

AFTER ALL OF THE EVIDENCE IS PRESENTED, WHETHER OR NOT IT IS

LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH. DO YOU UNDERSTAND

THAT?

MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: THAT IS THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE CASE. NOW, THIS QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH THE PENALTY PHASE.

DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH

PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE IT AFTER

A VERDICT OF GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A FINDING

OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY

BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

THE COURT: AND FIFTH, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING
THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE
IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AFTER A VERDICT

0F ΑŢ CIRCUMSTANCES THE GUILTY PENALTY 0F MURDER REGARDLESS PHASE  $\ddot{z}$ 0F HE HH HH 0F FIRST PZK TRIAL? EVIDENCE DEGREE WITH THAT ]> MAY FINDING DD [7] PRESENTED 0F SPECI

MR. CLEWS: NO.

0R MH I CH 0 F ELSE. NATURE EITHER THIS MITIGATING WILL D0 THE 0F EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES TRIAL YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? I HE COURT: B F INTRODUCED AND THOSE I S OFFENSE CIRCUMSTANCES  $\triangleright$ DO SEPARATE 70U AND UNDERSTAND 80 0R TRIAL? FORTH, CIRCUMSTANCES Z FACTS FAVOR BACKGROUND THAT THERE ARE THE 0 F WILL THE DESIGNED AGGRAVATING PENALTY AND ΒE DEFENDANT OTHER EVERYTHING PHASE 70 FACTS THE MOHS

MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR.

5

4

 $\vec{\omega}$ 

 $\vec{\sim}$ 

ニ

9

α

თ

G

ω

2

6

27

26

24

23

22

20

19

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AFTER A VERDICT OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED IN THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL? MR. CLEWS: NO. THE COURT: YOU WOULD LISTEN TO THE PENALTY PHASE EVIDENCE AND THEN MAKE UP YOUR OWN MIND? MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT OF COURSE, THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT OCCUR IN THIS CASE AND THAT THE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL? DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? MR. CLEWS: I UNDERSTAND THAT, YES, SIR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 

4 B

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

28

```
MR. CHIER: MR. CLEWS, COULD 1 ASK YOU SIR -- MY NAME
IS CHIER. I REPRESENT JOE HUNT, HERE. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW,
SIR, IF YOU HAVE HEARD OR SEEN ANYTHING CONCERNING THIS CASE
PRIOR TO READING THE TIMES ARTICLE? THE SUNDAY TIMES ARTICLE?
      MR. CLEWS: PARDON ME?
      MR. CHIER: IN THE LOS ANGELES SUNDAY TIMES?
      MR. CLEWS: I DON'T REMEMBER IF IT WAS THE SUNDAY TIMES.
      MR. CHIER: IT WAS ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE METRO
SECTION?
      MR. CLEWS: I DON'T REMEMBER THAT. I JUST REMEMBER
SEEING IT IN THE PAPER. I DON'T REMEMBER WHICH DAY IT WAS.
     MR. CHIER: DO YOU REMEMBER READING THE ENTIRE ARTICLE?
      MR. CLEWS: PRETTY MUCH, I THINK I DID. YEAH.
      MR. CHIER: AS A RESULT OF HAVING READ THAT ARTICLE,
DID YOU FORM ANY OPINION AS TO THE PROBABLE GUILT OR INNOCENCE
OF THE DEFENDANT?
     MR. CLEWS: NO, SIR.
     MR. CHIER: HAVE YOU SEEN TIME MAGAZINE?
     MR. CLEWS: NO.
     MR. CHIER: DO YOU SUBSCRIBE TO TIME MAGAZINE?
     MR. CLEWS: NO.
     MR. CHIER: DO YOU SUBSCRIBE TO ANY MAGAZINES?
     MR. CLEWS: ATLANTIC.
     MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. DID YOU READ THE ENTIRE ARTICLE
IN THE L.A. TIMES?
     MR. CLEWS: I THINK I DID, YEAH.
     MR. CHIER: DID YOU HEAR THE ARTICLE BEING DISCUSSED
```

