COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT



THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF	F CALIFORNIA,)	
PLAINTIFF-RE	ESPONDENT,) SUPERIOR	COURT
VS.) NO. A-090	
JOE HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HENRY GAMSKY,	OCT 0	9 1837
DEFENDANT-AF	PPELLANT.)	

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 29 OF 101 (PAGES 4/7/ TO 436/ , INCLUSIVE)



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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 2 HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE DEPARTMENT WEST C 3 4 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,) 5 PLAINTIFF, 6 NO. A-090435 VS. 7 JOSEPH HUNT, 8 DEFENDANT. 9 10 REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT 11 TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1987 12 VOLUME 29 13 (PAGES 4171 TO 4361, INCLUSIVE) 14 15 APPEARANCES: 16 IRA REINER, DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR THE PEOPLE: BY: FREDERICK N. WAPNER, DEPUTY 1725 MAIN STREET 17 SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90401 18 ARTHUR H. BARENS, ESQ. FOR THE DEFENDANT: 10209 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD 19 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067 20 AND RICHARD C. CHIER, ESQ. 21 10920 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024 22 23 24 25 ROSEMARIE GOODBODY, CSR NO. 932 SALLY YERGER, CSR NO. 2008 26 OFFICIAL REPORTERS 27

1	TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1987 V	OLUME 29	PAGES 4171 TO	4361
2	A	M.		4171
3	F	.M.		4243
4				
5				
6	PROCEE	DINGS		
7				
8	VOIR DIRE OF PROSPECTIVE JURORS	(CONTINUED)		4171
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
2 0				
21				
2 2				
23				
24				
2 5				
26				
2 7				
28				
				}

```
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1987; 10:30 A.M.
1
    DEPARTMENT WEST C
                                  HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE
2
                 (APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.)
3
4
          THE COURT: THE RECORD WILL INDICATE THE PRESENCE OF
5
    THE DEFENDANT AND COUNSEL.
6
                 IT SEEMS THAT WE ARE MAKING HASTE MUCH TOO SLOWLY.
7
    LET'S TRY TO EXPEDITE IT IF YOU CAN.
8
          MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, EVEN EXPEDITING IT, IT SEEMS
9
    UNLIKELY THAT AT THE VERY FASTEST WE COULD DO MORE THAN 20
10
    TODAY. WE HAVE ALL OF THIS GROUP OF 35 HERE.
11
          THE COURT: LET'S SEE WHAT WE CAN DO.
12
          MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT.
13
          THE COURT: IT MAY BE THAT WE MIGHT HAVE A SUFFICIENT
14
    NUMBER ANYWAY.
15
                 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONE ENTERED THE
16
                 COURTROOM.)
17
          THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, GOOD MORNING.
18
19
          MS. BONE: GOOD MORNING.
          MR. BARENS: I BELIEVE MR. WAPNER WAS PROCEEDING WITH
20
    MS. BONE.
21
          THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
22
          MR. WAPNER: GOOD MORNING, MRS. BONE.
23
          MS. BONE: GOOD MORNING.
24
           MR. WAPNER: LET ME SEE IF I CAN CHANGE THE EXAMPLE
25
    A LITTLE BIT THAT I STARTED WITH YESTERDAY.
26
                 LET'S ASSUME THAT YOU ARE SITTING ON A JURY ON
27
    A MURDER CASE AND IN THE BEGINNING PART OF THIS EXAMPLE,
28
```

F

THAT CASE DOESN'T INVOLVE THE DEATH PENALTY, YOU HAVE NEVER HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AND YOU ARE SITTING ON A JURY AND YOU ARE TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHETHER OR NOT IT HAS BEEN PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT A MURDER WAS COMMITTED AND THAT THE DEFENDANT DID IT.

ARE YOU WITH ME SO FAR?

MS. BONE: YES, SIR.

_

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM. AND AFTER SERIOUS DELIBERATION, YOU HAVE DECIDED THAT THE CASE HAS BEEN PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, OKAY?

MS. BONE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. NOW, LET'S ASSUME -- OF COURSE, THIS WOULDN'T HAPPEN. BUT FOR THE HYPOTHETICAL, ASSUME THAT BEFORE YOU COME BACK INTO COURT AND RENDER YOUR VERDICT, SOME-BODY COMES INTO THE JURY ROOM AND SAYS TO YOU, OKAY, NOW, DO YOU KNOW THAT THIS CASE MIGHT INVOLVE THE DEATH PENALTY? AND THEY TELL YOU IT MIGHT INVOLVE THE DEATH PENALTY.

WOULD YOU SAY TO YOURSELF WELL, I HAVE TO RETHINK WHETHER OR NOT THE CASE HAS BEEN PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT?

MS. BONE: NO.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. SO, EVEN THOUGH YOU KNOW FROM THE BEGINNING IN THIS CASE, IF YOU ARE CHOSEN AS A JUROR, THAT SOMEWHERE DOWN THE LINE THERE IS A POSSIBILITY OF YOUR HAVING TO DECIDE THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY, WOULD THAT CHANGE YOUR VIEW OF HOW MUCH PROOF IS REQUIRED FOR PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT?

MS. BONE: NO. BECAUSE I HAVE TO HAVE A LOT OF PROOF

TO EVEN FIND HIM GUILTY. EITHER WAY I DECIDED, IT WOULD KEEP

ME AWAKE. I MEAN, I KNOW THAT IS NOT A YES OR NO. BUT EITHER

WAY, IT WOULD BOTHER ME.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. LET ME COME BACK TO THAT IN A SECOND.

WHAT I AM GETTING AT THOUGH, IS WOULD YOU REQUIRE MORE PROOF

IN THE GUILT PHASE BECAUSE IT IS A DEATH PENALTY CASE THAN

YOU WOULD IF IT WAS NOT A DEATH PENALTY CASE?

MS. BONE: I DON'T THINK SO BECAUSE I WOULD HAVE TO BE VERY SURE IN THE FIRST PLACE, TO EVEN RENDER A VERDICT OF GUILTY.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. IF THE JUDGE TELLS YOU THAT
THE STANDARD IS PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND IT IS THE
SAME STANDARD IN THIS CASE AS ANY OTHER CASE, REGARDLESS OF
THE PENALTY, COULD YOU FOLLOW THAT INSTRUCTION?

MS. BONE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. YOU WILL REALIZE THAT THE

STANDARD IS THE SAME? IT IS NOT ANY LOWER OR HIGHER BECAUSE -
MS. BONE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. TELL ME WHAT YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAY THAT EITHER WAY YOU DECIDE THE CASE, IT WOULD KEEP YOU AWAKE?

MS. BONE: I WOULD ALWAYS WORRY. SOMEONE'S LIFE, THE DECISION WOULD BE A PART OF MY DECISION IN MY HANDS. I WOULD FEEL VERY CONSCIENTIOUS ABOUT MAKING THAT DECISION.

I WOULD FEEL BADLY EITHER WAY. I WOULD FEEL BADLY FOR THE PERSON WHO COMMITTED IT. I WOULD FEEL BADLY FOR THE VICTIM. I WOULD FEEL VERY DISTRAUGHT IF THE PERSON SPENDS THE REST OF THEIR LIFE IN JAIL.

THAT IN ITSELF, IS A DEATH WISH. BOTH OF THEM ARE. BOTH ARE VERY DIFFICULT DECISIONS TO MAKE.

THERE IS NOT A RIGHT OR WRONG IN MAKING THE

DECISION. IT IS ONE YOU MUST MAKE. EITHER ONE WOULD BE

HARD. I WOULD REALLY GIVE IT -- I KNOW I WOULD AGONIZE OVER

IT.

BUT I AGONIZE OVER MY CHORUS, THE RIGHT DECISIONS.

WHATEVER YOU SAY FOR THIS PERSON IS A VERY, VERY DIFFICULT DECISION. THE COURT REPORTER: CHORUS? MS. BONE: CHORUS. MR. WAPNER: DO YOU AGONIZE OVER SMALL DECISIONS AS WELL AS LARGE ONES? MS. BONE: NOT THAT MUCH. BUT YES, SOMETIMES. SOMETIMES BUT NOT AT GREAT LENGTH. BUT I AM USUALLY VERY SURE BEFORE I MAKE A DECISION ON SOMETHING. I GIVE IT A LOT OF THOUGHT.

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU ARE ON THIS JURY AND IF YOU GET
TO THE PENALTY PHASE, YOUR CHOICES WILL BE EITHER LIFE
IMPRISONMENT OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER; IS THAT A DECISION
YOU ARE CAPABLE OF MAKING?

MS. BONE: I AM CAPABLE OF MAKING IT, YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONGLY-HELD RELIGIOUS

OR MORAL BELIEFS THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU OR MAKE IT DIFFICULT

FOR YOU TO IMPOSE THE PENALTY OF DEATH ON SOMEBODY?

MS. BONE: NO.

IT WOULD JUST BE PERSONAL -- A PERSONAL FEELING.

MR. WAPNER: EXPLAIN THAT TO ME.

MS. BONE: I WOULD GIVE IT A LOT OF SOUL SEARCHING ON PLAYING GOD WITH A PERSON'S LIFE.

MR. WAPNER: YOU USED THAT PHRASE YESTERDAY --

MS. BONE: YES, I DID.

MR. WAPNER: -- ALSO.

MS. BONE: I REMEMBER IT.

MR. WAPNER: WHAT DO YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAY THAT?

MS. BONE: IT WOULD BE VERY HARD TO MAKE A DECISION

TO TAKE SOMEONE'S LIFE. YOU MIGHT FEEL THAT YOU WERE IN A

POSITION OF, YOU KNOW, AS I SAID, GOD MAKES THOSE DECISIONS

IN LIFE. HOWEVER, IF THE PERSON TOOK SOMEONE ELSE'S LIFE,

THAT DECISION WAS MADE BY THEM, AND I COULD MAKE THE DECISION.

MR. WAPNER: WHEN YOU SAY GOD MAKES THAT DECISION NORMALLY --

MR. BONE: FOR LIFE AND DEATH NORMALLY.

MR. WAPNER: -- DO YOU HAVE ANY FEELING THAT IF YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM DECIDING THE QUESTION OF PENALTY IN THIS

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

27

28

THOSE WERE HER OWN WORDS.

CASE THAT IT COULD ULTIMATELY COME DOWN TO SAYING "WELL, GOD SHOULD MAKE THAT DECISION, NOT ME, AND THEREFORE I WILL COME DOWN ON THE SIDE OF SPARING SOMEONE'S LIFE"? MS. BONE: NO, I DON'T BELIEVE SO. THAT IS A DIFFERENT THING. MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I WILL PASS FOR CAUSE. MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR MIGHT RECALL THE DEFENSE HAS RESERVED A MOTION. THE COURT: YES. MR. BARENS: IF WE COULD DISCUSS THAT. THE COURT: WOULD YOU WAIT OUTSIDE JUST FOR A MOMENT, PLEASE? WE HAVE SOME LEGAL DISCUSSIONS. MS. BONE: YES. (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONE EXITED THE COURTROOM.) THE COURT: YES? MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE DEFENSE FINDS THIS TO BE A VERY HONEST AND STRAIGHTFORWARD WOMAN. I AM EXTREMELY CONCERNED BY THE FACT THAT SHE NEVER APPEARED TO RECONCILE AN UNDERSTANDING THAT AN ACCUSATION IS NOT TANTAMOUNT TO AN ASSUMPTION THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS DONE SOMETHING WRONG. WHEN I INQUIRED ON THIS SUBJECT FROM START TO FINISH, SHE CONSISTENTLY INDICATED THAT THE FACT HE WAS ACCUSED AND WAS HERE IN THIS COURTROOM AND WE WERE DISCUSSING THE DEATH PENALTY AT ALL, TO HER, SIGNIFIED HE MUST HAVE DONE SOMETHING WRONG.

ALTHOUGH I ASKED YOUR HONOR TO ASSIST IN

INTERVENING TO GIVE THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE EXPLANATION,

WHICH YOUR HONOR MOST GRACIOUSLY DID, SHE STILL WAS

UNRECONCILED WITH HER BELIEF THAT HE MUST HAVE DONE SOMETHING

WRONG OR WE WOULDN'T BE HERE TO BEGIN WITH AND I DON'T FEEL -
AND WHEN SHE PERSISTENTLY MAKES THAT STATEMENT, YOUR HONOR,

I DON'T FEEL THE DEFENSE COULD EVER GET A FAIR TRIAL.

LISTEN, I AM SURE YOUR HONOR HAS SEEN BEFORE A

LOT OF PEOPLE THINK IF A GUY IS IN A COURTROOM AS A DEFENDANT,

HE MUST HAVE DONE SOMETHING WRONG OR HE WOULDN'T BE THERE

TO BEGIN WITH, BEING ACCUSED, PERIOD. THE DEFENSE SIMPLY

COULDN'T ACCEPT A JUROR WITH THAT ORIENTATION IN THIS OR ANY

OTHER CASE AND WE CHALLENGE FOR CAUSE ON THAT BASIS, YOUR

HONOR.

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T THINK THIS IS THE

APPROPRIATE TIME TO MAKE THAT KIND OF A CHALLENGE. WE ARE

HERE AT THIS STAGE TO DECIDE HER VIEWS ON THE DEATH PENALTY

AND --

THE COURT: I THINK THAT THAT IS TRUE. WE ARE
PRINCIPALLY CONCERNED, AS COUNSEL SAYS, WITH HER ATTITUDE
TOWARDS THE DEATH PENALTY AND SHE SAYS ON THE DEATH PENALTY
THAT SHE COULD BE FAIR.

HOWEVER, IF YOU FEEL THAT AFTER WE HAVE GOTTEN

THROUGH THE VOIR DIRE IF SHE IS SELECTED AS A JUROR AND YOU

WANT TO MAKE A MOTION AFTER YOU HAVE MORE THOROUGHLY EXAMINED

HER WITH RESPECT TO HER ATTITUDE --

WOULD YOU TELL YOUR ASSOCIATE THERE, THE ASSISTANT THAT YOU HAVE, THAT WHEN I AM TALKING TO YOU I DON'T WANT HIM TO INTERRUPT IT?

MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR.

1	THE COURT: WILL YOU TELL HIM THAT?
2	MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR. IT IS UNDERSTOOD, YOUR
3	HONOR.
4	YOUR HONOR, I WILL SUBMIT THE MATTER AS YOUR HONOR
5	SUGGESTS.
6	THE COURT: I WILL RESERVE IT TO A LATER TIME.
7	MR. BARENS: UNTIL WE DO IT ON GENERAL VOIR DIRE?
8	THE COURT: YES.
9	MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10	WOULD YOU GET HER BACK IN, PLEASE?
11	(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONE RE-ENTERED THE
12	COURTROOM.)
13	THE COURT: THE COURT HAS RULED THAT YOU QUALIFY AS
14	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR IN THIS CASE ON THE DEATH PENALTY, SO
15	WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS TO COME BACK TOMORROW AFTERNOON
16	AND JOIN THE OTHER JURORS WHO MIGHT BE POSSIBLE JURORS IN
17	THE CASE AT 1:30 AT 1:45 IN THE AFTERNOON.
18	WILL YOU COME BACK TOMORROW AFTERNOON, PLEASE?
19	MS. BONE: YES.
20	THE COURT: IN THE MEANTIME, IF YOU HEAR OR READ
21	ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE, TRY NOT TO READ OR LISTEN TO
22	ANYTHING ABOUT IT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
2 3	(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONE EXITED THE
24	COURTROOM.)
25	
2 6	
27	

4-F

1 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONGEORNO ENTERS THE 2 COURTROOM.) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING. THAT IS MR. BONGEORNO? 3 MR. BONGEORNO: YES. 5 THE COURT: THAT MEANS GOOD DAY? 6 MR. BONGEORNO: IT SURE DOES. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. BONGEORNO, WHERE DO YOU LIVE? 7 8 MR. BONGEORNO: I LIVE IN VAN NUYS. THE COURT: YOU HEARD YESTERDAY, MY TELLING THE JURORS 9 10 THAT THIS CASE INVOLVES A MURDER, ALLEGED MURDER, A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE 11 12 OF A ROBBERY. 13 I INDICATED TO YOU TOO, THAT BECAUSE IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT QUALIFIES THE CASE FOR A 14 15 POSSIBLE DEATH PENALTY. ALL RIGHT? 16 AND I HAVE ALSO INDICATED TO YOU YESTERDAY, THAT THE LEGISLATURE SAID THERE WERE ABOUT 19 INSTANCES WHERE MURDER 17 18 OF THE FIRST DEGREE -- IT IS NOT JUST MURDER OF THE FIRST 19 DEGREE THAT CALLS FOR THE IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY AND 20 LIFF WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. IT IS ONLY IN THOSE 19 21 INSTANCES, THAT SOMETHING IN ADDITION IS DONE, WHERE THERE 22 ARE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THAT IT THEN QUALIFIES FOR THE DEATH 23 PENALTY. 24 ROBBERY IS ONE. BURGLARY IS ANOTHER. KIDNAPPING, 25 MULTIPLE MURDERS, RAPE, TORTURE, THOSE ARE INSTANCES WHERE 26 THE DEATH PENALTY MAY BE IMPOSED. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 27 MR. BONGEORNO: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: NOW, THE FIRST THING THE JURORS WILL DO WHO

ARE SELECTED TO TRY THIS CASE, THEY FIRST GO THROUGH WHAT THEY

CALL THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL. THEN THEY WILL DETERMINE

THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT, WAS HE OR WAS HE NOT

GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE.

THEN WE HAVE A QUESTION TO ANSWER. WAS THAT MURDER COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? IS IT TRUE OR FALSE IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? AS I SAY, IF THEY SAY IT IS TRUE, THEN THEY GO INTO THE SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL. THAT IS CALLED THE PENALTY PHASE.

NOW, DURING THE GUILT PHASE, THE QUESTION OF PENALTY MUST NEVER BE CONSIDERED BY THE JURY. IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE GUILT PHASE. IT IS ONLY IF HE IS FOUND GUILTY, THEN ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF IT, THEN CONSIDERATION OF PENALTY AND OTHER FACTORS MAY BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION.

FOR EXAMPLE, ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL,
BOTH SIDES WILL INTRODUCE ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY. YOU MUST
CONSIDER OF COURSE, THE FACTS THAT YOU HEARD IN CONNECTION
WITH THE CRIME ITSELF AND THE ROBBERY.

YOU WILL ALSO HEAR FROM THE DEFENDANT, THINGS ABOUT HIM WHICH ARE FAVORABLE TO HIM, HIS AGE, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS LACK OF ANY PREVIOUS CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS AND ANYTHING -- HIS EDUCATION AS I SAID AND EVERYTHING RELATING TO HIS CHARACTER AND HIS BACKGROUND WILL BE HEARD BY THE JURORS. WE CALL THAT MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

AND THE PROSECUTION WILL ATTEMPT TO SHOW FACTS
ABOUT HIM WHICH ARE UNFAVORABLE. THOSE ARE AGGRAVATING
CIRCUMSTANCES.

SO, THE JURY CONSIDERS ALL OF THAT BEFORE IT MAKES

UP ITS MIND AS TO WHETHER OR NOT TO IMPOSE ONE OF TWO

PENALTIES, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THAT MEANS

EXACTLY THAT -- NO PAROLE, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

HE CAN'T GET OUT FOR THE REST OF HIS LIFE. OR, IT CAN BE THE

DEATH PENALTY.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. BONGEORNO: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: NOW, WE ARE HERE FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXPLORING YOUR MIND TO DETERMINE WHAT YOUR FEELINGS ARE AND YOUR MIND SET IS WITH RESPECT TO THE DEATH PENALTY.

I WILL ASK YOU A SERIES OF QUESTIONS TO ASSIST
IN DETERMINING THAT AND SO WILL COUNSEL. NOW, THE FIRST TWO
QUESTIONS APPLY TO THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL. THE FIRST
IS, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION WHATEVER THAT OPINION MAY BE,
REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM
MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF
THE DEFENDANT AS TO THE CRIMES WHICH HAVE BEEN CHARGED?

MR. BONGEORNO: NO.

THE COURT: THE SECOND QUESTION IS ALSO RELATED TO THE GUILT PHASE. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT AS TO THE CRIMES WHICH HAVE BEEN CHARGED?

MR. BONGEORNO: NO.

THE COURT: THE SECOND QUESTION IS ALSO RELATING TO THE GUILT PHASE. 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? THAT IS, ON WAS IT COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MR. BONGEORNO: NO. 1 FEEL THAT I DON'T.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, THE SECOND TWO QUESTIONS
HAVE TO DO WITH THE PENALTY PHASE, ASSUMING THAT HE HAS BEEN
CONVICTED OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE IN THE COURSE OF A
ROBBERY. THEN WE ARE ON THE PENALTY PHASE. DO YOU HAVE ANY
OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU
AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS
OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE
OF THIS TRIAL?

MR. BONGEORNO: DEFINITELY NOT.

THE COURT: AND THE SECOND ONE IS THE SAME KIND EXCEPT

IT RELATES TO LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. DO YOU HAVE

SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD

AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE,

REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY

PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. BONGEORNO: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND OF COURSE,

THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT COME TO

TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN

ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. BONGEORNO: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. GOOD MORNING,
MR. BONGEORNO. I AM ARTHUR BARENS.

I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT. AND AS HIS HONOR DID, IT IS MY OBLIGATION AT THIS POINT IN THE PROCEEDINGS, TO INQUIRE INTO YOUR POINT OF VIEW CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY.

PRELIMINARILY, I WOULD LIKE TO INDICATE THAT THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS. NO ONE HERE IS GOING TO JUDGE ANY OF YOUR ANSWERS BECAUSE YOU NEVER COULD BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OWN OPINION. THAT IS ALL WE ARE SEEKING THIS MORNING. OKAY?

MR. BONGEORNO: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY
AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MR. BONGEORNO: I REALLY DON'T HAVE MUCH OPINION. IT

IS A PRETTY LARGE ISSUE ON WHICH I AM NOT VERSED TO MAKE THOSE

KINDS OF DECISIONS.

I AM RIGHT DOWN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD ON THAT.

MR. BARENS: I KIND OF NEED YOU TO HAVE AN OPINION

BECAUSE THAT IS THE WHOLE SUBJECT OF OUR INQUIRY. DO YOU

REMEMBER WHEN IT WAS A SUBJECT ON THE BALLOT A FEW YEARS AGO

IN CALIFORNIA?

MR. BONGEORNO: HAS IT BEEN MORE THAN FIVE YEARS?

MR. BARENS: NO -- YES.

MR. BONGEORNO: I AM NEW TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AS OF FIVE YEARS AGO. SO I WAS NOT INVOLVED IN THAT ISSUE.

MR. BARENS: WELL, IF YOU HAD BEEN HERE -- I AM GOING
TO GREATLY OVER-SIMPLIFY WHAT THIS WHOLE ISSUE AND DEBATE AND
HUF AND CRY WAS ABOUT.

BUT IF THERE WAS A BALLOT PROPOSITION THAT SAID
IN INSTANCES WHERE THERE IS A FIRST DEGREE, PREMEDITATED,
INTENTIONAL MURDER AND IT OCCURS DURING A ROBBERY OR A BURGLARY
OR WHAT WE CALL ANOTHER FELONY, LET'S SAY, BUT A BAD FELONY
LIKE RAPE, LIKE HIS HONOR SAID ABOUT THOSE 19 CATEGORIES, IF
THAT WERE ON THE BALLOT AND THE BALLOT SAID, DO YOU WANT TO
HAVE THAT AS A CITIZEN OF THIS STATE OR SHOULD WE ONLY HAVE
LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, NO MATTER WHAT ANYBODY
HAS DONE, HOW DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WOULD HAVE VOTED?

MR. BONGEORNO: I THINK I WOULD VOTE AGAINST IT.

MR. BARENS: VOTE AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. NOW, ONE OF THE CONCERNS WE HAVE
DURING THIS PROCESS IS THAT BOTH SIDES ARE LOOKING FOR AS
NEUTRAL A JUROR AS POSSIBLE. TO ME, WHAT THAT MEANS IN THIS

INSTANCE IS THAT WE NEED A PERSON WHO IS CAPABLE OF CONSIDERING VOTING EITHER FOR THE DEATH PENALTY OR VOTING FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, LISTENING TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AND BEING ABLE TO CONSIDER THAT EVIDENCE AND CAPABLE OF VOTING EITHER WAY.

NOW, I ASK YOU IF YOU WOULD BE THAT KIND OF A PERSON. WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO CONSIDER ALL OF THE EVIDENCE PRIOR TO VOTING? LET'S START WITH THAT.

MR. BONGEORNO: YES, I WOULD.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. NOW, THE SECOND QUESTION THAT
INEVITABLY COMES UP IS, DO YOU FEEL UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES
AND I AM GOING TO TRY TO GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE, THAT YOU WOULD
BE EVER CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR THE DEATH PENALTY? NOW
OBVIOUSLY, I TELL YOU WHY. BECAUSE IF YOU SAY NO TO THAT,
YOU COULD NEVER BE A JUROR BECAUSE THE LAW SAYS THAT IF SOMEONE
IS IRRECONCILABLY OPPOSED TO THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT IS IT.
BECAUSE THAT IS JUST THE WAY IT IS.

NOW, LET ME ASK YOU THIS. IF YOU HAD A SITUATION WHERE THERE WAS -- WELL, LET ME JUST REPHRASE THAT. IS THERE ANY CIRCUMSTANCE IN WHICH YOU FEEL YOU WOULD VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES. I THINK THERE ARE.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. SO, YOU ARE NOT IRRECONCILABLY
AGAINST IT, WHERE YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY, NEVER, EVER VOTE
FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BONGEORNO: NO.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. NOW, THERE ARE GRADATIONS OF WHEN YOU SAY YOU COULD. AND I WOULD IMAGINE IN MY OWN MIND THAT

IF I ASKED YOU TO GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE OF THAT, MR. BONGEORNO, YOU MIGHT SAY MANSON OR RICHARD RAMIREZ. IS THAT WHAT YOU WERE THINKING WHEN YOU COULD IN SOME INSTANCES? MR. BONGEORNO: IT WOULD BE ONE EXAMPLE, YES.

_

. .

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU GIVE ME ANY OTHER EXAMPLES THAT COME TO MIND?

MR. BONGEORNO: MAYBE SOMETHING THAT WAS PREMEDITATED.

MR. BARENS: ALL YOU WOULD EVER HAVE IN THIS CASE IS
A PREMEDITATED MURDER BY THE TIME YOU AND A JURY GET TO
EVALUATING THE LIFE OR DEATH PENALTY QUESTION. REMEMBER, AS
HIS HONOR INDICATED, YOU WOULD FIRST HAVE HAD TO HAVE FOUND
THE DEFENDANT GUILTY IN THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, GUILTY
OF A FIRST DEGREE MURDER, WHICH INCLUDES OBVIOUSLY A MURDER
THAT IS PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL AND INDEFENSIBLE, THAT IT
WAS NOT IN SELF DEFENSE, IT WASN'T JUSTIFIABLE IN ANY ASPECT
OF THE WORD, THAT IT WAS IN FACT INTENTIONAL AND PREMEDITATED;
DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. BONGEORNO: UH-HUH.

MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES, THAT IS A YES.

I AM SORRY.

MR. BARENS: MR. BONGEORNO, BEFORE WE WOULD EVER GET
TO THE PENALTY PHASE, YOU WOULD HAVE FIRST MADE THAT
DETERMINATION, ALL RIGHT?

MR. BONGEORNO: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: NOW, IF WE HAD AS THE PEOPLE ALLEGE IN
THIS CASE, A SINGLE VICTIM, IT WOULD THEREFORE BE A
SITUATION WHERE IF THERE WAS ONLY ONE VICTIM, WHERE IT WAS
PROVED TO YOU BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE VICTIM HAD
BEEN KILLED BY THE DEFENDANT PREMEDITATEDLY AND INTENTIONALLY,
COULD YOU EVER VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IN THAT INSTANCE?

MR. BONGEORNO: COULD YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION?

2

3

5

6

7

8

g

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I AM NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND.

MR. BARENS: SURE. I AM GOING TO ADD JUST A TAD HERE.

EARLIER ON, YOU HAD AN EXAMPLE OF WHERE YOU SAID "I COULD VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY ON RICHARD RAMIREZ, ON SERIAL KILLERS LIKE RICHARD RAMIREZ AND CHARLES MANSON." NOW I AM ASKING YOU IF YOU HAD A PREMEDITATED, FIRST DEGREE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT GUILTY DEFENDANT WITH A SINGLE VICTIM, COULD YOU UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES IN THAT INSTANCE VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES.

MR. BARENS: THE CONVERSE OF THAT QUESTION IS: COULD YOU UNDER ANY OF THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES CONSIDER LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES, I THINK I COULD.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IN THIS CONTEXT, LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE MEANS PRECISELY THAT, THAT THE DEFENDANT WILL NEVER EVER BE ELIGIBLE FOR OR GRANTED PAROLE?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND YOU DON'T THINK THAT IS JUST LAWYER TALK I AM GIVING YOU?

MR. BONGEORNO: NO.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, BECAUSE A LOT OF PEOPLE MAY HAVE A SNEAKING SUSPICION THAT WE HAVE SAID THAT FOR YEARS BUT IT ISN'T TRUE.

HIS HONOR WILL TELL YOU THAT THAT IS THE ABSOLUTE TRUTH AND I BELIEVE HE HAS ALREADY MENTIONED THAT TO YOU, THAT LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE SPECIFICALLY MEANS THAT.

NOW, COULD YOU TELL ME WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES MIGHT INFLUENCE YOU ON GIVING A PREMEDITATED MURDERER LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MR. BONGEORNO: I DON'T THINK I KNOW HOW TO ANSWER THAT OUESTION.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, YOU HAVE INDICATED THAT THERE ARE CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH -- AND I BELIEVE THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT SEEMED TO SWAY YOU WERE IF THERE WAS A PREMEDITATED MURDER, AN INTENTIONAL MURDER, YOU COULD GIVE THAT DEFENDANT THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. BONGEORNO: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: HAVING THE SAME DEFENDANT, I AM ASKING
YOU FOR A CRITERIA OR CIRCUMSTANCE THAT WOULD MAKE IT WHERE
YOU WOULDN'T GIVE THAT DEFENDANT THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. BONGEORNO: OKAY, IN A CASE PERHAPS THERE WAS AN ACCIDENTAL MURDER INVOLVED WITH.

THE COURT: NO, NO.

MR. BARENS: WE ARE NEVER GOING TO HAVE THAT.

THE COURT: FORGET ABOUT THAT.

IT IS PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL AND DELIBERATE.

MR. BARENS: THE ONLY TIME THIS QUESTION WILL EVER COME UP, MR. BONGEORNO, IS IF YOU AND THE OTHER JURORS BELIEVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT AN INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED, INDEFENSIBLE, UNJUSTIFIABLE MURDER OCCURRED. IF WE HAVE THAT SITUATION, WHAT THE QUESTION REALLY BECOMES FOR YOU, MR. BONGEORNO, COULD YOU EVER, EVER GIVE A DEFENDANT CONVICTED ON THAT BASIS, LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF

PAROLE?

MR. BONGEORNO: NO.

MR. BARENS: YOU NEVER COULD, COULD YOU?

MR. BONGEORNO: NO.

MR. BARENS: I AM NOT EVEN SAYING I DISAGREE WITH YOU.

RATHER, I AM SIMPLY TRYING TO GET YOUR POINT OF VIEW.

THE COURT: MR. BONGEORNO, DO YOU REMEMBER I TOLD YOU THAT ON THE SECOND PHASE OR THE PENALTY PHASE, YOU WILL HEAR A LOT OF TESTIMONY, ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY THAT YOU HADN'T HEARD ON THE GUILT PHASE AND THAT HAD TO DO WITH THE BACKGROUND OF THE DEFENDANT, HIS AGE AND EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM AS A PERSON AND ANY FAVORABLE FACTORS THAT WILL HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION, MUST BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION, TOGETHER WITH AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES THAT ARE UNFAVORABLE. IT IS THEN YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND AS TO WHETHER IT WILL BE ONE OF THOSE TWO THINGS, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES.

6

. -

THE COURT: AND YOU WILL WAIT UNTIL YOU HEAR ALL OF THE TESTIMONY BEFORE YOU DETERMINE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES, I WILL.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: NOW, MR. BONGEORNO, I UNDERSTAND THAT YOU WOULD WAIT UNTIL YOU HEAR ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, BUT IN YOUR HEART OF HEARTS, I BELIEVE THAT I WOULD BE WASTING MY TIME GIVING YOU ANY EVIDENCE, ONCE YOU HAVE BECOME CONVINCED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED A PREMEDITATED, COLD-BLOODED FIRST DEGREE MURDER. IS IT YOUR POINT OF VIEW IN YOUR HEART OF HEARTS THAT WITH THOSE KINDS OF PEOPLE, WE HAVE GOT TO GIVE THEM THE DEATH PENALTY, LIFE FOR A LIFE?

(PAUSE.)

MR. BONGEORNO: I WOULD HAVE TO ANSWER YES.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, I BELIEVE -- AND AGAIN, YOU MAY EVEN REPRESENT THE MAJORITY VIEW IN THIS STATE -- THAT GIVEN A SITUATION WHERE WE HAVE A FIRST DEGREE, INTENTIONAL MURDER AND IT OCCURS DURING A ROBBERY WHERE A GUY GETS KILLED, SIMPLY BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT WANTS TO STEAL THIS PERSON'S MONEY, THAT YOU ARE GOING TO SAY CONSISTENTLY IN EVERY INSTANCE, THE ONLY PENALTY POSSIBLE EVEN IS THE DEATH PENALTY FOR THAT DEFENDANT; IS THAT CORRECT, SIR?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES.

MR. BARENS: I THANK YOU FOR YOUR HONESTY WITH -YOUR OPINION. THERE IS A MOTION.

MR. BONGEORNO: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: IN OTHER WORDS, YOU ARE SAYING IT DOESN'T

MAKE A DIFFERENCE WHAT YOU HEAR ON THE PENALTY PHASE, YOU ARE GOING TO VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY; IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE TELLING US?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: MAY I ASK A FEW QUESTIONS?

MR. BONGEORNO, GOOD MORNING. I AM FRED WAPNER,
THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY WHO IS PROSECUTING THIS CASE.

YOU STARTED OUT BY SAYING THAT YOU HADN'T GIVEN
THIS ISSUE ANY THOUGHT UNTIL YOU CAME HERE TODAY; IS THAT
FAIRLY ACCURATE?

MR. BONGEORNO: I THINK UNTIL YESTERDAY WHEN I FOUND OUT WHAT THE CASE WAS ABOUT.

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU GIVE THIS SOME THOUGHT LAST NIGHT?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU KNOW LAST NIGHT THAT IF YOU WERE CHOSEN AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE, ONE OF YOUR JOBS WOULD BE TO DECIDE WHAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES.

MR. WAPNER: WHEN YOU WERE THINKING ABOUT THAT LAST
NIGHT, DID YOU SEARCH YOUR CONSCIENCE FOR YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT
THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES, I DID.

MR. WAPNER: AND UP UNTIL THAT POINT, YOU HADN'T GIVEN
IT MUCH THOUGHT?

MR. BONGEORNO: THERE WAS NO NEED TO, NO.

MR. WAPNER: ARE YOU SAYING THAT IF YOU GET TO THE PENALTY

PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THAT ALL PEOPLE CONVICTED OF INTENTIONAL

```
MURDERS DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY SHOULD BE TREATED THE
1
     SAME, THEY SHOULD ALL GET THE SAME PUNISHMENT?
2
           MR. BONGEORNO: WELL, LOGICALLY THAT DOESN'T MAKE ANY
3
     SENSE, NO.
4
           MR. WAPNER: OKAY, PUTTING ASIDE WHETHER IT LOGICALLY
5
     MAKES ANY SENSE, IS THAT WHAT YOU WOULD DO IN YOUR OWN MIND?
6
           MR. BONGEORNO: NO, I CAN'T SAY THAT I WOULD.
           MR. WAPNER: WELL, IF THEY ALL SHOULDN'T GET THE SAME
8
     PUNISHMENT, WHAT SHOULD MAKE THE DIFFERENCE IN VARIOUS CASES?
9
10
           MR. BONGEORNO: I AM NOT SURE ABOUT THAT.
           MR. WAPNER: WOULD THE PARTICULAR FACTS OF THE CASE
11
     MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO YOU. THE FACTS OF HOW THE MURDER OCCURRED,
12
     FOR EXAMPLE?
13
14
      MR. BONGEORNO: YOU MEAN AS TO THE METHOD?
           MR. WAPNER: EITHER THE METHOD, THE AMOUNT OF VIOLENCE
15
16
     OR BRUTALITY, THE AMOUNT OF PLANNING, ANYTHING IN TERMS OF
     THE FACTS OF THE WAY THE MURDER WAS COMMITTED.
17
           MR. BONGEORNO: WELL, I DON'T THINK SO.
18
           MR. WAPNER: SO A PERSON WHO COMMITS A VICIOUS AND BRUTAL
19
     MURDER SHOULD BE TREATED THE SAME IN YOUR OPINION AS THE PERSON
20
     WHO, FOR EXAMPLE, MAYBE SHOOTS SOMEONE ONE TIME, THE OFFENSE
21
22
     IS THE SAME?
           MR. BARENS: ASSUMING THEY ARE BOTH INTENTIONAL AND
23
24
     PREMEDITATED, I ASSUME?
25
           THE COURT: YES.
26
          MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT.
          MR. BONGEORNO: WELL, DEAD IS DEAD. IT IS KIND OF HARD
27
```

TO SAY, YOU KNOW.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY, AND WHAT ABOUT THE PERSON WHO DID
THE KILLING, WOULD THAT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE TO YOU IN TERMS
OF HIS BACKGROUND?

MR. BONGEORNO: NO.

MR. WAPNER: IF LOGICALLY, IT DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE
TO TREAT THEM ALL THE SAME, WHAT DISTINCTION WOULD YOU MAKE
BETWEEN PEOPLE WHO COMMIT MURDERS IN TERMS OF WHAT PUNISHMENT
THEY SHOULD GET?

MR. BONGEORNO: I DON'T THINK I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU MEAN.

I AM A LITTLE BIT NERVOUS. THIS IS KIND OF NEW FOR ME.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. LET ME ASK YOU TO PUT YOURSELF IN A SITUATION. YOU ARE ON THE JURY. YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM. YOU ARE TRYING TO DECIDE WHAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE. YOU ONLY HAVE TWO CHOICES.

ONE IS LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND ONE
IS THE DEATH PENALTY. ARE YOU CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR EITHER
ONE?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES.

MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU FIGURED OUT BY NOW THAT IN THE CASE OF THIS NATURE, YOU WILL NEVER GET TO THE QUESTION OF PENALTY UNTIL YOU HAVE DECIDED THAT THERE WAS AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY?

MR. BONGEORNO: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AFTER YOU HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE
IN THE GUILT PHASE AND YOU HAVE DECIDED THERE WAS AN
INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY, WE ARE GOING TO HAVE
ANOTHER TRIAL WHERE YOU WOULD HEAR ALL KINDS OF OTHER EVIDENCE.

WOULD YOU LISTEN TO THAT EVIDENCE IN DECIDING WHAT
THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT WOULD BE OR WOULD YOU HAVE ALREADY
MADE UP YOUR MIND?

THE COURT: I ASKED HIM THAT QUESTION. DON'T YOU REMEMBER? HE SAID THAT IRRESPECTIVE OF WHAT THAT EVIDENCE

WAS, HE WOULD VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. ISN'T THAT WHAT 1 2 YOU SAID? 3 MR. BONGEORNO: YES. MR. WAPNER: NOTHING FURTHER. THANK YOU. 4 MR. BARENS: THE DEFENSE HAS A MOTION. 5 THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. BONGEORNO. YOU 6 WILL QUALIFY I GATHER AS A VERY FINE JUROR IN SOME OTHER CASE 7 8 BUT NOT A DEATH PENALTY CASE. YOU GO BACK AND TELL THEM THERE THAT YOU COULD ð 10 SERVE ON SOME OTHER CASE, WOULD YOU? (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONGEORNO EXITS THE - 2 COURTROOM.) THE BAILIFF: MR. KISLIUK NEEDS TO BE EXCUSED BECAUSE 13 OF HIS EMPLOYER. THEY ONLY PAY FOR 25 DAYS. 14 THE COURT: HOW DO YOU SPELL THAT? 15 16 THE BAILIFF: K-1-S-L-I-U-K. THE COURT: HE WILL BE EXCUSED. 17 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUBAKER ENTERS THE 18 19 COURTROOM.) THE COURT: IS THAT MISS OR MRS.? 20 21 MS. BRUBAKER: MRS. THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, MRS. BRUBAKER. WHERE DO YOU 22 23 LIVE? 24 MS. BRUBAKER: WESTCHESTER. THE COURT: DO YOU RECALL YESTERDAY I TOLD THE JURORS 25 WHAT KIND OF A CASE WE ARE ABOUT TO TRY? IT IS A MURDER WHERE 26 IT IS ALLEGED THAT THE MURDER WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE 27 OF A ROBBERY. I TOLD YOU THAT THERE WERE CERTAIN MURDERS --

NOT EVERY MURDER CALLS FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, EVEN IF IT IS
INTENTIONAL, DELIBERATE AND PREMEDITATED AND PLANNED.

CERTAIN, WHAT WE CALL SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THAT IT MAY THEN QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. AND INCLUDED IN THOSE CATEGORIES, THERE ARE 19 OF THEM -- IS MURDER COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, A BURGLARY, A RAPE, KIDNAPPING, TORTURE, MULTIPLE MURDERS AND WHERE A CHILD DIES AS THE RESULT OF A MOLESTATION. THERE ARE OTHER KINDS. I DON'T HAVE TO GIVE YOU ALL 19 OF THEM.