AMONG OTHER JURORS IN THE ASSEMBLY ROOM?

```
4B-1
```

MR. CLEWS: NO. 1 MR. CHJER: DID YOU FEEL AS A RESULT OF THE ARTICLE 2 IN THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, THE DEFENDANT WAS PROBABLY NOT 3 GUILTY? 4 THE COURT: HE SAID HE DIDN'T FORM ANY OPINION AFTER 5 READING THE ARTICLE. THAT MEANS NOT GUILTY OR GUILTY. IS 6 THAT TRUE? MR. CLEWS: I AGREE WITH THAT, YES. 8 MR. CHIER: YOU FORMED NO OPINION WHATSOEVER? 9 MR. CLEWS: RIGHT. 10 MR. CHIER: LET ME PASS THAT FOR JUST A MOMENT. AND 11 I WILL ASK YOU WHETHER YOU ARE A PERSON IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH 12 PENALTY, SIR. 13 MR. CLEWS: WHEN APPROPRIATE, YES. 14 MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT. AND WHEN IS IT APPROPRIATE --15 AS FAR AS THE QUESTIONS I AM ASKING NOW, THEY ARE OF AN 16 ATTITUDINAL TYPE. 17 MR. CLEWS: RIGHT. 18 MR. CHIER: NOT CONCERNING YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAW. 19 I AM SIMPLY SEEKING OUT YOUR FEELINGS, YOUR VISCERAL, 20 ATTITUDINAL FEELINGS TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY AS THEY MIGHT 21 BEAR UPON YOUR QUALIFICATIONS AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE. 22 23 MR. CLEWS: I UNDERSTAND. MR. CHIER: DO YOU HAVE SOME GENERAL, PRECONCEIVED 24 NOTION ABOUT WHEN THE DEATH PENALTY IS APPROPRIATE GENERALLY 25 SPEAKING? 26 27 MR. CLEWS: YES.

MR. CHIER: COULD YOU ARTICULATE IT FOR US, PLEASE,

TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY? I UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS HARD.

MR. CLEWS: WELL, WHEN SOMEBODY TAKES ANOTHER PERSON'S

MR. CHIER: IF I CAN ASSIST, IN CASES OF FIRST DEGREE,
PREMEDITATED, DELIBERATE MURDER, WOULD YOU SAY THAT THE DEATH
PENALTY WAS PROBABLY APPROPRIATE?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

MR. CHIER: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT IN SUCH CASES, WHERE
A PERSON COMMITS A DELIBERATE --

THE COURT: I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE PROSPECTIVE

JUROR KNOWS THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE CAN PRESCRIBE THOSE

CASES IN WHICH THE DEATH PENALTY WILL BE IMPOSED.

AND UNLESS A MURDER FALLS WITHIN THOSE PRESCRIBED STANDARDS, IT IS NOT A DEATH PENALTY CASE. YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: NOW, THE LEGISLATURE HAS PRESCRIBED THAT WHERE THERE IS A MURDER, DELIBERATE OR NOT, THAT DOESN'T AUTOMATICALLY QUALIFY IT FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. IT HAS GOT TO BE COMMITTED IN CERTAIN TYPES OF CRIMES, AMONG WHICH IS A MURDER COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY OR MAYHEM OR RAPE OR TORTURE OR THOSE KINDS OF CRIMES.

YOU WILL FOLLOW THE LAW THAT THE COURT GIVES
TO YOU?

MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: AND THAT DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THAT EVERY SINGLE MURDER IS A DEATH PENALTY?

MR. CLEWS: I UNDERSTAND.