BUT THOSE ARE INSTANCES OF WHICH THE JURY HAS TO DETERMINE WHAT THE PENALTY IS GOING TO BE, IF THEY FIND HIM GUILTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

THE COURT: SO WHAT WILL HAPPEN, IS THAT THE JURY WHO
IS SELECTED, WILL FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE WHAT WE CALL THE
GUILT PHASE. THEY WILL FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR
NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY OF A PREMEDITATED
MURDER AND IF THEY FIND THAT HE WAS GUILTY OF THAT, THEN THEY
ANSWER A QUESTION. THE QUESTION IS, WAS THAT MURDER -- IS
IT TRUE OR FALSE THAT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED DURING THE
COURSE OF A ROBBERY, SO THAT IT WOULD QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH
PENALTY.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND? IF THE ANSWER IS YES, IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, IT WAS A PREMEDITATED MURDER, THEN WE COME INTO WHAT IS KNOWN AS THE PENALTY PHASE.

DURING THE GUILT PHASE, THE QUESTION OF PENALTY

MUST NEVER BE DISCUSSED OR CONSIDERED UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES.

3

6

THAT PHASE, THEY THEN CONSIDER ANY NUMBER OF FACTORS BEFORE
THEY DETERMINE WHAT THE PENALTY SHOULD BE. IT WILL EITHER
BE LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR IT WILL BE DEATH
IN THE GAS CHAMBER. SO ON THE SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THE
SAME JURY DETERMINES AND HEARS ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE FROM BOTH
SIDES.

THE PURPOSE OF ALL OF THIS ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

IS TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT THERE ARE ANY MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

THAT MITIGATE THE OFFENSE WITH WHICH HE IS FOUND GUILTY OR

AMELIORATE IT OR AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES OR FACTS ABOUT

THE DEFENDANT WHICH WOULD JUSTIFY THE IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH

PENALTY.

SO, THE DEFENDANT WILL INTRODUCE EVIDENCE WHICH
IS FAVORABLE TO HIM, THINGS ABOUT HIS AGE, HIS BACKGROUND AND
HIS EDUCATION, HIS MENTAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION, ANY FACTS
WHICH MAY BE FAVORABLE TO HIM. THEY WILL BE OFFERED TO THE
JURY IN THE FORM OF EVIDENCE.

ON THE OTHER HAND, THERE ARE MITIGATING AND EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES. I HAVE JUST TOLD YOU ABOUT THAT.

ON THE OTHER HAND, THE PEOPLE WILL ADDUCE, I ASSUME, EVIDENCE TO SHOW BAD THINGS ABOUT HIM, UNFAVORABLE THINGS ABOUT THE DEFENDANT WHICH WOULD THEN TRY TO CANCEL OUT ANYTHING FAVORABLE ABOUT HIM.

AT ANY RATE, ALL OF THOSE THINGS WILL BE

CONSIDERED BY THE JURY, INCLUDING ALL OF THE FACTS OF THE

MURDER ITSELF, WHICH THE JURY FOUND TO BE TRUE. DO YOU UNDER
STAND ALL OF THAT, DON'T YOU?

MS. BRUBAKER: (NODS HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: NOW, WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO PRESENTLY IS

TO EXPLORE YOUR STATE OF MIND WITH RESPECT TO THE DEATH

PENALTY, WHAT YOUR FEELINGS, YOUR OPINIONS ARE ON THE DEATH

PENALTY, TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT YOU CAN QUALIFY AS A JUROR IN

THIS PARTICULAR CASE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

бΒ

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, THE FIRST QUESTION I WILL ASK YOU, THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS HAVE TO DO WITH THE GUILT PHASE OF IT.

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

MS. BRUBAKER: NO. I DON'T THINK 50.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND THE OTHER QUESTION IS ALSO
ON THE GUILT PHASE. 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? THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE THE TRUTH OR
FALSITY, WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE
OF A ROBBERY.

MS. BRUBAKER: I DON'T KNOW.

THE COURT: YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT?

MS. BRUBAKER: WELL --

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION WHERE YOU -- SUCH THAT YOU CAN'T REACH AN IMPARTIAL DECISION ON THE QUESTION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES. I SUPPOSE I COULD WITH THE EVIDENCE.

THE COURT: YOU MEAN IF THE EVIDENCE SHOWED THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, YOU CAN SAY YES, IT IS TRUE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, IF THE EVIDENCE JUSTIFIES THAT? IS THAT WHAT YOU

THE COURT: YOUR FEELING ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY DOESN'T AFFECT YOUR JUDGMENT ON THIS PARTICULAR SUBJECT, WOULD IT?

MS. BRUBAKER: I DON'T KNOW.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN I HAVE TO ASK YOU SOMETHING. I KNOW WHAT IS IN YOUR MIND.

THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS HAVE TO DO WITH THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL, ASSUMING THAT THE JURY HAS FOUND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY AND IT WAS DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. BRUBAKER: NO. I DON'T THINK SO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE SECOND IS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME EXCEPT IT HAS TO DO WITH THE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. BRUBAKER: NO.

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

MS. BRUBAKER: RIGHT.

THE COURT: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. GOOD MORNING, MS.
BRUBAKER. I AM ARTHUR BARENS. I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT,
JOE HUNT. IT IS MY OBLIGATION, AS IT WAS THE JUDGE'S, TO ASK
YOU ABOUT YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY AT THIS STAGE
OF THE PROCEEDINGS. IT IS JUST THE WAY THINGS ARE SET UP,
THAT WE DO THINGS IN THIS WHOLE PROCESS.

I WANT YOU TO UNDERSTAND PARENTHETICALLY, THERE

ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS AND NEITHER

MYSELF NOR ANYBODY IS GOING TO JUDGE YOUR ANSWERS BECAUSE YOU

CAN NEVER BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OWN OPINION. THAT IS ALL I AM

LOOKING FOR. OKAY?

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MS. BRUBAKER: I THINK IT IS NEEDED.

THE COURT: WHAT?

MS. BRUBAKER: NEEDED.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL US WHEN YOU THINK IT IS NEEDED?

MS. BRUBAKER: FOR MASS MURDERERS AND REPEATERS.

MR. BARENS: MASS MURDERERS, GUYS LIKE RICHARD RAMIREZ
OR CHARLES MANSON? THAT TYPE OF PEOPLE, RIGHT?

MS. BRUBAKER: WELL, THERE COULD BE OTHERS, TOO.

MR. BARENS: UNFORTUNATELY, I AM SURE THAT THERE ARE.

WHAT WE HAVE GOT IN THIS SITUATION, IS A CASE WHERE, BEFORE

YOU WOULD EVER GET TO THAT SECOND PHASE HIS HONOR SPOKE ABOUT,

THE PENALTY PHASE WHICH WE ARE TALKING ABOUT NOW, YOU WOULD

FIRST GO THROUGH THE GUILT PHASE WHERE YOU WOULD HAVE TO

BELIEVE IN THIS TYPE OF A CASE, THAT THE DEFENDANT HAD COMMITTED

A FIRST DEGREE, INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY. YOU WOULD HAVE TO BELIEVE THOSE THINGS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

NOW, ONLY IF YOU BELIEVE THAT, WOULD THIS QUESTION

OF WHETHER WE ARE GOING TO GIVE THAT DEFENDANT LIFE WITHOUT

POSSIBILITY OR THE DEATH PENALTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, IF WE HAVE A SITUATION WHERE YOU AS AN INDIVIDUAL BELIEVE IN YOUR HEART THAT A DEFENDANT COMMITTED AN INTENTIONAL, FIRST DEGREE MURDER FOR GREED OR GAIN, YOU KNOW DURING A ROBBERY, WHAT DO YOU THINK OUGHT TO HAPPEN TO THAT DEFENDANT?

MS. BRUBAKER: WOULD DEPEND UPON THE EVIDENCE GIVEN.

3

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. BARENS: WELL, THE EVIDENCE SHOWED THAT HE COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE, INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED MURDER AND THERE IS A DEAD PERSON AND HE DID IT DURING A ROBBERY.

THE COURT: YOU MEAN THE EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE, IS THAT WHAT YOU MEAN ON THE PENALTY PHASE, THE SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. BRUBAKER: WELL, YEAH, BECAUSE GUILT SUPPOSEDLY HAS ALREADY BEEN DECIDED.

THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT.

MS. BRUBAKER: ON THE EVIDENCE.

THE COURT: WHICH EVIDENCE IS THAT? YOU MEAN THE EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE, WHICH IS GOOD AND BAD ABOUT THE DEFENDANT?

MS. BRUBAKER: I DON'T KNOW. I AM NOT SURE.

THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY "THE EVIDENCE"?

MS. BRUBAKER: WELL, THE EVIDENCE EVIDENTLY CAME IN ON THE FIRST PHASE AND THEN THERE IS MORE EVIDENCE IN THE PENALTY PHASE.

THE COURT: THAT IS RIGHT, THAT IS CORRECT.

YOU MEAN YOU HEAR ALL OF THAT EVIDENCE, YOU NEED ALL OF THAT EVIDENCE BEFORE YOU WOULD MAKE UP YOUR MIND; IS THAT RIGHT?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

MR. BARENS: WHAT WE ARE LOOKING FOR HERE IN WHAT WE CALL A FAIR TRIAL OR AS FAIR A TRIAL AS WE CAN GET, IS A JUROR WHO DOESN'T HAVE, AS NEARLY AS HUMAN BEINGS CAN, ANY PRECONCEIVED IDEAS ON THIS SUBJECT OR ANY IRRECONCILABLE BIASES ABOUT WHAT SHOULD HAPPEN IN THESE CASES.

WHO HAD COMMITTED AN INTENTIONAL, FIRST DEGREE MURDER,
UNJUSTIFIABLY SO, YOU KNOW, HE WASN'T CRAZY AND IT WASN'T
AN ACCIDENT, AND IT WASN'T BECAUSE HE REALLY NEEDED THE MONEY
OR SOME OTHER REASON, BUT HE DID IT AND DID IT WITH A BLACK
HEART AND JUST DID IT, DO YOU THINK YOU COULD EVER GIVE THAT
INDIVIDUAL, THAT TYPE OF A DEFENDANT LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT
THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MS. BRUBAKER: I SUPPOSE SO.

THE COURT: WHAT WAS THAT?

(THE RECORD WAS READ BY THE REPORTER.)

MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK YOU COULD?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

MR. BARENS: AM I CORRECT THEN IN ASSUMING THAT YOU COULD CONSIDER THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT IN MAKING A DECISION ON WHETHER HE SHOULD LIVE OR DIE?

MS. BRUBAKER: NO.

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULDN'T CONSIDER THAT?

MS. BRUBAKER: NO.

THE COURT: SUPPOSE I INSTRUCT YOU THAT YOU MUST CONSIDER THAT, YOU WILL CONSIDER IT, TOO, WON'T YOU? IF I TELL YOU THAT IS ONE OF THE FACTORS THAT YOU MUST TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION.

MS. BRUBAKER: YES, I WOULD.

THE COURT: LIKE HIS AGE AND HIS BACKGROUND, HIS LACK OF ANY RECORD, ALL OF THOSE THINGS.

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

THE COURT: ALL OF THAT TESTIMONY IS DESIGNED FOR ONE

PURPOSE: TO TRY TO GIVE YOU THE ENTIRE PICTURE OF THE PERSON

BEFORE YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND AS TO HOW YOU ARE GOING TO PUNISH

HIM.

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

(MS. BRUBAKER: NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE A PHILOSOPHY OR RELIGIOUS

BELIEF WHERE YOU SUBSCRIBE TO A BELIEF KNOWN AS AN EYE FOR

AN EYE, MRS. BRUBAKER --

MS. BRUBAKER: NO.

MR. BARENS: -- WHICH IS KIND OF AN OLD BIBLICAL THING.

MS. BRUBAKER: NO, I DON'T BELIEVE IN IT.

MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU SAY THAT IT IS POSSIBLE, THEREFORE,
IN YOUR MIND THAT IF MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES -- NOT
MITIGATING ABOUT THE CRIME, MIND YOU, BUT ABOUT THE DEFENDANT'S
BACKGROUND, HIS AGE OR CHARACTER, COULD THOSE SORT OF FACTORS
INFLUENCE YOU AS TO WHETHER YOU WOULD VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY
OR NOT?

MS. BRUBAKER: POSSIBLY.

MR. BARENS: POSSIBLY?

EVEN THOUGH A FIRST DEGREE MURDER HAD OCCURRED?

MS. BRUBAKER: I DON'T KNOW.

MR. BARENS: I KNOW THAT IS A HARD QUESTION, ISN'T IT?

IT IS KIND OF HARD, I THINK MRS. BRUBAKER, IN

YOUR OWN MIND TO REALLY TELL ME -- AND UNDERSTAND, MRS. BRUBAKER,

THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH YOUR OPINION. YOU MAY BE IN THE

MAJORITY.

MRS. BRUBAKER, ARE YOU HAVING A PROBLEM TELLING

ME THAT YOU COULD EVER CONSIDER NOT GIVING THE DEATH PENALTY

TO A FIRST DEGREE INTENTIONAL MURDERER?

MS. BRUBAKER: MAYBE THAT IS WHAT I AM TRYING TO SAY

MR. BARENS: THAT IS WHAT I NEED YOU TO TELL ME IS IN YOUR HEART OF HEARTS WHAT YOU HONESTLY FEEL ON THIS SUBJECT.

AND AGAIN, MRS. BRUBAKER, I AM NOT JUDGING THE

ANSWER. I AM JUST LOOKING FOR TYPES OF JURORS, AS THE PEOPLE

ARE AS WELL IN THIS SYSTEM.

I BELIEVE YOU, BUT I DON'T THINK YOU REALLY COULD EVER GIVE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE TO A DEFENDANT WHO COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE MURDER, AN INTENTIONAL MURDER.

MR. WAPNER: I OBJECT TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION.

COUNSEL CONSTANTLY --

THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION. YOUR REACTION IS NOT IMPORTANT AT THE MOMENT.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

26

27

28

MR. BARENS: WELL, LET ME ASK YOU YOUR REACTION.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: IN YOUR HEART OF HEARTS, MRS. BRUBAKER, COULD YOU -- WOULD YOU FEEL IT APPROPRIATE TO GIVE THE DEATH PENALTY TO A FIRST DEGREE, PREMEDITATED MURDERER?

MS. BRUBAKER: I DON'T KNOW.

MR. BARENS: OKAY.

THE COURT: I ASKED YOU THE QUESTION BEFORE. I ASKED YOU: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL, AND YOU SAID NO.

IS THAT TRUE, WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY IF SOMEBODY HAD BEEN CONVICTED OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, AUTOMATICALLY, WITHOUT CONSIDERING THE BACKGROUND OR WITHOUT CONSIDERING EVERYTHING?

MS. BRUBAKER: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: IF WE TAKE AWAY THE WORD "AUTOMATICALLY" AND I KNOW THAT SOMETIMES MIGHT HAVE SOME NEGATIVE IMPLICATION, WOULD YOURPHILOSOPHICAL POINT OF VIEW IN WHICH YOU MIGHT BELIEVE THAT THE DEATH PENALTY IS THE ONLY APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT FOR SOMEONE WHO COMMITS A FIRST DEGREE MURDER SUBSTANTIALLY IMPAIR YOUR ABILITY TO VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE FOR THAT TYPE OF A DEFENDANT?

MS. BRUBAKER: NO.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU COULD VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE FOR THAT TYPE OF DEFENDANT?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK YOU COULD?

I HAVE SOME CONFLICTING SIGNALS FROM YOU WHICH ARE CONFUSING ME.

MS. BRUBAKER: I GUESS I AM SO NERVOUS THAT I AM JUST NOT --

MR. BARENS: DON'T BE NERVOUS BECAUSE, AGAIN, YOU ARE NOT BEING JUDGED ON YOUR ANSWERS, BECAUSE WHEN I APPEAR TO GET DIFFERENT ANSWERS TO THE SAME INQUIRY, I NEED TO SQUARE THOSE TWO THINGS AND 1 DON'T MEAN TO BE REDUNDANT BUT WE HAVE AN INCONSISTENCY TO RESOLVE.

I WILL ASK YOU: HOW DO YOU FEEL IF YOU HAD THAT DEFENDANT AND YOU BELIEVE THAT HE HAD COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE MURDER AND IT WAS PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL AND UNJUSTIFIABLE IN EVERY SENSE OF THE WORD, DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD GIVE THOSE DEFENDANTS THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, NOW I ASK YOU -- I REALIZE THAT IN RESPONSE TO THE JUDGE'S QUESTION THAT YOU SAID YOU WOULD CONSIDER EVIDENCE ABOUT THEIR BACKGROUND AND ABOUT THEIR AGE AND WHATEVER, BUT WOULD IT BE A FAIR STATEMENT TO SAY THAT ALTHOUGH YOU WOULD CONSIDER THAT, YOU ARE REALLY PREDISPOSED TO GIVING THOSE DEFENDANTS THE DEATH PENALTY IF THEY HAVE INTENTIONALLY TAKEN A LIFE DURING A ROBBERY?

MS. BRUBAKER: I SUPPOSE, YES.

THE COURT: PARDON ME?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

13

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

15 -16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

7 - 7

75 F

THE EVIDENCE ON THE GUILT PHASE AND YOU HAVE DECIDED THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OF MURDER DURING A ROBBERY AND YOU ARE NOW DECIDING -- YOU HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE, THE GOOD THINGS ABOUT THE DEFENDANT AND THE BAD THINGS ABOUT HIM, AND YOU ARE NOW DECIDING IN THE JURY ROOM WHAT SHOULD HAPPEN TO HIM. AT THAT POINT YOU ONLY HAVE TWO CHOICES, LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THOSE WOULD BE YOUR TWO CHOICES?

(MS. BRUBAKER NODDED HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

25

26

27

28

MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE TO ANSWER OUT LOUD.

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

MR. WAPNER: KNOWING THAT THOSE WOULD BE YOUR ONLY TWO CHOICES, WOULD YOU HAVE ALREADY MADE UP YOUR MIND WHAT YOU WERE GOING TO DO AFTER HEARING THE EVIDENCE OF HIS GUILT?

MS. BRUBAKER: AFTER HEARING THE EVIDENCE, I WOULD HOPE I HAVE DECIDED.

THE COURT: YOU WOULD WHAT?

MS. BRUBAKER: I HOPE I HAVE DECIDED AFTER HEARING THE EVIDENCE.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY, THAT WASN'T A GOOD QUESTION.

AND YOU HAVE DECIDED HE IS GUILTY OF THE CRIME, OKAY? BUT
YOU HAVEN'T GOTTEN TO THE PENALTY PHASE YET.

ARE YOU WITH ME SO FAR?

MS. BRUBAKER: YES.

MR. WAPNER: ONCE YOU HAVE DECIDED THAT HE IS GUILTY

OF AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY, WILL YOU HAVE

ALREADY MADE UP YOUR MIND THAT THE PENALTY SHOULD BE DEATH?

MS. BRUBAKER: I DON'T KNOW.

THE COURT: YOU HAVEN'T HEARD ANY TESTIMONY ON THE PENALTY
PHASE, WILL YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND BEFORE YOU DO THAT?

MS. BRUBAKER: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: WHEN LISTENING TO THE EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY
PHASE, WOULD YOU BE OPEN TO BOTH PUNISHMENTS, THAT IS, EITHER
DEATH OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT?

MS. BRUBAKER: I ASSUME SO.

MR. WAPNER: I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR.

MR. BARENS: THERE IS A MOTION, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, WOULD YOU WAIT OUTSIDE JUST A MOMENT, PLEASE? THERE ARE SOME LEGAL PROBLEMS THAT WE HAVE TO DISCUSS.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUBAKER EXITED THE COURTROOM.)

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, IF I MIGHT HAVE ONE MOMENT.

WE HAVE A MEDICAL EMERGENCY AT THE OFFICE. IF I MIGHT HAVE

JUST ONE MOMENT.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

MR. BARENS: I AM SORRY, YOUR HONOR.

AGAIN, I BELIEVE THIS TO BE A CANDID WOMAN. SHE SAID TO ME SPECIFICALLY, ALTHOUGH SHE COULD CONSIDER THE EVIDENCE, SHE WOULD ALWAYS GIVE DEFENDANTS THE DEATH PENALTY THAT HAD BEEN CONVICTED OF A FIRST DEGREE MURDER; THAT WAS HER RESPONSE TO MY LAST INQUIRY TO HER, YOUR HONOR.

WHEN MR. WAPNER INQUIRED AS TO WHAT SHE WOULD DO, COULD SHE LISTEN TO THE EVIDENCE, SHE COULDN'T EVEN SAY YES TO THAT. SHE SAID THAT SHE ASSUMED SHE WOULD LISTEN TO THE EVIDENCE, AFTER HAVING TOLD ME THAT ALTHOUGH SHE WOULD LISTEN TO THE EVIDENCE, SHE WOULD ALWAYS GIVE FIRST DEGREE MURDERERS THE DEATH PENALTY.

THIS WOMAN SHOWED AN ABSOLUTE PREDISPOSITION,

AND SHE IS ENTITLED TO HER OPINION, TO ALWAYS GIVING THE DEATH

PENALTY TO A FIRST DEGREE MURDERER. SHE WAS RATHER CLEAR

ON THAT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: SHE WAS WISHY-WASHY ALL THROUGHOUT.

MR. BARENS: A BIT SO, YOUR HONOR, BUT SHE WAS 1 CONSISTENT. 2 THE COURT: SHE HAD NO FIRM CONVICTION ABOUT ANYTHING. 3 HER NAME SHOULD HAVE BEEN BLANK, THE SAME AS THE OTHER ONE 4 WE HAD. I DON'T THINK IT IS THE KIND OF JUROR WE WANT IN 5 THIS CASE. 6 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR, THAT WAS MY SENTIMENT. 7 <u>.</u>: 8 THE COURT: YOU FEEL THE SAME WAY ABOUT IT? MR. WAPNER: ABSOLUTELY. _10 THE COURT: ASK HER TO COME IN AND THEN WE WILL GET - 11 MR. BUSHNELL READY. MR. WAPNER: THE ONLY THING DEFINITE ABOUT THIS LADY 12 13 WAS SHE WASN'T DEFINITE ABOUT ANYTHING. 14 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUBAKER RE-ENTERED THE COURTROOM.) - 15 - 16 THE COURT: THAT IS ALL RIGHT, YOU CAN STAY THERE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MRS. BRUBAKER. WE THINK THAT YOU WILL 17 MAKE A VERY FINE JUROR ON SOMETHING OTHER THAN A DEATH PENALTY 18 CASE, SO YOU TELL THEM IN THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM, THE CLERK 19 THERE, THAT I THINK YOU WILL MAKE A GOOD JUROR ON SOME OTHER 20 21 CASE. 22 MS. BRUBAKER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 23 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUBAKER EXITED 24 THE COURTROOM.) 25 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR DONALD R. BUSHNELL 26 ENTERED THE COURTROOM.) 27 THE COURT: MR. BUSHNELL, IS IT?

MR. BUSHNELL: THAT'S CORRECT.

THE COURT: MR. BUSHNELL, WHERE DO YOU LIVE? 1 MR. BUSHNELL: I RESIDE IN CULVER CITY. 2 THE COURT: DO YOU REMEMBER YESTERDAY I TOLD YOU WHAT 3 THIS CASE IS ABOUT AND THAT THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED WITH 4 THE COMMISSION OF A MURDER AND THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED DURING 5 THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? 6 MR. BUSHNELL: RIGHT. 7 THE COURT: INCIDENTALLY, I MEANT TO ASK YOU: HAVE · 8 YOU READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS CASE? 9 10 MR. BUSHNELL: NO, I HAVEN'T. . 11 12 . 13 -14 15 .16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

3 F

문분 13 후 - ፫ 14

₹ 16 ₹ 17

5

THE COURT: YOU HAVE NOT SEEN THE NAME, BILLIONAIRE BOYS
CLUB? IT DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING TO YOU?

MR. BUSHNELL: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE JURY THAT WILL BE SELECTED

IN THIS CASE, WILL FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE THE GUILT OR

INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT. THAT IS KNOWN AS THE GUILT PHASE

OF THE TRIAL. AND IF THEY FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER

IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THEY ANSWER A QUESTION, IS IT TRUE

OR IS IT FALSE THAT IT OCCURRED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

NOW, DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY IS SIGNIFICANT BECAUSE NOT EVERY MURDER, EVEN IF IT IS DELIBERATE,

PREMEDITATED AND PLANNED, IS PUNISHABLE BY LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR BY DEATH. IT IS ONLY WHERE IT IS COMMITTED DURING CERTAIN SPECIAE-CIRCUMSTANCES, YOU SEE, THAT THEN IT QUALIFIES FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

ONE OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, AS I INDICATED
YESTERDAY, WAS ROBBERY, OR BURGLARY OR RAPE OR KIDNAPPING OR
WHERE A CHILD IS MOLESTED AND DIES OR TORTURE OR MULTIPLE
MURDERS AND SO ON AND SO FORTH. THERE ARE 19 OF THEM WHERE THE
LEGISLATURE HAS SAID IN THOSE CASES, THEY QUALIFY FOR A
POSSIBLE DEATH SENTENCE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

THE COURT: NOW AS I SAID, THE JURY WILL FIRST HAVE TO

DETERMINE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT, WAS HE

GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, DELIBERATE,

PREMEDITATED MURDER.

AND IF THEY SAY YES, THEN THEY HAVE TO DETERMINE
AS REQUESTED, IS IT TRUE OR IS IT FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED

DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. OKAY?

0

3

IF IT IS YES, THEN THE SAME JURY GOES THROUGH THE SECOND PHASE OF TRIAL WHERE THERE WILL BE ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY.

NOW, THE ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY WAS INTENDED FOR THE PURPOSE

OF SHOWING THE DEFENDANT IN A FAVORABLE LIGHT OR GOOD THINGS

ABOUT HIM WILL BE BROUGHT OUT.

YOU MUST CONSIDER HIS AGE, BACKGROUND, EDUCATION,
PHYSICAL OR MENTAL CONDITION PLUS ALL OF THE THINGS ABOUT THE
MURDER ITSELF.

THESE ARE WHAT WE CALL MITIGATING OR EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH THEY WILL PRODUCE OR TRY TO PERSUADE THE JURORS THAT THEY SHOULD NOT IMPOSE THE ULTIMATE PENALTY OF DEATH.

ON THE OTHER HAND, THE PROSECUTION WILL PRODUCE
EVIDENCE I ASSUME, WHICH WOULD SHOW UNFAVORABLE ASPECTS ABOUT
THE DEFENDANT, WHICH WOULD COUNTERBALANCE ALL OF THE FAVORABLE
ASPECTS. THEY WILL TRY TO SHOW THAT NO CONSIDERATION SHOULD
BE GIVEN TO HIM AT ALL, IN DETERMINING THE PENALTY. THAT IS
THE PENALTY PHASE.

NOW ON THE GUILT PHASE, YOU DON'T CONSIDER THE QUESTION OF PENALTY AT ALL. THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH IT, AS TO WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO HIM IF HE IS FOUND GUILTY. YOU ONLY CONSIDER THE FACTS OF THE CASE.

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, WITH THAT IN MIND, WE ARE INQUIRING AND ALL OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS HAVE BEEN ASKED WHAT THEIR STATE OF MIND IS AND WHAT THEIR -- EXPLORING THEIR STATE OF MIND WITH RESPECT TO THEIR ATTITUDES AND FEELINGS

ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY. THAT IS WHAT I AM GOING TO ASK YOU ABOUT NOW.

MR. BUSHNELL: WELL, IN MY OPINION --

THE COURT: LET ME ASK YOU THE QUESTIONS FIRST.

MR. BUSHNELL: OKAY.

THE COURT: NOW, THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS HAVE TO DO WITH
THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL. 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. BUSHNELL: I DON'T THINK SO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE SECOND PART IS OF COURSE,
IN THE GUILT PHASE I TOLD YOU THAT IF HE IS FOUND GUILTY OF
MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THEY DETERMINE WHETHER OR
NOT IT IS TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE
COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

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?

MR. BUSHNELL: I DON'T THINK SO.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED IN THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. BUSHNELL: NO.

THE COURT: THE SAME THING, THE SAME QUESTION AS TO LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THIS TRIAL?

MR. BUSHNELL: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND OF COURSE, THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE?

MR. BUSHNELL: RIGHT.

THE COURT: THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING, MR. BUSHNELL.

I AM ARTHUR BARENS. I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT AND

AS IS THE CASE WITH HIS HONOR, IT IS MY DUTY TO INQUIRE OF

YOU NOW AS TO YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY.

PARENTHETICALLY, LET ME INDICATE THAT THERE ARE
NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS. I AM CERTAINLY
NOT, NOR IS ANYONE ELSE GOING TO JUDGE YOU ON YOUR ANSWERS.
ALL I AM LOOKING FOR IS YOUR OPINION. YOU CAN NEVER BE WRONG
ABOUT YOUR OPINION. OKAY?

MR. BUSHNELL: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY
AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MR. BUSHNELL: I FEEL THAT IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT THE DEATH PENALTY IS IN LAW NOW AND THE EVDIENCE PRESENTED IS:
SUFFICIENT TO CARRY IT, I THINK THAT THAT IS THE WAY IT SHOULD BE.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. HOW DO YOU FEEL, IF YOU HAVE A SITUATION WHERE A DEFENDANT COMMITS A FIRST DEGREE MURDER, AND -- YOU KNOW, BY THAT, WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HERE IS THAT YOU NEVER GET TO THE QUESTION UNLESS YOU FIRST BELIEVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT ALONG WITH 11 OTHER PEOPLE, THAT AN INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED, FIRST DEGREE MURDER OCCURRED DURING A ROBBERY.

THE DEFENDANT DID IT FOR SOME KIND OF GAIN. HE STOLE MONEY OR SOMETHING. WHAT DO YOU THINK WE SHOULD DO WITH THOSE DEFENDANTS?

MR. BUSHNELL: THAT IS A GOOD QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: THAT IS THE QUESTION AT THIS MOMENT. 1 MR. BUSHNELL: THE QUESTION. I HONESTLY DON'T KNOW RIGHT 2 3 AT THIS TIME. I DON'T KNOW. MR. BARENS: OKAY. WELL, WE KIND OF NEED TO KNOW RIGHT 5 NOW, BECAUSE THAT IS THE WHOLE INQUIRY THAT WE ARE MAKING. THE COURT: WELL, YOU ARE ASKING HIM TO PREJUDGE. 6 7 REALLY. THAT FACT ALONE -- WHY DON'T YOU ASK HIM ABOUT THE PENALTY PHASE OF IT AND ALL OF THE FAVORABLE AND UNFAVORABLE 8 ASPECTS AND WOULD HE WAIT UNTIL THAT IS DONE. THAT IS WHAT 9 10 I ASKED HIM. MERELY TO SAY HE COMMITTED A DELIBERATE, INTENTIONAL 11 MURDER AND WHAT DO YOU DO WITH HIM, THAT ISN'T SUFFICIENT. 12 MR. BARENS: WELL, AGAIN, I AM LOOKING FOR A PREDISPOSITION 13 ON BEHALF OF THE JUROR. I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A GOOD RECORD. 14 15 THE COURT: WELL, THEN STATE ALL OF THE FACTS IN YOUR 16 QUESTION. MR. BARENS: WELL NOW MR. BUSHNELL, THE COURT WOULD 17 INSTRUCT YOU TO CONSIDER IN REACHING A DECISION ON THE LIFE 18 OR DEATH ISSUE, THINGS LIKE THE DEFENDANT'S AGE OR WHETHER 19 OR NOT THE DEFENDANT HAD A HISTORY OF PRIOR CRIMINAL ACTS OR 20 21 VIOLENT ACTS AND FACTS ABOUT THE DEFENDANT'S CHARACTER. WOULD YOU CONSIDER THOSE THINGS BEFORE YOU MADE 22 23 A DECISION? 24 MR. BUSHNELL: YES. 25 MR. BARENS: OKAY. 26 MR. BUSHNELL: YES. 27 MR. BARENS: COULD YOU BE SWAYED ALTHOUGH YOU WOULD

CONSIDER THOSE THINGS, IF THE DEFENDANT HAD NONETHELESS,

1 COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE MURDER? WOULD THE FACT THAT YOU CONSIDER THOSE, MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE TO YOU OR WOULD YOU HAVE 2 ALREADY MADE UP YOUR MIND THAT IF HE TOOK A LIFE INTENTIONALLY, THE ONLY APPROPRIATE PENALTY WOULD BE THE DEATH PENALTY? MR. BUSHNELL: PROVIDING THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED WAS 5 DIRECTED IN THAT DIRECTION, WE WOULD HAVE TO MAKE THE DECISION 6 7 THAT WAY. 8 MR. BARENS: NO. WHATEVER EVIDENCE ARE YOU REFERRING 9 TO, MR. BUSHNELL? MR. BUSHNELL: WELL, I WOULD SAY THAT THE EVIDENCE THAT 10 HE ACTUALLY DID COMMIT THE CRIME AND IT WAS WITHOUT A DOUBT 11 AND WE WOULD HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION ON THAT. 12 MR. BARENS: WELL, WHAT I AM TELLING YOU MR. BUSHNELL, 13 IS THAT YOU WILL NEVER HAVE TO CONSIDER THE ISSUE OF PENALTY. 14 15 MR. BUSHNELL: NO. 16 MR. BARENS: UNTIL YOU FIRST BELIEVE THAT YOU WOULD ALREADY -- YOU WOULD ALREADY HAVE BELIEVED THAT THE DEFENDANT 17 INTENTIONALLY, PREMEDITATEDLY AND WITHOUT JUSTIFICATION, KILLED 18 19 A HUMAN BEING DURING A ROBBERY. NOW, THAT IS WHO WE HAVE GOT. YOU BELIEVE THAT 20 BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. NOW, IF THAT IS YOUR STATE OF MIND, 21 BEFORE WE GET TO THE PENALTY PHASE, I ASK YOU SIR, IN ALL 22 TRUTH, DURING THE PENALTY PHASE, WOULD ANYTHING MAKE A DIFFERENCE 23 24 TO YOU OR WOULD YOU IN EVERY INSTANCE, GIVE THAT DEFENDANT 25 THE DEATH PENALTY? MR. BUSHNELL: WELL, ALL THINGS WOULD HAVE TO BE WEIGHED, 26 27 WHAT WAS GIVEN IN THE WAY OF EVIDENCE AND PROOF, BEFORE YOU 28 COULD COME UP WITH THE DEATH PENALTY, IN MY OPINION.

1.5

MR. BARENS: I DON'T QUITE FOLLOW YOU, SIR.

MR. BUSHNELL: WELL, IF YOU ARE ASKING ME ABOUT WHETHER I WOULD BE HESITANT ABOUT PUTTING THE DEATH PENALTY INTO ACTION, THE ONLY WAY I WOULD DO THAT IS DEPENDING UPON THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED TO ME, BEYOND PROOF THAT THE MAN DID IT, THE CRIME OF THAT NATURE.

MR. BARENS: ASSUMING YOU BELIEVE THAT HE COMMITTED A CRIME, SIR?

MR. BUSHNELL: WELL, SURE. IF HE -- I WOULDN'T SAY ASSUMPTION. 1 WOULD SAY THAT IT WOULD HAVE TO BE A FACT.

MR. BARENS: NO. IT IS A FACT IN YOUR MIND MR. BUSHNELL, BY THE TIME WE EVER GET TO THE PENALTY PHASE. IT WILL BE AN ESTABLISHED FACT IN YOUR MIND BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT IN FACT COMMITTED AN INTENTIONAL, FIRST DEGREE, PREMEDITATED AND UNJUSTIFIABLE MURDER. WE HAVE GOT THAT ESTABLISHED.

MR. BUSHNELL: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: I ASK YOU SIR, ONCE THAT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED IN YOUR MIND, WOULD IT BE A TRUE STATEMENT THAT YOU WOULD BELIEVE THAT THOSE DEFENDANTS SHOULD ALWAYS GET THE DEATH PENALTY? THAT IS THE ONLY APPROPRIATE PENALTY TO THOSE DEFENDANTS?

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

27

28

THEY GET THAT PUNISHMENT, DID YOU KNOW THAT?

MR. BUSHNELL: NO.

MR. WAPNER: WHAT IT MEANS IS THAT IF THE JURY DECIDES THAT THE PERSON COMMITTED A CRIME THAT FITS INTO THOSE CATEGORIES, THEN THE JURY HAS TO DECIDE WHETHER THAT PERSON SHOULD SPEND THE REST OF HIS LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE JURY HAS TO DECIDE WHETHER THAT PERSON SHOULD DIE IN THE GAS CHAMBER; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES, I UNDERSTAND THAT.

MR. WAPNER: NOW, IF YOU ARE A JUROR IN THIS CASE, THE FIRST QUESTION YOU HAVE TO DECIDE IS WHETHER OR NOT THERE WAS AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY; YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES, I UNDERSTAND.

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU ARE ON THIS CASE AND YOU HAVE ALREADY DECIDED THAT THERE WAS AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, YOU GET TO THE PENALTY PHASE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: WHEN YOU GET TO THE PENALTY PHASE, THEN YOU AND 11 OTHER PEOPLE HEAR THE OTHER EVIDENCE, AS THE COURT HAS EXPLAINED TO YOU; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IS YOUR STATE OF MIND NOW SUCH THAT ONCE YOU HAVE DECIDED THAT THERE WAS AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY, YOU ARE NOT GOING TO LISTEN TO ANY EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE?

MR. BUSHNELL: OH, NO.

```
MR. BARENS: WELL, YOUR HONOR, THE DEFENSE OBJECTS TO
1
     THE EXPRESSION "NOT GOING TO LISTEN TO IT."
2
                 WHAT IS HE GOING TO DO, PUT HIS FINGERS IN HIS
3
     EARS?
           MR. WAPNER: I WILL ELABORATE ON THAT.
5
           THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
6
           MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU BE OPEN TO EITHER POSSIBLE
7
     PUNISHMENT AS WE STARTED THE GUILT PHASE, THAT IS, EITHER
8
     DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT?
9
           MR. BUSHNELL: YES.
10
           MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU HAVE ALREADY MADE UP YOUR MIND
11
     HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE ON THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY
12
     BEFORE YOU HEARD THE EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE
13
     TRIAL?
14
          MR. BUSHNELL: NO.
15
          MR. WAPNER: SHOULD ALL MURDERERS -- LET ME START THAT
16
     AGAIN.
17
                 SHOULD ALL PEOPLE WHO COMMIT MURDERS DURING
18
     ROBBERIES, INTENTIONAL MURDERS DURING ROBBERIES BE TREATED
19
     THE SAME, REGARDLESS OF THE WAY THE CRIME WAS COMMITTED
20
    AND THE BACKGROUND OF THE PERSON WHO DID IT?
21
           MR. BARENS: OBJECTION TO THE COMPOUND NATURE OF THE
22
23
     QUESTION.
           THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN IT.
24
           MR. BARENS: THE FIRST PART IS VERY MISLEADING.
25
           MR. WAPNER: SHOULD ALL PEOPLE WHO COMMIT MURDERS DURING
26
27
     THE COURSE OF ROBBERIES BE TREATED THE SAME, REGARDLESS OF
```

THE MANNER IN WHICH THE CRIME WAS COMMITTED?

MR. BUSHNELL: NO.

 MR. WAPNER: SHOULD ALL PEOPLE WHO COMMIT INTENTIONAL

MURDERS DURING ROBBERIES BE TREATED THE SAME, REGARDLESS OF

MR. BUSHNELL: NO.

THE BACKGROUND OF THAT PERSON?

MR. WAPNER: FOR EXAMPLE, SHOULD A PERSON WHO COMMITS

AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY AND HAS

DONE THAT THREE OR FOUR TIMES BEFORE AND BEEN CONVICTED OF

IT, BE TREATED THE SAME AS A PERSON WHO COMMITS AN INTENTIONAL

MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY AND HAS NO CRIMINAL

BACKGROUND AT ALL?

² 12

. 11

-- 13

MR. BUSHNELL: I THINK THERE SHOULD BE SOME CONSIDERATION TAKEN TO THE BACKGROUND.

_.8

QUESTION.

. .

MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU TAKE THAT INTO CONSIDERATION

IN DECIDING WHAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE?

MR. BUSHNELL: IT IS A POSSIBILITY.

THE COURT: WELL, SUPPOSE I INSTRUCT YOU THAT YOU MUST CONSIDER BEFORE YOU DETERMINE WHAT THE PENALTY IS, THE BACKGROUND OF THE DEFENDANT, HIS AGE, HIS LACK OF ANY PRIOR CONVICTIONS, HIS EDUCATION, HIS PHYSICAL AND MENTAL CONDITION AND ALSO CONSIDER THE FACTS OF THE CRIME ITSELF AND ALSO CONSIDER ANY OTHER FAVORABLE ASPECTS OF IT BEFORE YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND AS TO WHAT THE PENALTY WOULD BE?

MR. BUSHNELL: I SEE.

THE COURT: WOULD YOU DO THAT?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES, YES.

MR. WAPNER: WHAT DID YOU MEAN BEFORE WHEN YOU SAID
"WE HAVE A LAW, IF THE EVIDENCE IS SUFFICIENT, THEN THAT IS
HOW IT SHOULD GO"; COULD YOU EXPLAIN THAT TO ME.

MR. BUSHNELL: WHAT I WAS MEANING THERE, THAT THE DEATH PENALTY LAW IS IN FACT IN STATUS IN CALIFORNIA NOW AND IF THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IS SUCH THAT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY AND IF THE EVIDENCE PRESENTS ITSELF THAT HE SHOULD BE GIVEN THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT IS WHAT SHOULD BE.

MR. WAPNER: ORAY, YOU MENTIONED TWO DIFFERENT THINGS.

IS IT SUFFICIENT IN YOUR MIND TO HAVE HIM PROVEN

GUILTY OF THE CRIME IN ORDER FOR HIM TO -- THAT IS A BAD

THE COURT: YES.