4B - 4THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU WILL FOLLOW THE LAW, WON'T 1 YOU? 2 MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR. 3 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 4 MR. CHIER: WOULD IT BE DIFFICULT FOR YOU, MR. CLEWS, 5 TO FIND MITIGATION IN A CASE WHERE YOU HAD PREVIOUSLY FOUND 6 THAT A MURDER HAD BEEN COMMITTED IN THE FIRST DEGREE IN THE 7 COURSE OF A ROBBERY? 8 MR. CLEWS: I THINK IT IS A SERIOUS BUSINESS AND WOULD 9 HAVE TO CONSIDER EVERYTHING. 10 MR. CHIER: WELL, WHAT I AM SAYING IS, DO YOU HAVE 11 ANY KIND OF A BIAS FOR -- AT GROUND ZERO, ARE YOU MORE BIASED 12 TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY THAN SAY, LIFE IMPRISONMENT IN A 13 CASE OF A MURDER, A FIRST DEGREE MURDER? 14 MR. CLEWS: I WOULD HAVE TO -- IT WOULD BE A QUESTION 15 OF THE CASE ITSELF, I THINK. 16 I CAN'T SAY AHEAD OF TIME THAT I AM LEANING ONE 17 WAY OR ANOTHER. 18 MR. CHIER: COULD YOU, IF YOU THOUGHT THAT THE EVIDENCE 19 WARRANTED IT, RETURN A VERDICT OF LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY 20 OF PAROLE, IF YOU FOUND THAT THERE WERE EXTENUATING 21 22 CIRCUMSTANCES OR MITIGATION? 23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. CLEWS: I BELIEVE IN MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

MR. CHIER: AND WHAT IS IT THAT YOU WOULD CONSIDER

A TYPE OF MITIGATION, WITHOUT REFERENCE TO WHAT IS CONSIDERED

LEGAL MITIGATION? BUT WHAT TYPES OF SITUATIONS WOULD YOU

CONSIDER?

THE COURT: WELL, THEY ARE INFINITE. HE CAN'T TELL

YOU ALL OF THOSE THINGS THAT YOU ARE ASKING HIM FOR. 4B-5 MR. CHIER: I AM ASKING HIM FOR ANY --THE COURT: FORGET THAT, WILL YOU? ALL OF THOSE WHICH THE COURT PERMITS YOU TO CONSIDER, YOU WILL CONSIDER, ISN'T THAT TRUE? MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND ALL OF THE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, YOU WILL ALSO CONSIDER, WOULD YOU NOT? MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR. 5 FO 

```
MR. CHIER: WOULD YOU CONSIDER AGE AS A MITIGATING
1
     CIRCUMSTANCE?
2
           THE COURT: IF THE COURT TELLS YOU THAT THAT MAY BE
3
     CONSIDERED, WOULD YOU CONSIDER IT?
4
           MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR.
5
           MR. CHIER: DO YOU THINK IT IS A MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCE?
6
           MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION. HE IS ASKING HIM TO PREJUDGE
7
     THE EVIDENCE.
8
           MR. CLEWS: I WOULD HAVE NO IDEA.
9
           THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION.
10
           MR. CHIER: DO YOU THINK LACK OF PRIOR CRIMINAL RECORD
11
     IS A FACTOR IN MITIGATION?
12
           THE COURT: SUPPOSE THE COURT INSTRUCTS YOU THAT THAT
13
     IS A MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCE, WOULD YOU ACCEPT THAT?
14
           MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR.
15
           THE COURT: AND CONSIDER IT?
16
           MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR.
17
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
18
           MR. CHIER: IF THE COURT INSTRUCTED YOU, YOU COULD
19
     CONSIDER IT BUT YOU DIDN'T HAVE TO, WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT
20
     ATTITUDE TOWARD WHETHER OR NOT AGE IS A --
21
           THE COURT: IF I AM TELLING HIM THAT HE CAN CONSIDER
22
23
     IT, WHAT DO YOU MEAN HE DOESN'T HAVE TO?
                 THAT IS A MATTER THAT HE MAY CONSIDER.
24
25
           MR. CHIER: HE HAS DISCRETION TO CONSIDER IT AND I
26
     WANT TO KNOW --
           THE COURT: THAT IS WHAT I SAID, YOU DON'T HAVE TO
27
     GO ANY FURTHER.
28
```