MR. WAPNER: I DIDN'T LIKE THAT FROM THE BEGINNING.

THE COURT: START IT AGAIN.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

. 9

10

11

72

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

CRIME ON THE GUILT PHASE AND THAT THAT CRIME IS IN THE CATEGORY

OF CRIMES THAT QUALIFIES THE CASE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, DOES

THAT AUTOMATICALLY MEAN HE SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BUSHNELL: NO.

MR. WAPNER: IF THE LAW IS THAT AFTER HE IS CONVICTED

OF THE CRIME, THERE IS A SECOND PART OF THE CASE WHERE YOU

LISTEN TO EVIDENCE AS TO WHAT THE CORRECT PUNISHMENT SHOULD

BE, WOULD YOU LISTEN TO THAT EVIDENCE?

MR. BUSHNELL: ABSOLUTELY.

MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO CONSIDER BOTH SIDES?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO CONSIDER LIFE

IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE IF YOU THOUGHT IT WAS THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: ON THE OTHER HAND, WOULD YOU VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IF YOU THOUGHT THAT WAS THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: I MIGHT WANT TO INQUIRE AGAIN OF THE JUROR,

27 YOUR HONOR. I WISH TO.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. BARENS: DOES YOUR HONOR TAKE EXCEPTION AT THIS POINT?

THE COURT: YES. YOU HAVE EXHAUSTED ALL OF THE

QUESTIONS THAT YOU WANT TO ASK. IF YOU WANT ME TO HEAR ARGUMENT

I WILL HEAR ARGUMENT.

IF YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS TO ASK HIM,
I WILL PERMIT YOU TO DO SO.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

MR. BUSHNELL, AS BRIEFLY AS I CAN PUT IT, MY

CONCERN IS THAT I SEEM TO HAVE SOME CONFLICTING SIGNALS FROM

YOU IN YOUR RESPONSES.

WHEN I LEFT OFF WITH YOU EARLIER, YOU TOLD ME
THAT ALTHOUGH YOU WOULD CONSIDER THE EVIDENCE DURING THE
PENALTY PHASE, THAT IT WAS YOUR POINT OF VIEW THAT WE SHOULD
ALWAYS GIVE DEFENDANTS WHO WERE CONVICTED OF INTENTIONAL,
FIRST DEGREE MURDERS THAT ARE UNJUSTIFIABLE AND JUST A BLACK
HEART AND IT WAS COMMITTED DURING --

MR. WAPNER: THERE IS AN OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION BECAUSE WHO --

THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: YOU HAD TOLD ME EARLIER THAT IT WAS YOUR POINT OF VIEW THAT A DEFENDANT WHO WAS CONVICTED OF AN INTENTIONAL, FIRST DEGREE, PREMEDITATED MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT THOSE DEFENDANTS WE SHOULD ALWAYS GIVE THE DEATH PENALTY; IS THAT WHAT YOU TOLD ME, SIR?

MR. BUSHNELL: I DON'T THINK THAT WAS MY INTENTION ON THAT.

MR. BARENS: I AM SORRY IF I MISUNDERSTOOD.

WHAT DID YOU MEAN IN THAT RESPONSE, SIR?

THE COURT: WELL, THAT IS ASSUMING THAT HE MADE THAT

RESPONSE.

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

, -

11

12

13

15

16.

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

2728

THE COURT: WELL, LET ME ASK THE QUESTION. ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: IS YOUR STATE OF MIND SUCH THAT IF YOU WERE

MR. BARENS: I BELIEVE THE RECORD SHOULD REFLECT THAT

WAS THE RESPONSE TO MY LAST QUESTION WHEN I RESERVED AT THAT

POINT, YOUR HONOR. I WOULDN'T HAVE RESERVED, BUT FOR THAT

ONE OF THE JURORS AND THE JURY CAME IN WITH A VERDICT OF MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT IRRESPECTIVE OF WHAT THE TESTIMONY IS ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF IT, YOU WOULD VOTE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BUSHNELL: NOT NECESSARILY, NO.

THE COURT: YOU WOULD LISTEN TO THE TESTIMONY?

MR. BUSHNELL: SURE, ABSOLUTELY.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

RESPONSE, YOUR HONOR.

MR. BARENS: IS IT THEN POSSIBLE IN YOUR MIND, THAT EVEN THOUGH A PERSON WAS IN YOUR MIND, GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT OF FIRST DEGREE, INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED MURDER DURING A ROBBERY, THAT YOU COULD VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE FOR THAT DEFENDANT?

MR. BUSHNELL: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU COULD CONSIDER THAT?

MR. BUSHNELL: SURE, YES.

MR. BARENS: MR. BUSHNELL, HAVE YOU READ OR SEEN ANYTHING ON TELEVISION OR IN ANY MEDIA ABOUT THIS CASE?

MR. BUSHNELL: I HAVE NOT.

MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU HEARD --

THE COURT: I ASKED THAT QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR HAD INQUIRED? I STAND CORRECTED. 1 SORRY. MR. BUSHNELL, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH I AM 3 HERE TALKING TO YOU ASOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT THERE IS 4 NO REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE THAT MR. HUNT HAS DONE ANYTHING 5 6 WRONG. 7 OR. DO YOU FEEL THAT HE MIGHT -- MUST HAVE DONE 8 SOMETHING WRONG OR HE WOULDN'T BE HERE? MR. BUSHNELL: WELL, APPARENTLY HE HAS DONE SOMETHING Ģ WRONG OR THERE WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN A TRIAL ON IT. 10 THE COURT: YOU MEAN YOU ARE DETERMINING HE HAS DONE 11 SOMETHING WRONG? HE IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT, AS YOU KNOW, 12 UNTIL THE CONTRARY IS PROVED. MR. BUSHNELL: WELL, THAT IS TRUE. YES, I UNDERSTAND. 74 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WELL, AS HE SITS THERE, HE IS 75 PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT. HE HAS NOT DONE ANYTHING WRONG. DO 16 17 YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 18 MR. BUSHNELL: YES. THE COURT: I WANT TO DISABUSE YOUR MIND OF THAT. HE 19 20 IS ONLY ACCUSED AS HE SITS THERE. THIS MAN IS PRESUMABLY INNOCENT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND 21 22 THAT? 23 MR. BUSHNELL: YES. MR. BARENS: WELL, LET'S TRY TO SQUARE THAT, IF WE 24 25 COULD. MR. WAPNER: AGAIN, I HATE TO INTERRUPT COUNSEL. I 26 27 DON'T THINK THIS IS THE APPROPRAITE TIME TO GO INTO THIS 28 QUESTION.

28

MR. BARENS: WELL, I BELIEVE THE PRECEDENT CASES -THE COURT: NO. I DON'T THINK HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE
DEATH PENALTY -- THIS DOESN'T DEAL WITH THOSE THINGS. HE IS
SITTING HERE AND WE NEED TO EXAMINE HIS ATTITUDES ABOUT THE
DEATH PENALTY. THIS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. BARENS: WELL, LET ME MERELY INDICATE AS HIS HONOR HAS, AND CONFIRM WITH YOU, THAT YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH PROCEDURALLY THE LAW OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SAYS I HAVE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY --

MR. BUSHNELL: CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: THAT THAT DOES NOT SUGGEST TO YOU IN ANY WAY, THAT EITHER THE JUDGE OR MYSELF OR THE PROSECUTOR IS SAYING THAT THERE IS ANY YOU KNOW, REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE HE HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG, JUST BECAUSE WE ARE ASKING THESE QUESTIONS.

MR. BUSHNELL: YES. I UNDERSTAND.

MR. BARENS: THAT IT IS A PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT AT THIS POINT. IT IS NOT EVIDENCE.

MR. BUSHNELL: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, SIR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: WE WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT TO THE COURT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WOULD YOU WAIT OUTSIDE JUST FOR ONE MINUTE PLEASE, MR. BUSHNELL.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BUSHNELL EXITS THE

COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: YES?

MR. BARENS: WELL YOUR HONOR, WE HAVE GOT AN INCONSISTENT

JUROR. I AM SURE YOUR HONOR REALIZED THAT I WOULD NOT HAVE RESERVED A CHALLENGE, BUT FOR HIS AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSE IN TELLING ME -- AND I HAVE THE QUOTATION HERE. I ASKED HIM, "ALTHOUGH YOU WOULD CONSIDER THE EVIDENCE THAT WOULD BE GIVEN TO YOU DURING THE PENALTY PHASE, AS YOUR HONOR INSTRUCTED, WOULD YOU NONETHELESS ALWAYS GIVE THOSE DEFENDANTS THE DEATH PENALTY?" AND HE SAID, "YES."

EARLIER ON, HE SAID THAT IT IS THE LAW IN THE STATE AND IF THE EVIDENCE SHOWS HE IS GUILTY, WE WILL GIVE THAT DEFENDANT THE DEATH PENALTY. HE CONSISTENTLY EVIDENCED A STATE OF MIND THAT ALTHOUGH HE WOULD CONSIDER THE EVIDENCE OR LISTEN TO IT, I THINK WAS THE EXPRESSION, THAT WHEN HE GOT DOWN TO THAT, HE WOULD LISTEN TO THE EVIDENCE DURING THE PENALTY PHASE.

HE SAID THAT HE WOULD ALWAYS GIVE THOSE DEFENDANTS THE DEATH PENALTY. LATER ON, 1 WILL CONCEDE THAT THERE WAS SOME INCONSISTENCY IN HIS WILLINGNESS TO CONSIDER LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. BUT YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE IN A MORE CANDID FRAME OF MIND EARLIER ON, THIS JUROR WAS CONSISTENT IN SAYING THAT GUILT TO HIM, EQUATED THE NECESSITY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. THERE WAS NO QUESTION IN MY MIND ABOUT THAT, YOUR HONOR.

26 27

THAT A FINDING OF GUILT ALONE, WAS NOT SUFFICIENT FOR THE DETERMINATION OF THE PENALTY. IT SEEMED TO ME THAT ONCE HE WAS MADE AWARE THAT HE THEN HAD TO GO INTO THE PENALTY PHASE, THAT HE COULD AND THAT A FINDING OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES WAS NOT ALONE, SUFFICIENT FOR THE IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I DISAGREE WITH THAT TO THE

HE SAID THAT HE WOULD CONSIDER AND VOTE FOR BOTH PUNISHMENTS. BUT BEFORE THE COURT MAKES A DETERMINATION WHETHER WE SHOULD KEEP HIM, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE COURT TO MAKE A FACTUAL FINDING IN THAT REGARD, THAT THAT IS THE COURT'S OPINION ALSO.

IF NOT, IF THE COURT DOESN'T CONCUR WITH THAT OPINION, THEN I THINK THAT PERHAPS MR. BUSHNELL SHOULD BE EXCUSED.

THE COURT: WELL, I AM OF THE OPINION THAT HE WILL

NOT AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, IRRESPECTIVE

OF WHAT THE TESTIMONY WILL BE ON THE PENALTY PHASE. I WILL

SAY THAT HE IS QUALIFIED. WOULD YOU BRING HIM IN, PLEASE?

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR BUSHNELL ENTERED THE

COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: MR. BUSHNELL, THE COURT IS MAKING A RULING
THAT YOU ARE QUALIFIED TO SIT AS A POSSIBLE JUROR IN THIS
CASE. IN THAT EVENT, I WILL ASK YOU TO COME BACK TO THE JURY
ASSEMBLY ROOM TOMORROW AFTERNOON AT 1:45. WILL YOU DO THAT,
PLEASE?

MR. BUSHNELL: WILL DO.

Ĝ

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: IS IT CAMBELL-CABLE?

MS. CAMBELL: CAMBELL WAS MY REAL FATHER'S NAME. AND CABLE IS MY STEPFATHER'S NAME.

THE COURT: I SEE. IS THAT MISS?

MS. CAMBELL: MISS.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MISS CAMBELL-CABLE --

MS. CAMBELL: YOU CAN JUST SAY CAMEELL.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MS. CABLE, YOU HEARD YESTERDAY,
MY INFORMATION ON THE NATURE OF THE CHARGE AGINST THE DEFENDANT,
THAT HE IS ACCUSED OF THE CRIME OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE
AND THAT THE MURDER WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A
ROBBERY.

BEING COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY
HAS SIGNIFICANCE IN THIS WAY, AS I EXPLAINED IT.

NOT EVERY MURDER, EVEN IF IT IS DELIBERATE AND PREMEDITATED, CALLS FOR THE DEATH PENALTY OR FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. IT IS ONLY THOSE MURDERS WHICH ARE COMMITTED UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES LIKE COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, A BURGLARY, A KIDNAPPING, A RAPE, OR TORTURE OR CHILD MOLESTATION AND THE

1 .

А

CHILD DIES -- ONLY IN THOSE INSTANCES TOGETHER WITH A NUMBER

OF OTHERS THAT THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID, DO THOSE THEN QUALIFY

FOR A POSSIBLE DEATH PENALTY.

NOW, A DEATH PENALTY CONSISTS OF TWO THINGS. IT

IS LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS

CHAMBER. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CAMBELL: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: NOW, IF THE JURY SELECTED IN THIS CASE WILL
FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT,
WE CALL THAT THE GUILT PHASE. DID THE DEFENDANT COMMIT THIS
MURDER AND WAS IT A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND WAS IT
COMMITTED-- IS IT TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING
THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

THEN THAT WILL QUALIFY FOR A POSSIBLE DEATH PENALTY.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CAMBELL: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: OKAY. AND IF THEY SAY YES, IT IS TRUE THAT

IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN THE

SAME JURY HEARS ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY. THE SECOND PHASE OF

THE TRIAL IS KNOWN AS TO THE PENALTY PHASE. AND DURING THE

PENALTY PHASE, TESTIMONY WILL BE ADDUCED BY THE DEFENDANT

TO SHOW FAVORABLE THINGS ABOUT HIM, EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES,

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH MITIGATE THE OFFENSE AND HIS

BACKGROUND, HIS EDUCATION, HIS LACK OF ANY OTHER CRIMINAL

ACTIVITIES AND ANYTHING THAT IS FAVORABLE TO HIM. THAT IS

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONVINCING THE JURORS THAT HE IS NOT SUCH

A BAD PERSON AFTER ALL, THAT HE THEREFORE, SHOULD NOT SUFFER THE

ULTIMATE PENALTY OF DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

11 🕺

12 =

17 c

THE PEOPLE ON THE OTHER HAND, WILL TRY TO SHOW UNFAVORABLE ASPECTS, WHATEVER IT WILL BE, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PERSUADING THE JURY THAT HE IS NOT A PERSON WHO SHOULD RECEIVE ANY CONSIDERATION ON THE QUESTION OF WHAT THE PENALTY IS THAT SHOULD BE IMPOSED UPON HIM.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CAMBELL: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: WHAT I WILL DO IS, ASK YOU A SERIES OF
QUESTIONS. WE ARE INTENDING TO EXPLORE YOUR MIND AS TO YOUR
ATTITUDE AND YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY. DO YOU
UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CAMBELL: YES.

THE COURT: NOW, THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE GUILT PHASE OF IT. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. CAMBELL: I DO NOT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND DO YOU REMEMBER THAT I TOLD
YOU THAT YOU WILL HAVE TO ANSWER THE QUESTION, WAS IT COMMITTED
DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? THOSE ARE THE SPECIAL
CIRCUMSTANCES.

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?

MS. CAMBELL: I DO NOT.

THE COURT: THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS HAVE TO DO WITH THE PENALTY PHASE. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH

PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE TO IMPOSE 1 THE DEATH PENALTY REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE 2 PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 3 MS. CAMBELL: I DO NOT. 4 THE COURT: AND THE SAME THING WITH RESPECT TO LIFE 5 WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION 6 7 CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY 8 VOTE TO IMPOSE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE 9 OF THE TRIAL? 10 MS. CAMBELL: I DO NOT. 11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND OF COURSE, 12 13 THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY 14 IN THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 15 16 MS. CAMBELL: YES, SIR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. INCIDENTALLY, YOU HAVE NOT READ 17 OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT THIS CASE? 18 19 MS. CAMBELL: NO. THE COURT: THE NAME BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB OR JOE HUNT 20 21 OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING TO YOU? 22 MS. CAMBELL: NO, SIR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I THINK WE WILL GIVE YOU A CHANCE 23 TO GO TO LUNCH. YOU COME BACK THIS AFTERNOON. WHAT TIME? 24 25 MR. BARENS: I HAVE TO GO TO THE HOSPITAL ON A MATTER, YOUR HONOR, INVOLVING MY OFFICE MANAGER'S MOTHER, WHO HAS 26 27 HAD A STROKE.

I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE 1:45 AT THE EARLIEST,

1 SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1986; 1:55 P.M. 2 HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE DEPARTMENT EST C 3 (APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.) 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, COUNSEL AND THE DEFENDANT ARE 6 PRESENT. 7 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR LINDA CAMPBELL 8 ENTERS THE COURTROOM.) THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON. 10 ALL RIGHT, YOU MAY INQUIRE. 11 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 12 GOOD AFTERNOON, MISS CAMPBELL. 13 MS. CAMPBELL: HI. 14 MR. BARENS: I AM ARTHUR BARENS AND I REPRESENT THE 15 DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT, IN THIS MATTER, AND AS WITH HIS HONOR, 16 IT IS MY OBLIGATION AND DUTY AT THIS POINT TO ASK YOU ABOUT 17 YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY. 18 NOW PARENTHETICALLY, LET ME INDICATE THAT THERE 19 ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS AND NO ONE IN 20 THIS COURTROOM IS GOING TO BE JUDGING ANY OF YOUR ANSWERS. 21 YOU CAN NEVER BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OWN OPINION AND THAT IS ALL 22 I AM SEEKING HERE, OKAY? 23 MS. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR. 24 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH 25 PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY? 26 MS. CAMPBELL: IT IS KIND OF HARD TO ANSWER. I FEEL 27 THAT IT DEPENDS ON THE INDIVIDUAL CASE, I REALLY DO. 28 THERE IS NO EASY ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: ARE THERE ANY INSTANCES OR CIRCUMSTANCES
IN WHICH YOU FEEL THE DEATH PENALTY IS THE APPROPRIATE
REMEDY OR APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT?

MS. CAMPBELL: OFFHAND, 1 WOULD HAVE TO SAY NO. I WOULD

BE AGAINST --

I AM SORRY. I AM A LITTLE NERVOUS TALKING IN FRONT OF A BUNCH OF PEOPLE.

IT WOULD DEPEND ON THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT LED UP
TO IT, TO, YOU KNOW. WHATEVER HAPPENED.

MR. BARENS: THERE ARE TWO SETS OF CIRCUMSTANCES WE ARE TALKING ABOUT, HERE. LET ME MAKE SURE WE ARE PROPERLY FOCUSED ON THE ONE WE WANT TO ADDRESS.

THE FIRST SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES ARE GUILT CIRCUM-

THE FIRST SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES ARE GUILT CIRCUMSTANCES, CIRCUMSTANCES INVOLVING WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, GUILTY OF HAVING COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE, PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL MURDER.

NOW, WE'LL NEVER GET TO THIS PENALTY QUESTION

UNLESS YOU AND -- IF YOU ARE A JUROR AND THE OTHER JURORS

BELIEVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT, IN FACT, THE DEFENDANT

COMMITTED AN INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED MURDER DURING A ROBBERY.

NOW, THAT SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES, LET'S CALL THOSE

THE GUILT CIRCUMSTANCES. NOW, JUST STOPPING THERE FOR A

MOMENT, WE ARE GOING TO GET TO THE PENALTY SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES

IN A MOMENT.

BUT IF YOU WERE CONVINCED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT
THAT THE DEFENDANT HAD COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE, INTENTIONAL,
PREMEDITATED MURDER, WOULD YOU FEEL THAT THE ONLY WAY TO DEAL
WITH OR TO PUNISH PROPERLY A DEFENDANT UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES,
WOULD BE TO GIVE HIM THE DEATH PENALTY?

THE COURT: WITHOUT HEARING ANY OF THE --

MR. BARENS: WITHOUT HEARING --

THE COURT: WITHOUT HEARING ANYTHING ELSE?

MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR. QUITE SO.

AS I MENTIONED MISS CAMPBELL, I WILL COME TO THE SECOND SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES IN A MOMENT.

MS. CAMPBELL: WITHOUT HEARING ANY TESTIMONY AT ALL?

MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU HEARD TESTIMONY THAT HE COMMITTED

A CRIME AND YOU BELIEVED THAT IT WAS COMMITTED -- IT WAS A FIRST DEGREE MURDER DURING A ROBBERY.

MS. CAMPBELL: I WOULD HAVE TO REALLY SEARCH LONG AND HARD TO DECIDE ON IT ON A DEATH PENALTY CASE.

BUT I WOULD BE CAPABLE OF DOING SO, IF I REALLY FELT IT WAS NECESSARY.

MR. BARENS: WOULD IT BE A FAIR STATEMENT, THEN, THAT
YOU WOULD NEED TO HEAR EVIDENCE IN THAT SECOND PHASE, THE
PENALTY PHASE, CONCERNING THE DEFENDANT'S AGE AT THE TIME THE
CRIME WAS ALLEGEDLY COMMITTED AND WHETHER OR NOT HE HAD A
CRIMINAL BACKGROUND, BEFORE THIS INCIDENT AND ANY EVIDENCE
OF HIS CHARACTER BEFORE YOU COULD MAKE THAT DECISION?

MS. CAMPBELL: I BELIEVE THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL, YES.

MR. EARENS: OKAY. IS IT A TRUE STATEMENT THEN, THAT YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT THE DEFENDANT OTHER THAN THE FACT THAT HE HAD COMMITTED THE CRIME, BEFORE YOU WOULD DETERMINE HOW HE SHOULD BE SENTENCED?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. THAT'S THE KIND OF JUROR I THINK
WE ARE LOOKING FOR HERE, THAT YOU WOULD REALLY LISTEN AND
CONSIDER ALL OF THE EVIDENCE BEFORE MAKING THE DECISION.

MS. CAMPSELL: I HOPE THAT I WOULD BE ABLE TO DO IT.

MR. BARENS: NOW, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE REALLY MEANS THAT TODAY IN CALIFORNIA?

MS. CAMPBELL: I WAS NOT AWARE OF THAT.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. I REALIZE THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE HAVE KIND OF A LINGERING DOUBT AT THE MINIMUM, THAT WHEN LAWYERS SAY THAT, THAT IT IS TRUE.

- 5

•€

OF THAT?

BUT HIS HONOR WILL TELL YOU AND I BELIEVE MENTION

DURING HIS QUESTIONING OF YOU, THAT LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY

OF PAROLE TODAY MEANS LITERALLY THAT, THE DEFENANT CAN NEVER,

EVER, EVER QUALIFY FOR OR BE ELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE AT ANY TIME.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND YOU WOULD ACCEPT THAT IF THE COURT TELLS YOU THAT?

MS. CAMPBELL: I WOULD ACCEPT THAT IF THE COURT TOLD ME THAT.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. NOW, ALTHOUGH HIS HONOR

REFERRED TO SOME 19 CATEGORIES THAT THE STATE LEGISLATURE HAS

CREATED WHEREBY A DEFENDANT CAN BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR THE DEATH

PENALTY, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT NONE OF THOSE 19 CATEGORIES

IN A MATTER OF FACT, UNDER NO SECTION OF OUR LEGAL SYSTEM,

IS IT EVER MANDATORY THAT A DEFENDANT GETS THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. CAMPBELL: SORRY. WOULD YOU REPEAT THE FIRST PART

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

17

12

13

14 1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH THE LEGISLATURE HAS CREATED 19 CATEGORIES WHERE A DEFENDANT CAN QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT NONE OF THEM ARE MANDATORY? MS. CAMBELL: OKAY. I DID NOT REALIZE THAT.

MR. BARENS: WELL, I WANT TO MAKE SURE YOU REALIZE THAT ALTHOUGH A JURY --

THE COURT: WHAT HE MEANS IS THAT THE JURY DETERMINES IN EVERY SINGLE CASE WHAT PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED. IT IS NOT MANDATORY. IN OTHER WORDS, THEY ARE NOT FORCED TO COME TO ANY SUCH CONCLUSION IF THEY DON'T WANT TO.

MS. CAMBELL: OKAY, I UNDERSTAND.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THAT IS PRECISELY MY POINT.

NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY BELIEF IN YOUR MIND THAT MR. HUNT MUST HAVE DONE SOMETHING WRONG OR WE WOULDN'T BE HERE TALKING ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. CAMBELL: THAT IS A TOUGH ONE TO ANSWER.

I REALLY BELIEVE THAT ONE IS INNOCENT UNTIL THEY ARE ABSOLUTELY PROVEN GUILTY.

I HAVE GROWN UP WITH --

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THAT IS THE POINT I WANTED TO MAKE, MRS. CAMBELL. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. WE PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: YOU KNOW THAT IS WHAT WE TALK ABOUT, THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, HE IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT UNTIL HE IS PROVEN GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT; YOU MEAN THAT, DON'T YOU?

MS. CAMBELL: YES, SIR.

TO ABSOLUTE PROOF BECAUSE YOU KNOW THAT THE DEATH PENALTY

IS INVOLVED?

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY, LET ME GIVE YOU A HYPOTHETICAL

MS. CAMBELL: WELL, I THINK BECAUSE THE DEATH PENALTY IS INVOLVED THAT YOU HAVE TO TAKE THAT INTO CONSIDERATION. YOU JUST CAN'T GO -- WELL, YEAH, A PERSON --

THE COURT: I JUST GOT THROUGH TELLING YOU THAT IN EVERY CRIMINAL CASE, IT DOESN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE WHETHER IT IS A DRUNK DRIVING CASE OR RUNNING A RED LIGHT OR A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE CASE WHERE THERE ARE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES. THE LAW IS THE SAME FOR A DEFENDANT, IN ORDER TO BE CONVICTED OF BEING UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF DRIVING AN AUTOMOBILE BEFORE HE CAN BE CONVICTED OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANTING THE DEATH PENALTY, THE RULE IS EXACTLY THE SAME IN BOTH CASES, THAT HE MUST BE PROVED GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND NOT ANYTHING MORE. THE TWO ARE EXACTLY THE SAME.

MS. CAMBELL: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: YOU CAN'T GET ANY MORE PROOF IN ONE CASE THAN YOU DO IN ANOTHER. BY PROOF, I MEAN BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. IN OTHER WORDS, IT CAN'T BE BEYOND ANY DOUBT.

MS. CAMBELL: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: IT IS A REASONABLE DOUBT IN BOTH CASES, WHETHER IT IS A DRUNK DRIVING CASE OR WHETHER IT IS A MURDER CASE: DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. CAMBELL: I THINK SO.

THE COURT: THE RULE IS EXACTLY THE SAME.

MS. CAMBELL: OKAY.

25

26

27

28

SITUATION. YOU ARE SITTING ON A MURDER CASE AND AS FAR AS YOU KNOW THERE IS NO DEATH PENALTY INVOLVED, OKAY? AND YOU HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AND YOU GO BACK INTO THE JURY ROOM TO DELIBERATE AND THE JUDGE HAS TOLD YOU THAT IN ORDER TO FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY YOU MUST -- THE PROOF MUST BE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT -- AND SO YOU LISTEN TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AND YOU DISCUSS IT WITH THE OTHER JURORS AND YOU DECIDE IN YOUR OWN MIND THAT THE PROOF IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND THE OTHER 11 PEOPLE AGREE WITH YOU AND YOU ARE ABOUT TO RENDER YOUR VERDICT WHEN SOMEONE COMES INTO THE JURY ROOM --BY THE WAY. THIS WOULD NEVER HAPPEN -- AND TELLS YOU THAT IF YOU FIND THE PERSON GUILTY, THE CASE COULD INVOLVED THE DEATH PENALTY. WOULD YOU THINK THAT THAT WOULD CHANGE THE AMOUNT OF PROOF THAT IS REQUIRED? WOULD YOU CHANGE YOUR MIND AND SAY "WELL, MAYBE THAT HAS NOT BEEN PROVEN BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT"?

MS. CAMBELL: I BELIEVE THAT IF I BELIEVED IN MY HEART THAT IT WAS PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT I WOULD HAVE TO CARRY OUT THAT VERDICT, YES, THAT DECISION OF MINE.

MR. WAPNER: REGARDLESS OF WHAT THE PUNISHMENT WAS?

MS. CAMBELL: REGARDLESS OF WHAT THE PUNISHMENT IS,
I WOULD HOPE I WOULD BE ABLE TO DO THAT WITH A CLEAR HEART
AND CONSCIENCE.

MR. WAPNER: THE JUDGE WILL TELL YOU AT THE END OF THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL BEFORE YOU GO IN TO DELIBERATE THAT YOU CAN'T CONSIDER PENALTY OR PUNISHMENT; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CAMBELL: NO, I DO NOT.

4 F

2

3

5

6

7

8

g

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. WAPNER: KEEP IN MIND THAT WE HAVE TWO PARTS OF THE TRIAL, THE GUILT PART AND THE PENALTY PART. WHEN YOU ARE DECIDING WHETHER THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT, THE JUDGE IS GOING TO TELL YOU THAT YOU CAN'T THINK ABOUT WHAT THE PUNISHMENT IS. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: THAT IS KIND OF TANTAMOUNT TO A REFEREE AT A FOOTBALL GAME, NOT BEING ABLE TO MAKE HIS DECISION ON WHETHER THERE IS A PENALTY OR NOT, DEPENDING UPON WHETHER ONE TEAM WILL GO TO THE SUPER BOWL OR NOT, BASED ON HIS DECISION. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND IF HE TELLS YOU DURING THE GUILT PART OF THE CASE, THAT YOU CAN'T THINK ABOUT WHAT THE PUNISHMENT IS, COULD YOU FOLLOW THAT INSTRUCTION?

MS. CAMPBELL: I BELIEVE SO.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WHEN YOU GET TO THE PENALTY PART OF THE TRIAL, IF YOU GET TO THAT POINT, YOUR JOB WOULD BE TO FIRST OF ALL, LISTEN TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON BOTH SIDES AND SECOND OF ALL, TO DECIDE WHETHER THE PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

AND THOSE WOULD BE YOUR ONLY CHOICES IF YOU GOT TO THAT POINT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU WERE FORCED TO CHOOSE BETWEEN THOSE TWO THINGS, DO YOU THINK THAT IS A DECISION YOU ARE CAPABLE OF MAKING?

MS. CAMPBELL: 1 BELIEVE SO.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONGLY HELD RELIGIOUS, MORAL OR PHILOSOPHICAL BELIEFS THAT WOULD GET IN THE WAY OF YOUR MAKING A DECISION BASED ON THE FACTS AND THE LAW?

MS. CAMPBELL: 1 DO NOT.

MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU GIVEN MUCH THOUGHT TO THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY BEFORE YOU CAME INTO COURT?

MS. CAMPBELL: 1 HAD NOT.

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU SAT THROUGH THE WHOLE CASE AND YOU BELIEVED THERE WAS PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS GUILTY, THAT THE MURDER OCCURRED DURING A ROBBERY AND YOU BELIEVED THAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT WAS DEATH, ARE YOU CAPABLE OF RENDERING THAT VERDICT?

MS. CAMPBELL: IT WOULD BE HARD. BUT I BELIEVE I WOULD BE ABLE TO.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. TELL ME WHY YOU THINK IT WOULD BE HARD. OTHER THAN THE OBVIOUS?

MR. BARENS: WELL, I OBJECT.

THE COURT: YOU DON'T HAVE TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION.

IT IS OBVIOUS, ISN'T IT?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, IF THERE IS ANYTHING THAT IS NOT -THE COURT: THAT IS OBVIOUS. TO MAKE A DECISION TO SEND
SOMEBODY TO THE GAS CHAMBER, IS A VERY HARD DECISION TO MAKE.

MR. WAPNER: NO QUESTION ABOUT IT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN WHY ASK THE QUESTION?

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IF YOU GET TO THAT
POINT OF THE CASE, THAT ALTHOUGH THERE WILL BE 11 OTHER
PEOPLE IN THE JURY ROOM, THAT IS A DECISION THAT YOU HAVE TO

28

MAKE AS AN INDIVIDUAL?

MS. CAMBELL: YES, 1 DO.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY VIEWS ABOUT WHETHER THAT SUBJECT -- THAT YOU THINK WOULD AFFECT YOUR DECISION THAT YOU HAVE NOT TOLD US ABOUT?

MS. CAMPBELL: NO, 1 DO NOT.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. PASS FOR CAUSE.

MR. BARENS: PASS FOR CAUSE.

THE COURT: BOTH SIDES AGREE, AS DOES THE JUDGE, THAT YOU QUALIFY TO SIT ON THIS CASE AS A TRIAL JUROR IF YOU ARE SELECTED. SO WHAT I WILL DO IS ASK YOU TO COME BACK --

MR. BARENS: I DOUBT THAT --

THE COURT: WELL AT ANY RATE, COME BACK IN ANY EVENT TOMORROW AFTERNOON AT 1:45 TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM. MEET THE OTHER JURGRS AND WE'LL GET YOU BACK HERE. OKAY? THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

OF COURSE, I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANY CHANCE OF YOUR READING ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE OR SEEING ANYTHING ON TELEVISION OR HEARING IT ON THE RADIO, BUT TURN IT OFF IF YOU HAPPEN TO HEAR. WILL YOU DO THAT?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

THE COURT: SEE YOU TOMORROW.

MS. CAMBELL: OKAY.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR CAMPBELL EXITS THE COURTROOM.)

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHAFFEE ENTERS

THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: IS IT CHAFFEE?

MS. CHAFFEE: YES. 1 THE COURT: IS IT MISS OR MRS.? 2 MS. CHAFFEE: MRS. 3 THE COURT: MRS. CHAFFEE, WHERE DO YOU LIVE? 5 MS. CHAFFEE: I LIVE IN LOS ANGELES. THE COURT: BEFORE YOU CAME TO COURT YESTERDAY, DID YOU 6 EVER HEAR ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS CASE OR SINCE THAT TIME? 7 8 MS. CHAFFEE: NO, I DID NOT. THE COURT: EXCEPT WHAT I TOLD YOU HERE? õ 10 MS. CHAFFEE: THAT'S CORRECT. THE COURT: AND THE NAME BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB OR JOE 11 HUNT OR ANYTHING DOESN'T RING A BELL WITH YOU? 12 13 MS. CHAFFEE: NO. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WOULD YOU TELL US WHERE YOU LIVE? 14 MS. CHAFFEE: I WUULD RATHER NOT GIVE MY ADDRESS. 15 THE COURT: NOT YOUR ADDRESS. I JUST WANT TO KNOW --16 MS. CHAFFEE: LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA. 17 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU REMEMBER YESTERDAY I TOLD 18 YOU SOMETHING ABOUT THE CASE? 19 20 MS. CHAFFEE: YES. THE COURT: LET ME REPEAT IT BRIEFLY. THE CHARGE AGAINST 21 THE DEFENDANT IS THAT HE COMMITTED A MURDER. A MURDER WAS 22 COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. 23 24 MS. CHAFFEE: UH-HUH. THE COURT: AND IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS SPECIAL 25 SIGNIFICANCE IN THIS CASE BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID 26 THAT EVEN IF A MURDER IS COMMITTED DELIBERATELY AND 27 PREMEDITATEDLY AND INTENTIONALLY, BY ITSELF, DOESN'T CALL FOR

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

ō

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

10

20

2:

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE DEATH PENALTY OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

THAT MURDER MUST BE COMMITTED UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES LIKE FOR EXAMPLE, IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY OR A BURGLARY OR KIDNAPPING OR RAPE OR TORTURE.

THE LEGISLATURE HAS GIVEN US ANY NUMBER OF INSTANCES WHERE, IF A MURDER IS COMMITTED UNDER THOSE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THEN THE CASE QUALIFIES FOR A POSSIBLE DEATH PENALTY.

MS. CHAFFEE: RIGHT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO THE JURY WHICH WILL BE IMPANELED IN THIS CASE TO TRY THIS CASE, WILL FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE WHAT WE CALL THE GUILT PHASE, IS THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY ON THE MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE?

IF THEY SAY THAT HE WAS GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE. THEN THEY HAVE TO MAKE A SPECIAL FINDING, 1S IT TRUE OR IS IT FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

MS. CHAFFEE: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: IF THEY SAY IT IS TRUE, THEN WE COME TO WHAT WE CALL THE SECOND PHASE. ALL RIGHT?

MS. CHAFFEE: YES.

THE COURT: NOW, THE SECOND PHASE -- YOU REMEMBER IN THE FIRST PHASE HOWEVER, THE QUESTION OF PENALTY OR PUNISHMENT IS NOT TO BE DISCUSSED. IT DOESN'T COME INTO QUESTION AT ALL. IT IS ONLY UNTIL AFTER THE JURY HAS FOUND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT THEN, THEY COME TO WHAT IS KNOWN AS THE PENALTY

PHASE, WHAT PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED UPON HIM, YOU SEE.

NOW, THE PENALTY IN CALIFORNIA IS ONE OF TWO THINGS,
EITHER LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THAT MEANS
EXACTLY THAT, NO POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. HE IS SENTENCED TO
THE STATE PRISON. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CHAFFEE: YES, I DO.

THE COURT: OR IT IS DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER, ONE OF THOSE TWO. NOW, BEFORE THE JURY -- AND IT WILL BE THE SAME JURY ON THE GUILT PHASE THAT ALSO SITS ON THE PENALTY PHASE.

NOW, ON THE PENALTY PHASE, YOU WILL HEAR MUCH MORE TESTIMONY WHICH YOU DIDN'T HEAR BEFORE. AND THAT TESTIMONY WILL RELATE TO THE DEFENDANT. THE DEFENDANT WILL HAVE THE TESTIMONY THAT IS IN MITIGATION.

MS. CHAFFEE: WHAT DOES THAT MEAN?

THE COURT: TO DIMINISH. IN OTHER WORDS, TO SHOW THAT AFTER ALL, HE MIGHT HAVE COMMITTED THIS CRIME, BUT HE IS ESSENTIALLY MUCH BETTER THAN THE CRIME MIGHT INDICATE HE IS.

IN OTHER WORDS, HIS CHARACTER.

MS. CHAFFEE: OKAY.

THE COURT: AND HIS AGE AND THE FACT THAT HE HAS A FINE, UNBLEMISHED REPUTATION BEFORE THAT AND HIS BACKGROUND, HIS EDUCATION AND AS I SAID, HIS MENTAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

28

EVERYTHING THAT HAS A TENDENCY TO BE FAVORABLE TO HIM, OF COURSE THE DEFENDANT WILL TRY TO SHOW.

MS. CHAFFEE: OKAY.

THE COURT: ON THE OTHER HAND, THE PROSECUTION WILL TRY TO SHOW FACTS WHICH ARE UNFAVORABLE TO THE DEFENDANT.

WE CALL THAT AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

MS. CHAFFEE: ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: SO THEN THE JURY WEIGHS BOTH, MUST WEIGH
THAT BEFORE THEY COME TO A DECISION. THEY CAN'T SAY IMMEDIATELY
JUST BECAUSE HE HAPPENED TO COMMIT A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE
DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY THAT HE SHOULD SUFFER ONE OR
TWO OF THOSE PENALTIES. THEY FIRST HAVE TO WEIGH AND HEAR
WHAT THE TESTIMONY IS ON BOTH SIDES BEFORE THEY MAKE UP THEIR
MINDS.

MS. CHAFFEE: RIGHT.

THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. CHAFFEE: YES.

THE COURT: MERELY BECAUSE HE COMMITTED MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THAT ISN'T ENOUGH.

MS. CHAFFEE: OKAY.

THE COURT: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CHAFFEE: YES.

THE COURT: BEFORE THEY MAKE UP THEIR MINDS, DO YOU

24 UNDERSTAND?

MS. CHAFFEE: YES.

THE COURT: ARE YOU WILLING TO DO IT IF YOU SERVE AS

27 | A JUROR?

MS. CHAFFEE: I GUESS SO.

21

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: THE QUESTIONS I AM GOING TO ASK YOU AND COUNSEL WILL ASK YOU, AND THE SPECIAL PURPOSE OF THIS HEARING, IS TO DETERMINE, TO EXPLORE YOUR STATE OF MIND ON THE SUBJECT OF THE DEATH PENALTY, WHAT YOUR BELIEFS ARE WITH RESPECT TO IT.

MS. CHAFFEE: OKAY.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THE QUESTIONS I AM GOING TO ASK YOU HAVE REFERENCE TO THE FIRST PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THE GUILT PHASE, AND THESE ARE THE QUESTIONS:

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

MS. CHAFFEE: I HAVE IN MY OWN PERSONAL FAMILY, MY BROTHER WAS MURDERED AND THAT MIGHT INFLUENCE ME AS A JUROR.

THE COURT: IN DETERMINING WHETHER THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY?

MS. CHAFFEE: NO, NOT THAT WAY. BUT THAT WOULD MAKE --

MS. CHAFFEE: THAT IS WHY I --

THE COURT: THAT ISN'T WHAT I ASKED.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, NOW WE WILL COME TO THE OTHER IN A MINUTE.

MS. CHAFFEE: OKAY.

THE COURT: THE FIRST PART OF IT, YOU COULD MAKE AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. CHAFFEE: YES.

THE COURT: THE SECOND QUESTION ALSO RELATES TO THE

5

_ ,

GUILT OR INNOCENCE PART OF IT.

MS. CHAFFEE: UH-HUH.

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?

YOU REMEMBER I TOLD YOU THAT IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY

OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN YOU DETERMINE IS IT TRUE

OR IS IT FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF

A ROBBERY? AND THAT IS THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE.

MS. CHAFFEE: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: YOUR OPINION OF THE DEATH PENALTY, WOULD
THAT IN ANY WAY AFFECT YOU IN MAKING THAT PARTICULAR DECISION?

MS. CHAFFEE: NO. I WOULD HAVE TO WEIGH THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, FINE.