5 - 1

```
MR. CHIER: WELL, MR. CLEWS, WHEN YOU READ THE ARTICLE
1
     IN THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, WHAT DO YOU REMEMBER ABOUT THE
    ARTICLE IN THE TIMES?
3
           MR. CLEWS: OH, I REMEMBER A FEW THINGS. I REMEMBER
4
     THAT THERE WAS NO BODY.
5
          MR. CHIER: YES?
6
           MR. CLEWS: AND I REMEMBER THAT MR. HUNT WAS INTO
7
    FINANCE.
8
           MR. CHIER: DO YOU REMEMBER ANY REFERENCES TO SAN
9
    MATEO, CALIFORNIA?
10
          MR. CLEWS: NO, I DON'T.
11
                 OH, AND I REMEMBER THE VICTIM'S NAME.
12
           MR. CHIER: YES?
13
          MR. CLEWS: IS RONALD LEVIN.
14
           MR. CHIER: HAD YOU EVER HEARD OF RONALD LEVIN PRIOR
15
     TO --
16
          MR. CLEWS: NO, NO.
17
           MR. CHIER: -- PRIOR TO THE APPEARANCE OF THAT ARTICLE?
18
          MR. CLEWS: NO.
19
           THE COURT: YOU HEARD ME IN COURT MENTION THE NAME
20
     OF THE VICTIM, DIDN'T YOU?
21
           MR. CLEWS: OH, THAT IS TRUE, THAT REMINDED ME.
22
           THE COURT: IS THAT RIGHT?
23
           MR. CLEWS: PLUS RONALD IS MY SAME NAME, YOU SEE, THAT
24
     IS ME.
25
           MR. CHIER: PASS THIS GENTLEMAN FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.
26
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, PASS FOR CAUSE.
27
                 DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?
28
```

25 - 3

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. WAPNER: JUST BRIEFLY -- NO. I WILL PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. CLEWS. YOU SEE WE ARE DOWN TO C'S NOW, WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH Z, YOU SEE. WE ARE IN THE PROCESS NOW OF ASKING ALL OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS WHO ARE ON THE LIST --

MR. CLEWS: YES.

THE COURT: -- THE SAME QUESTIONS WE HAVE BEEN ASKING YOU. AND YOU SEE HOW LONG IT TAKES. WE EXPECT OR ANTICIPATE THAT THIS INTERROGATION PROCESS WILL TAKE UNTIL ABOUT DECEMBER 2ND.

MR. CLEWS: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS TO COME BACK ON DECEMBER 2ND TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AT 10:30 IN THE MORNING AND IF IT LASTS ANY LONGER THAN THAT, WE WILL CALL YOU AND LET YOU KNOW WHEN YOU CAN COME BACK.

AT ANY RATE, DECEMBER 2ND --

MR. CLEWS: I UNDERSTAND.

THE COURT: -- IN THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AT 10:30 IN THE MORNING.

AND DON'T TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT THE CASE.

MR. CLEWS: ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: IN FACT, DON'T TALK ABOUT ANY QUESTIONS WE HAVE ASKED.

MR. WAPNER: AND NOT TO READ ANYTHING.

THE COURT: YES, OF COURSE, NOT TO READ ANYTHING FURTHER.

MR. CLEWS: OKAY, OKAY.

THE COURT: AND YOU ARE NOT TO LISTEN TO THE RADIO

25

26

27

```
1
    OR TELEVISION.
                 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR CLEWS EXITED THE
2
3
                 COURTROOM,)
          THE COURT: WHAT TIME IS THE HEARING TOMORROW?
4
          MR. WAPNER: I THOUGHT WE HAD SCHEDULED IT FOR 10:00.
5
          THE COURT: 10 O'CLOCK? WE WILL ASK THE CLERK.
6
           THE CLERK: I BELIEVE IT WAS 10:30.
7
8
           THE COURT: NO, IT WAS 10 O'CLOCK.
           THE CLERK: I HAVE MY LIST HERE.
9
           THE COURT: AT ANY RATE, YOU ARE HAVING HIM HERE AT
10
    10:00, ARE YOU?
11
          MR. WAPNER: I THINK HE WILL BE HERE EARLIER THAN THAT
12
     TO TALK TO ME BUT WHATEVER TIME THE COURT WANTS.
13
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MAKE IT AT 10 O'CLOCK.
14
           THE CLERK: I FOUND IT. IT IS 10 O'CLOCK.
15
16
                 (AT 4:45 P.M. AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN
                 UNTIL WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1986, AT
17
18
                 10 A.M.)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```