NOW, THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS HAVE TO DO WITH THE PENALTY PHASE: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE. YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE YOU MAY HEAR ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

RIGHT AWAY, IF YOU'D SAY "I AM GOING TO FIND HIM GUILTY"OR "I AM GOING TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY IRRESPECTIVE OF ANYTHING I HAVE HEARD OR WILL HEAR OR HAVE HEARD."

MS. CHAFFEE: I DON'T KNOW IF IT WOULD BE AUTOMATIC
BUT I BELIEVE IN THE DEATH PENALTY.

THE COURT: THAT IS ALL RIGHT.

MS. CHAFFEE: OKAY.

THE COURT: YOU CAN ENTERTAIN THAT BELIEF. A LOT OF

OTHER PEOPLE DO, TOO. BUT WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR DEATH WITHOUT HEARING ANY EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE? MS. CHAFFEE: WITHOUT -- THAT WOULD BE THE SECOND INFORMATION THAT YOU GET? THE COURT: YES, THE SECOND TRIAL. EVEN BEFORE YOU GO INTO THE SECOND TRIAL, ON THE SECOND PHASE OF IT, IS YOUR MIND MADE UP THAT YOU ARE GOING TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY WITHOUT HEARING ANYTHING? MS. CHAFFEE: I GUESS I FEEL WHEN SOMEBODY TAKES SOMEBODY'S LIFE, I WOULD PROBABLY MAKE IT AUTOMATIC. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: A DEFENSE MOTION, YOUR HONOR. 1 MR. WAPNER: 1 HAVE NO OBJECTION. 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I AM SORRY 3 ABOUT THAT TRAGEDY THAT HAPPENED IN YOUR LIFE THAT MIGHT HAVE INFLUENCED YOUR REASONING. I CAN UNDERSTAND HOW IT WOULD, 5 YOU KNOW. 6 MS. CHAFFEE: UH-HUH. THE COURT: BUT UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, I DON'T THINK 8 YOU WOULD QUALIFY AS A JUROR ON THIS CASE. YOU GO BACK INTO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AND TELL 10 THEM THAT YOU DO QUALIFY, HOWEVER, IN ANY OTHER KIND OF CASE. 11 12 MS. CHAFFEE: THANK YOU. (PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHAFFEE EXITED 13 14 THE COURTROOM.) 15 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR CRAMER ENTERED THE 16 COURTROOM.) MS. CRAMER: GOOD AFTERNOON, JUDGE. 17 18 THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON. MOST OF US AROUND THE COURTHOUSE KNOW THIS VERY 19 LOVELY LADY. SHE WAS IDENTIFIED WITH THE CLERK'S OFFICE FOR 20 21 MANY, MANY YEARS, WEREN'T YOU? 22 MS. CRAMER: YES, I WAS, SIR, FOR 17. 23 THE COURT: 17 YEARS? 24 DO YOU THINK BECAUSE YOU HAVE BEEN IN THE CLERK'S 25 OFFICE THAT THAT WOULD IN ANY WAY UNQUALIFY YOU TO BE A JUROR 26 IN THIS CASE? 27 MS. CRAMER: NO, SIR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

IN THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY, OF A RAPE, KIDNAPPING, CHILD

MOLESTATION WHERE THE CHILD DIES, MULTIPLE MURDERS, TORTURE,
THERE ARE 19 OF THEM.

SO IT IS ONLY WHEN THE MURDER IS COMMITTED UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THE DEATH PENALTY MAY COME INTO PLAY.

WHEN I TALK ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, THE DEATH PENALTY HAS TWO PHASES, TWO PARTS.

ONE IS THAT THE DEFENDANT MAY BE SENTENCED TO

LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THAT

MEANS EXACTLY THAT. THERE IS NO POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

SO IF YOU ARE SELECTED AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE,

THE JURY WILL FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE

OF THE DEFENDANT, WAS HE GUILTY OR WASN'T HE GUILTY OF COMMITTING

MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE?

IF THEY SAY YES, HE COMMITTED THE MURDER AND IT WAS IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THEY HAVE TO ANSWER THIS QUESTION: WAS IT OR WAS IT NOT COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

IF THEY SAY, YES, IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN THAT SAME JURY BEGINS THE TRIAL OF THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE CASE.

THE FIRST PHASE IS THE GUILT PHASE AND THIS ONE
I AM REFERRING TO NOW IS THE PENALTY PHASE. ON THE PENALTY
PHASE THE DEFENDANT AND THE PROSECUTION INTRODUCE TESTIMONY
WHICH THE JURY HAS TO CONSIDER. THE DEFENDANT WILL INTRODUCE
TESTIMONY ABOUT HIS AGE, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS EDUCATION, HIS
MENTAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION, EVERYTHING HE HAS DONE IN HIS
LIFETIME WHICH MIGHT BE FAVORABLE TO HIM THAT THE JURY WOULD

FEEL THAT HE IS A PERSON THAT SHOULD NOT SUFFER THE DEATH 1 PENALTY, BY THAT, I MEAN THE GAS CHAMBER AND THEY WILL HAVE 2 TO DETERMINE IF IT SHOULD BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE 3 POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, AS I TOLD YOU, OR DEATH IN THE GAS 4 5 CHAMBER. AND THE TESTIMONY WHICH THE DEFENDANT INTRODUCED 6 IS WHAT WE CALL EXTENUATING OR MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES. 7 ON THE OTHER HAND, THE PROSECUTION WILL ATTEMPT 8 TO SHOW BAD THINGS, AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES IN CONNECTION 9 10 WITH HIS BEING A BAD PERSON. THE JURY CONSIDERS ALL OF THAT. THEY CONSIDER 11 THE EVIDENCE THEY HEARD AT THE GUILT PHASE AND THEY TAKE 12 EVERYTHING INTO CONSIDERATION IN DETERMINING WHETHER IT SHOULD 13 BE ONE OR THE OTHER; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 14 15 MS. CRAMER: I UNDERSTAND. THE COURT: WHAT WE HAVE YOU HERE FOR IS TO EXPLORE 16 YOUR MIND TO FIND OUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY. 17 18 MS. CRAMER: ALL RIGHT. THE COURT: THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS HAVE TO DO WITH THE 19 20 GUILT PHASE. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION, WHATEVER THAT OPINION 21 MAY BE, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL 22 DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT? 23 24 MS. CRAMER: I WOULD GO BY THE LAW. 25 26

16F

27

THE COURT: YES. NOW, IS YOUR OPINION OF THE DEATH
PENALTY SUCH, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, THAT IMMEDIATELY YOU WILL
MAKE A DECISION FOR THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT
WITHOUT CONSIDERING ALL OF THE FACTORS?

MS. CRAMER: NO. I WOULD WANT TO HEAR EVERYTHING.

THE COURT: SURELY. ALSO, THAT HAS TO DO WITH THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES? IN OTHER WORDS, WAS IT COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. CRAMER: YES.

THE COURT: NOW, ASSUMING NOW THAT THE JURY HAS FOUND
HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS UNDER
SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, IN OTHER WORDS, IT WAS DURING THE COURSE
OF A ROBBERY, THEN ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF IT, DO YOUHAVE ANY
OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU
AUTOMATICALLY TO YOTE FOR THE DEATH FENALTY WITHOUT REGARD
TO ANY EVIDENCE THAT WAS PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF
THE TRIAL?

MS. CRAMER: NO. I WOULD GO BY THE EVIDENCE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO YOUR ANSWER IS NO, THAT YOU WOULD NOT AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. CRAMER: NO. I WOULD WANT TO HEAR ALL OF THE EVIDENCE.

THE COURT: ON THE PENALTY PHASE?

MS. CRAMER: YES.

THE COURT: AND SIMILARILY, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF

THE TRIAL?

MS. CRAMER: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU REMEMBER THAT I TOLD YOU THAT ONE
OF TWO THINGS YOU HAVE TO CONSIDER WOULD BE LIFE WITHOUT
POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER? THESE TWO
QUESTIONS WERE DESIGNED TO FIND OUT IF YOUR OPINION OF THE
DEATH PENALTY IS SUCH THAT YOU WOULD VOTE FOR ONE OR THE OTHER
AUTOMATICALLY. YOUR ANSWER IS NO?

MS. CRAMER: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU KNOW THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT COME INTO CONSIDERATION IN THIS CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT YOU REACH THAT PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. CRAMER: YES.

THE COURT: RIGHT?

MS. CRAMER: RIGHT.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. GOOD AFTERNOON, MISS CRAMER. WAS IT MRS. CRAMER?

MS. CRAMER: IT WAS MRS. CRAMER. MY HUSBAND DIED, PASSED AWAY FOUR YEARS AGO.

MR. BARENS: SORRY. I JUST HAD NOT PROPERLY HEARD WHEN THE JUDGE ADDRESSED YOU. IT WAS WHILE YOU WERE WORKING HERE?

MS. CRAMER: YES. THAT IS WHY I STAYED ANOTHER YEAR.

MR. BARENS: MISS CRAMER, I AM ARTHUR BARENS. I REPRESENT JOE HUNT, THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE, SEATED DOWN THERE AT THE END OF THE TABLE. IT IS MY DUTY, AS IT WAS THE JUDGE'S A MOMENT AGO, TO INQUIRE AT THIS POINT OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

THE LAW IS SET UP SO THAT WE ASK YOU NOW ABOUT
YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY. AND NONE OF US HERE
ARE JUDGING ANY OF YOUR ANSWERS AND THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG
ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS BECAUSE YOU CAN'T BE RIGHT OR WRONG
ABOUT WHAT YOUR OPINION IS. IT IS JUST YOUR OPINION.

SO WITH THAT IN MIND, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MS. CRAMER: YOU MEAN WHETHER I THINK IT SHOULD BE OR SHOULDN'T BE?

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO.

MS. CRAMER: WELL, IF HE HAS DONE SOMETHING WRONG AND HAS COMMITTED -- HAS BEEN PROVEN WITHOUT A DOUBT --

THE COURT: NO, NO, IT CAN'T BE THAT. IT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

MS. CRAMER: WELL, I MEAN BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.
THANK YOU, SIR.

IF IT WAS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND HE IS PROVEN GUILTY, I WOULD GO FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. WOULD IT BE -- AND AGAIN, THERE IS
NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWER TO THOSE QUESTIONS, YOU KNOW. YOU
MAY BE IN A MAJORITY ON THIS.

WOULD IT BE YOUR STATE OF MIND THAT A PERSON WHO
TAKES A LIFE WITH PREMEDITATION, INTENT, WITHOUT JUSTIFICATION,
THAT THE ONLY APPROPRIATE PENALTY FOR THAT PERSON IS THE DEATH
PENALTY?

THE COURT: YOU MEAN AFTER WE HAVE HAD THE PENALTY PHASE

OF THE TRIAL AND AFTER ALL THE EVIDENCE IS IN OF THE BACKGROUND

AND EVERYTHING?

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO. I LOOK FOR, AS I BELIEVE IT IS APPROPRIATE AND PROPER, FOR COUNSEL TO INQUIRE AS TO ANY PREDISPOSITION THAT MAY EXIST AS TO A LIFE-FOR-A-LIFE BASIS, YOUR HONOR. WITHOUT ANY FURTHER INQUIRY AT THIS POINT IN THE QUESTIONING --

THE COURT: WELL, THE LAW IN CALIFORNIA IS BEFORE A DEATH PENALTY CAN BE IMPOSED, YOU HAVE GOT TO HAVE A PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL WHERE THE JURORS HEAR THE ENTIRE BACKGROUND AND EVERYTHING ELSE ABOUT THE DEFENDANT.

. 5

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO.

THE COURT: THEY CAN'T MAKE UP THEIR MINDS UNTIL THAT

IS DONE. YOUR QUESTION JUST RELATES TO THE FACT THAT THERE

IS A TERRIBLE MURDER AND WILL SHE VOTE FOR THE IMPOSITION OF

THE DEATH PENALTY, WHICH ISN'T A FAIR QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: NOT MEANING ANY DISRESPECT, YOUR HONOR,
BUT THE CASES SEEM TO INDICATE THAT COUNSEL IS ENTITLED TO
INQUIRE AS TO A PROSPECTIVE JUROR'S BELIEF IN A LIFE-FOR-A-LIFE,
IN AND OF ITSELF, AS A QUESTION.

THE COURT: I DIDN'T HEAR YOU ASK THAT QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: I THOUGHT I WAS TRYING TO FRAME THAT. I WILL DO SO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. BARENS: IS IT YOUR OPINION THAT IF A DEFENDANT IS

PROVEN TO HAVE TAKE' A LIFE WITH INTENT AND PREMEDITATION AND
WITHOUT JUSTIFICATION, THAT THE ONLY POSSIBLE APPROPRIATE

PENALTY THERE COULD BE FOR THAT DEFENDANT, WOULD BE TO

SACRIFICE HIS OWN LIFE?

MS. CRAMER: THAT IS NOT THE ONLY POSSIBILITY. HE COULD HAVE LIFE WITHOUT RELEASE.

MR. BARENS: RIGHT. I UNDERSTAND THAT IS THE OTHER POSSIBILITY. I AM ASKING YOU FOR YOUR OPINION.

MS. CRAMER: I WOULD HAVE TO HEAR THE WHOLE CASE IN ORDER TO MAKE THAT KIND OF A DECISION.

MR. BARENS: BY THAT, YOUR HONOR MADE REFERENCE TO THE FACT THAT IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CASE, THE PENALTY PHASE, EVIDENCE WOULD BE INTRODUCED AS TO THE DEFENDANT'S AGE AT THE TIME OF THE ALLEGED CRIME, WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT HAD

ANY PRIOR HISTORY OF CRIMINAL CONDUCT, EVIDENCE AS TO THE DEFENDANT'S CHARACTER.

EVEN IF THE DEFENDANT IN YOUR MIND HAD COMMITTED

A FIRST DEGREE, INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED MURDER, WOULD THOSE

FACTORS MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO YOU IN DETERMINING WHETHER HE

SHOULD GET LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE DEATH

PENALTY?

MS. CRAMER: I WOULD STILL HAVE TO HEAR THE CASE. I WOULD WANT TO HEAR --

MR. BARENS: WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THAT?

MS. CRAMER: I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY. I WOULD WANT TO HEAR THE WHOLE STORY TO FORM MY OPINION.

MR. BARENS: SUPPOSING YOU HEARD A TRIAL IN THE GUILT PHASE WHERE YOU CAME TO A BELIEF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT IN FACT, A DEFENDANT HAD COMMITTED AN UNCUSTIFIABLE IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM, FIRST DEGREE, PREMEDITATED, COLD-BLOODED MURDER. THAT IS ALL I AM ASKING YOU RIGHT NOW.

WOULD THE FACT THAT HAD OCCURRED, PREDETERMINE
IN YOUR MIND, THAT THE ONLY WAY TO DEAL WITH THAT TYPE OF A
DEFENDANT IS THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT TO THAT QUESTION BECAUSE

I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT UNJUSTIFIABLE IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR

FORM MIGHT MEAN. IT MIGHT MEAN --

THE COURT: YOU ARE STILL OMITTING THOSE CONSIDERATIONS,
THOSE FACTORS THAT THEY MUST CONSIDER BEFORE --

MR. BARENS: 1 KNOW, YOUR HONOR. I THINK THOUGH THAT
WHAT WE ARE LOOKING FOR 15 THE EXPRESSION THAT THE CASES HAVE
REFFERRED TO ABOUT A PREDISPOSITION TO BE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY

OR FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. 1 I DON'T KNOW HOW I CAN DETERMINE PREDISPOSITION WITH 2 3 OUT INOUIRING AS TO THEIR STATE OF MIND AT THAT POINT OF THE 4 PROCEEDINGS. 5 THE COURT: WELL, 1 THINK 1 MADE 1T CLEAR HOW I FEEL ABOUT IT. PROCEED ALONG THOSE LINES, IF YOU WILL. 6 7 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. MS. CRAMER: I THINK WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO GET ME TO 8 SAY IS WOULD 1 OBJECT TO LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE ō 10 OR DEATH? 11 MR. BARENS: YES. MS. CRAMER: 1 WOULD HAVE TO DECIDE ONE OR THE OTHER. 12 I DON'T KNOW HOW I WOULD GO. I MEAN, UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES -13 I HAVE NEVER BEEN ON A MURDER TRIAL. I AM NOT SURE. 14 15 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. 16 MS. CRAMER: I MEAN, I AM NOT SURE WHAT I WOULD SAY. 17 I WOULD WANT TO KNOW EVERYTHING. MR. BARENS: SURE. MRS. CRAMER, I AM REALLY NOT TRYING 18 19 TO GET YOU TO SAY ANYTHING EXCEPT YOUR OPINION. 20 MS. CRAMER: THAT IS MY OPINION. 21 MR. BARENS: OKAY. DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU ARE OPEN-MINDED, EVEN THOUGH A DEFENDANT WERE CONVICTED AND GUILTY IN 22 YOUR MIND OF A FIRST DEGREE MURDER IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, 23 24 IS IT BELIEVABLE IN YOUR MIND THAT YOU COULD EVER GIVE THAT 25 SORT OF A DEFENDANT LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AS 26 OPPOSED TO THE DEATH PENALTY? 27 MS. CRAMER: I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT I WOULD DO. I MEAN,

I REALLY DON'T. I AM NOT SET ON EITHER WAY.

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO HEAR ALL OF THE EVIDENCE?

IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO TELL US?

MS. CRAMER: YES.

MR. BARENS: WELL, WHEN WE ARE USING THE WORD "EVIDENCE"

DOES THAT NOW INCLUDE IN YOUR MIND, EVIDENCE ABOUT THE

DEFENDANT'S BACKGROUND? I AM TALKING ABOUT EVIDENCE ASIDE

FROM THE CRIME. IN OTHER WORDS, DURING THE GUILT PHASE OF THE

TRIAL, YOU WOULD HEAR EVIDENCE ABOUT LET'S SAY, A BAD CRIME

THAT HAPPENS. YOU KNOW, SOMEONE WAS KILLED IN COLD BLOOD,

INTENTIONALLY, PREMEDITATEDLY AND LET'S SAY HE IS KILLED SOLELY

FOR THE PURPOSE OF SOMEBODY GETTING HIS MONEY, YOU KNOW.

SOMEONE COMES OVER AND ROBS SOMEBODY AND COMMITS

A MURDER IN ORDER TO EFFECT OR COMPLETE A ROBBERY. ALL RIGHT?

LET'S SAY THAT YOU BELIEVE THAT THAT IS WHAT

HAPFENED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. ALL RIGHT.

WOULD YOU BE SO PREDISPOSED TO GIVE THE DEATH

PENALTY TO THAT DEFENDANT AT THAT INSTANCE, THAT IT WOULD MAKE

IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR YOU TO FAIRLY CONSIDER EVIDENCE, FOR

INSTANCE, ABOUT HIS BACKGROUND OR CHARACTER?

MS. CRAMER: NO. I WOULD WANT TO KNOW WHY HE DID IT.

I WOULD WANT TO KNOW WHAT THE CIRCUMSTANCES ARE BEHIND IT.

1 MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT HIM, 2 T00? 3 MS. CRAMER: YES. 4 THE COURT: I TOLD YOU THAT IT WOULD BE ON THE PENALTY 5 PHASE, ALL OF THE THINGS FAVORABLE TO HIM OR UNFAVORABLE TO 6 HIM TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE JURY BEFORE THEY WERE COMMITTED 7 TO MAKE UP THEIR MINDS. 8 MS. CRAMER: THAT'S CORRECT. 9 MR. BARENS: WHAT I AM LOOKING FOR AND I THINK WHAT THE 10 JUDGE IS LOOKING FOR. WHEN YOU SAY YOU WOULD WANT TO HEAR MORE 11 EVIDENCE BEFORE MAKING A DECISION, I AM LOOKING FOR WHAT YOU 12 MEAN BY THAT. 13 MS. CRAMER: I HAVE NO DEFINITE DECISION ON WHETHER I WOULD SAY THE DEATH PENALTY OR LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY 14 15 OF PAROLE. 16 MR. BARENS: OKAY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT UNDER THE 17 STATUS OF THE LAW TODAY, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE 18 MEANS PRECISELY THAT? THE DEFENDANT IS NEVER ELIGIBLE FOR 19 PAROLE AND NEVER GETS OUT? 20 MS. CRAMER: THAT'S CORRECT. 21 MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T HAVE ANY LINGERING DOUBT THAT 22 THAT IS JUST LAWYER TALK I AM SAYING TO YOU? 23 MS. CRAMER: NO. 24 MR. BARENS: OKAY. IS IT BELIEVABLE IN YOUR MIND, THAT 25 A DEFENDANT CONVICTED OF A FIRST DEGREE MURDER DURING A 26 ROBBERY. COULD FAIRLY QUALIFY IN YOUR MIND AS A JUROR, YOUR 27 INDIVIDUAL DECISION, THAT THAT TYPE OF A DEFENDANT COULD QUALIFY 28 FOR LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

```
MS. CRAMER: YOU MEAN, DO I THINK THAT HE COULD?
 1
 2
           MR. BARENS: ARE YOU CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR THAT PENALTY,
     GIVEN THE CHOICE BETWEEN THAT AND THE DEATH PENALTY FOR A
 3
     DEFENDANT WHO YOU BELIEVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT COMMITTED
 4
5
     A FIRST DEGREE MURDER DURING A ROBBERY?
          MS. CRAMER: WE ARE BACK TO THE SAME QUESTION OF WHETHER
6
     I WOULD VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY OR THE GAS CHAMBER. I
7
8
     WOULD --
           THE COURT: NO, THE DEATH PENALTY OR --
ā
          MS. CRAMER: THE GAS CHAMBER OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY
10
11
    OF PAROLE. THANK YOU.
12
          MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
          MS. CRAMER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. I AM BACK TO THE
13
14
    SAME DECISION.
          MR. BARENS: THAT UNTIL YOU HAD HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE,
15
     NOT JUST ABOUT THE CASE BECAUSE YOU KNOW FOR SURE, YOU WILL
16
     HEAR EVIDENCE ABOUT THE CASE BEFORE YOU EVER COME TO THIS
17
     DECISION, BUT YOU WOULD WANT TO HEAR EVIDENCE ABOUT THE
18
19
     DEFENDANT AND HIS BACKGROUND, AS WELL?
20
          MS. CRAMER: YES.
21
           MR. BARENS: AND NOT JUST WHAT LEADS UP TO THE CRIME,
22
     BUT I MEAN, EVIDENCE PERSONAL TO MAYBE, THE KIND OF CHILDHOOD
23
     THE GUY HAD OR HIS HISTORY AS A PERSON?
24
           MS. CRAMER: THAT'S CORRECT.
25
           MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD LISTEN TO THAT?
26
           MS. CRAMER: CERTAINLY.
27
           MR. BARE'S: NOW, DID YOU UNDERSTAND, MRS. CRAMER, THAT
```

ALTHOUGH I HAVE BEEN ALLOWED TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY

AND THE OTHER PARTICIPANTS AS WELL, THAT BY THAT, THERE 1S NO IMPLICATION THAT MR. HUNT IS GUILTY OF ANYTHING OR HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG JUST BECAUSE HE IS HERE SITTING AS A DEFENDANT IN THIS COURTROOM?

MS. CRAMER: THAT'S CORRECT. HE IS HERE FOR TRIAL.

MR. BARENS: AND YOU UNDERSTAND, HAVING BEEN IN THIS BUILDING LONGER THAN I HAVE, THAT HE HAS A PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE THROUGHOUT THE PROCEEDINGS?

MS. CRAMER: THAT'S CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: I THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME, MA'AM. I PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: GOOD AFTERNOON. I AM FRED WAPNER, THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY WHO IS PROSECUTING THIS CASE.

DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONGLY HELD RELIGIOUS, MORAL OR PHILOSOPHICAL BELIEFS THAT WOULD GET IN THE WAY OF YOUR DECIDING FOR EITHER THE DEATH PENALTY OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MS. CRAMER: NO, I HAVE NOT.

MR. WAPNER: IF WE GET DOWN TO THAT PART OF THE CASE WHERE YOU ARE DECIDING THE PENALTY, YOU WILL BE REQUIRED TO RENDER YOUR OWN, INDIVIDUAL VOTE AS TO WHETHER THE PENALTY SHOULD BE DEATH OR WHETHER IT SHOULD BE LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. CRAMER: 1 DO.

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

MS. CRAMER: YES.

26

27

MR. WAPNER: AND IF YOU WILL FORGIVE ME, I DON'T

RECOGNIZE YOU. DO YOU RECOGNIZE ME FROM HAVING WORKED IN THIS

BUILDING?

MS. CRAMER: NO. I WORKED DOWN IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT.

I WAS IN TRAFFIC AS THE SUPERVISOR FOR MAIL-IN MONEYS. I NEVER
WAS ACTUALLY IN JUDGE MINTER'S OR JUDGE RUBIN'S OR JUDGE
CHANDLER'S COURTROOM. I DON'T THINK I RECOGNIZE YOU. I MAY
HAVE SEEN YOU BUT I DON'T RECOGNIZE YOU.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

2

MS. CRAMER: YOU ARE WELCOME, SIR.

3

THE COURT: PASS FOR CAUSE?

4

MR. WAPNER: YES.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON, MRS. DROKER.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MRS. CRAMER, YOU ARE ENTIRELY ACCEPTABLE AS A POSSIBLE JUROR IN THIS CASE, SO WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS TO COME TOMORROW AFTERNOON AT 1:45 AND GO INTO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AND YOU WILL FIND ALL OF THE OTHER JURORS HAVE BEEN QUESTIONED, AND WHEN WE ARE READY FOR YOU, WE WILL ASK YOU TO COME IN.

IT MAY BE THAT WE WON'T FINISH OUR PROCESS HERE SO IT WON'T BE TOMORROW AFTERNOON BUT IN ANY EVENT, IF IT IS NOT TOMORROW AFTERNOON, WE WILL POSSIBLY CALL YOU AND TELL YOU WHEN TO COME IN.

MS. CRAMER: ALL RIGHT. SO I SHOULD BE HERE AT 2:00 --1:45?

THE COURT: 1:45 IN THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM.

MS. CRAMER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, TRY NOT TO TALK ABOUT THE CASE OR TO LISTEN TO ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE OR TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT THE CASE, ALL RIGHT?

MS. CRAMER: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: NICE TO SEE YOU.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR CRAMER EXITED THE

COURTROOM.)

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR DROKER ENTERED THE

COURTROOM.)

IS THAT PRONOUNCED DROKER?

MS. DROKER: DROKER, YES.

THE COURT: IS THAT MRS.?

MS. DROKER: MRS.

THE COURT: MRS. DROKER, WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

MS. DROKER: WOODLAND HILLS.

THE COURT: HAVE YOU READ OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT THIS
CASE?

MS. DROKER: I HAVE NEVER HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT IT.

THE COURT: DOES THE WORD BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB MEAN

ANYTHING TO YOU?

MS. DROKER: NO.

THE COURT: YOU HAVE NEVER HEARD ANYTHING OR READ ANYTHING ABOUT JOE HUNT OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?

(MS. DROKER SHAKES HER HEAD FROM SIDE

TO SIDE.)

THE COURT: YESTERDAY, I THINK IT IS, I TOLD YOU BRIEFLY—
WAS IT YESTERDAY — BRIEFLY, YESTERDAY, I TOLD YOU WHAT THE

CASE IS ALL ABOUT AND TO REPEAT THAT, THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED
WITH THE COMMISSION OF THE CRIME OF MURDER AND IT IS ALLEGEDLY
MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE.

IT IS ALSO ALLEGED THAT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED

IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. NOW, IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY

HAS SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID

UNDER SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT A MURDER WAS COMMITTED, THAT

A MURDER CAN QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

NOW, THE DEATH PENALTY DOESN'T LITERALLY MEAN DEATH ONLY. THE DEATH PENALTY INVOLVES TWO THINGS: LIFE

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

IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE -- AND WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE MEANS EXACTLY THAT. HE STAYS IN FOR THE REST OF HIS LIFE AND NO PAROLE -- OR IT MEANS DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

NOW THE JURY SELECTED IN THIS CASE WILL FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT AND THAT IS KNOWN AS THE GUILT PHASE WHERE THE QUESTION OF PENALTY IS NOT INVOLVED IN ANY WAY. IT MUST NOT BE CONSIDERED BY THE JURY IN THE BACK OF THEIR MINDS OR OTHER WISE. FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE. DID THE DEFENDANT COMMIT THE CRIME OF MURDER AND WAS IT IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND WAS THAT COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? AND OF COURSE THAT WILL QUALIFY IT FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IF THE JURY SAYS, YES, HE IS GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IF THEY MAKE THE FINDING THAT IT IS TRUE IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

AND THEN THAT SAME JURY ENTERS INTO THE SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL KNOWN AS THE PENALTY PHASE WHERE TESTIMONY IS HEARD BY THE JURY GIVEN BY BOTH SIDES. THE DEFENDANT WILL, OF COURSE, I ASSUME, PRESENT EVIDENCE IN HIS BEHALF ABOUT HIS AGE, HIS LACK OF ANY CRIMINAL ACTIVITY IN THE PAST, HIS EDUCATION, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS CHARACTER, ANYTHING THAT IS FAVORABLE ABOUT HIM. AND THE REASON FOR THAT TESTIMONY IS TO PRESUADE THE JURY, AND PROPERLY SO, THAT THE ULTIMATE PENALTY SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED UPON HIM, NAMELY, DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER. THOSE ARE CALLED EXTENUATING OR MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

ON THE OTHER HAND, THE PROSECUTION WILL TRY TO

2

3

SHOW UNFAVORABLE ASPECTS OF THE DEFENDANT'S BACKGROUND AND CHARACTER, WE CALL THAT AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, WHICH WOULD SHOW HE IS NOT ENTITLED TO ANY CONSIDERATION FROM THE JURY.

NOW, THE JURY MUST CONSIDER ALL OF THOSE FACTORS,
HIS AGE, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS CHARACTER OR LACK OF ANY CRIMINAL
ACTIVITY BY THE DEFENDANT IN HIS PAST OR PRESENT AND ANYTHING
AT ALL THAT HAS TO DO WITH THE DEFENDANT AS A PERSON, THEY
MUST CONSIDER ALL OF THAT BEFORE THEY MAKE UP THEIR MINDS.

IN OTHER WORDS, MERELY BECAUSE HE HAS BEEN

CONVICTED OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS DURING

THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY DOESN'T MEAN HE MUST SUFFER THE ULTIMATE

PENALTY OF DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT

THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. THAT ONLY MEANS HE HAS BEEN FOUND

GUILTY OF THAT PARTICULAR CRIME.

THE PUNISHMENT THEN, THAT IS SEPARATE, THAT HAS
TO BE SEPARATELY CONSIDERED BY THE JURY, ALTHOUGH THEY HAVE
THE RIGHT TO CONSIDER THE FACTS OF THE COMMISSION OF THE CRIME
AS PART OF THE FACTORS WHICH THEY ARE CALLED UPON TO CONSIDER;
DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. DROKER: YES.

THE COURT: NOW, WITH THAT LONG PRELIMINARY, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS, AS WILL COUNSEL. THESE QUESTIONS ARE INTENDED FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRYING TO EXPLORE YOUR MIND AND YOUR FEELINGS WITH RESPECT TO THE DEATH PENALTY AND THE SUBJECT OF THE DEATH PENALTY, ALL RIGHT?

NOW THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE GUILT PHASE, AS I TOLD YOU, OF THE TRIAL: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. DROKER: WELL, I DON'T BELIEVE IN CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, SINCE YOU ARE SEEKING THE DEATH PENALTY, SHOULD HE BE FOUND GUILTY, I THINK -- I COULD NOT MAKE A DECISION BECAUSE I WOULD KNOW THEN THAT A DECISION I MAKE WOULD ULTIMATELY AND POSSIBLY LEAD TOHIS DEATH AND I COULDN'T DO THAT.

THE COURT: YOU MEAN UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD YOU VOTE FOR GUILT?

MS. DROKER: I DON'T KNOW HOW I COULD COME TO THAT
CONCLUSION BECAUSE I KNOW THAT ULTIMATELY IT WOULD PUT HIM
IN THE POSITION OF HAVING HIM PUT TO DEATH.

THE COURT: YOU DON'T WANT TO BE IN THAT POSITION?

```
MS. DROKER: I CANNOT MAKE THAT DECISION, I DON'T
1
     BELIEVE.
2
           THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO BE OR DON'T YOU WANT TO BE
3
     IN THAT POSITION?
4
          MS. DROKER: I CAN'T. I DON'T WANT TO BE, NO.
5
                 IT IS NOT A MATTER OF WHETHER I DON'T WANT TO
6
     TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY.
7
                 I DON'T BELIEVE IN THE DEATH PENALTY.
8
           THE COURT: NOBODY IS QUARRELING WITH YOU ABOUT THAT.
ã
           MS. DROKER: NO. I UNDERSTAND IT.
10
           THE COURT: A LOT OF PEOPLE FEEL THE SAME WAY YOU DO
11
     AND A LOT OF PEOPLE FEEL THE OPPOSITE WAY YOU DO; DO YOU
12
13
     UNDERSTAND?
          MS. DROKER: YES, I DO UNDERSTAND.
14
           THE COURT: THAT IS THE PURPOSE OF HAVING THIS HEARING,
15
     IS TO DETERMINE YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY.
16
           MS. DROKER: YES, I DO UNDERSTAND.
17
           THE COURT: AND AS I UNDERSTAND, YOU DO NOT WANT TO
18
     SIT AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE BECAUSE YOU CANNOT VOTE THE DEATH
19
20
     PENALTY; IS THAT CORRECT?
21
          MS. DROKER: CORRECT.
22
          THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
           MR. BARENS: DOES YOUR HONOR HAVE AN OPINION THAT THE
23
     DEFENSE COULD NOT REHABILITATE THE JUROR?
24
25
           THE COURT: YOU GO AHEAD AND DO ANYTHING YOU WANT.
           MR. BARENS: TAKE YOUR BEST SHOT?
26
           THE COURT: YOU CAN SEE IF YOU CAN GET HER TO CHANGE
27
28
     HER MIND, IF THAT IS WHAT YOU WANT.
```

7-6

5

MR. BARENS: WELL, I WILL AT LEAST INQUIRE, YOUR HONOR.

GOOD AFTERNOON.

MS. DROKER: GOOD AFTERNOON.

MR. BARENS: I AM ARTHUR BARENS AND I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT.

AND NOW YOU MUST BE TOTALLY CONFUSED ON WHY I WOULD WANT YOU TO EVER CHANGE YOUR MIND, SINCE I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, WHICH DOESN'T SEEM LOGICAL TO ME EITHER.

THE PROBLEM WE HAVE HERE, MS. DROKER, IS THAT OBVIOUSLY IF YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE JUST IRRECONCILABLY OPPOSED TO THE DEATH PENALTY UNDER ANY AND ALL CIRCUMSTANCES, YOU DON'T QUALIFY AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE, AND THAT IS JUST THE WAY THE LAW IN THIS STATE MADE THINGS BE AND I WANT TO SOMEWHAT FURTHER INQUIRE INTO YOUR STATE OF MIND TO SEE IF THAT IS IN FACT YOUR STATE OF MIND.

MS. DROKER: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: NOW PLEASE BEAR IN MIND THAT NEITHER THE JUDGE NOR THE PROSECUTION NOR MYSELF ARE JUDGING ANY OF YOUR ANSWERS. THERE IS NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWER TO ANY OF THISE.

MS. DROKER: I DON'T FEEL JUDGED.

MR. BARENS: BECAUSE YOU COULD NEVER BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OPINION.

MS. DROKER: THANK YOU. I DON'T FEEL JUDGED.

MR. BARENS: NOW ARE YOU TELLING ME AND THE COURT THAT NO MATTER WHAT, NO MATTER HOW HEINOUS THE CRIME, NO MATTER THAT THE DEFENDANT ACTED IN PREMEDITATION IN A COLD-BLOODED SENSE, FOR GREED AND GAIN, THAT YOU COULD NEVER VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY EVEN THOUGH THERE IS A DEAD PERSON?

MS. DROKER: THAT'S CORRECT.

MS. ELIE: MRS.

MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU EVER HAD A SITUATION WHERE YOU 1 KNEW SOMEONE YOU LIKED QUITE A BIT INITIALLY BUT LATER ON YOU 2 CHANGED YOUR OPINION ABOUT THEM? 3 MS. DROKER: PROBABLY. MR. BARENS: I AM GOING TO SUBMIT THE MATTER, YOUR HONOR. 5 THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HONESTY TODAY. 6 7 MR. WAPNER: NO QUESTIONS. THE COURT: WE WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE TO HAVE YOU. YOU 8 LOOK LIKE AN EXTREMELY INTELLIGENT JUROR. IF IT WEREN'T 9 10 A DEATH PENALTY CASE, WE WOULD GRAB YOU IN A MINUTE. MS. DROKER: THANK YOU. I WOULD LOVE TO BE A PART OF 11 12 THE PROCESS, BUT --THE COURT: SINCE YOU HAVE THIS DEEP CONVICTION THAT 13 UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD YOU VOTE THE DEATH PENALTY, WE 14 15 RELUCTANTLY ARE GOING TO EXCUSE YOU. 16 MS. DROKER: THANK YOU. 17 THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 18 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR DROKER EXITS THE 19 COURTROOM.) 20 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR ELIE ENTERS THE 21 COURTROOM.) 22 THE COURT: IS THAT PRONOUNCED ELIE? 23 MS. ELIE: IT IS PRONOUNCED ELIE. 24 THE COURT: ELIE? 25 MS. ELIE: YES. JUST LIKE IT IS SPELLED. THE COURT: I WOULD HAVE PRONOUNCED IT ELIE IF IT WERE 26 27 SPELLED E-L-Y. IS THAT MISS?

· 一年 · 一年 · 一年

THE COURT: MRS. ELIE, WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

MS. ELIE: EL SEGUNDO.

THE COURT: AND HAVE YOU HEARD ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS CASE, EXCEPT WHAT 1 TOLD YOU ABOUT?

MS. ELIE: ZERO. NOTHING TO MY KNOWLEDGE.

THE COURT: DOES ANY CHARACTERIZATION LIKE THE BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB RING A BELL?

MS. ELIE: NO.

THE COURT: GOE HUNT OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?

MS. ELIE: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AS I TOLD YOU YESTERDAY, I WILL REPEAT IT BRIEFLY, THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED IN THIS CASE WITH THE COMMISSION OF A MURDER AND MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE.

IT IS ALSO ALLEGED THAT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED

IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. AND I INDICATED TO YOU YESTERDAY,

THAT IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE

BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID AND IT IS THE LAW IN

CALIFORNIA, THAT NOT EVERY MURDER COMMITTED, EVEN IF IT IS

A MURDER DELIBERATELY PLANNED AND EXECUTED, EVEN IF IT WAS

PREMEDITATED AND INTENTIONAL, DOESN'T MEAN THAT IT IS SUBJECT

TO THE DEATH PENALTY.

IT IS ONLY IF THE MURDER IS COMMITTED UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT IT THEN QUALIFIES FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. ELIE: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: WHEN I TALK ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, THE
DEATH PENALTY INCLUDES TWO THINGS. IT INCLUDES FIRST, LIFE
WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND IT MEANS EXACTLY THAT. IF

ũ

HE GETS LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, HE NEVER COMES
OUT AGAIN. THERE IS NO PAROLE. HE IS NEVER OUT AGAIN.

OR, IT IS DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER. IT IS ONE OF THOSE TWO THINGS. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

NOW, THOSE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE PRESENT ONLY
IN CERTAIN ENUMERATED CASES THAT THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID.
THERE ARE 19 OF THEM.

THAT IS COMMITTING A MURDER IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY QUALIFIES FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. SO DOES A MURDER COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY OR A RAPE OR A KIDNAPPING OR A CHILD WHO IS MOLESTED AND DIES, TORTURE, MULTIPLE MURDERS AND SO ON. ALL OF THOSE QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. ELIE: YES.

THE COURT: SO WHAT THE JURGES ARE CALLED UPON TO DO FIRST, IS DETERMINE WHAT WE CALL THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL. FIRST, IT IS THE GUILT PHASE, DID THE DEFENDANT COMMIT THE CRIME OF MURDER OR WAS IT MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE?

THEN THEY HAVE TO ANSWER THE QUESTION, IS IT TRUE

OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

IF THEY DECIDE THAT IT WAS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT

WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, TRUE, THEN THAT

SAME JURY HEARS ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY, WHAT WE CALL THE SECOND

PHASE.

THE SECOND PHASE IS THE PENALTY PHASE. NOW, ON
THE GUILT PHASE, ALL THEY DETERMINE IS THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE
OF THE DEFENDANT, WAS IT COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

THE QUESTION OF PUNISHMENT OR PENALTY IS NOT

INVOLVED IN ANY WAY IN DETERMINING GUILT OR INNOCENCE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. ELIE: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: IT IS ONLY IN THE SECOND PHASE THAT THE PENALTY COMES INTO VIEW. THE JURY THEN HEARS ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY, THINGS WHICH ARE FAVORABLE TO THE DEFENDANT.

THEY MUST CONSIDER HIS AGE, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS EDUCATION, MENTAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION, HIS LACK OF ANY KIND OF PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY.

THEY WILL HAVE EVIDENCE PRESENTED BEFORE THE JURY ON THOSE ASPECTS. THESE ARE CALLED EXTENUATING OR MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE PROSECUTION ON THE OTHER HAND, WOULD TRY TO SHOW AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, TO SHOW UNFAVORABLE THINGS ABOUT THE DEFENDANT.

NOW, YOU CONSIDER THE UNFAVORABLE AND THE FAVORABLE, EVERYTHING THAT YOU HEAR IN THE PENALTY PHASE. YOU CONSIDER THAT. YOU ALSO CONSIDER THE NATURE OF THE OFFENSE ITSELF AND THE FACTS YOU HAVE HEARD.

THEN THE JURY DETERMINES WHETHER IT SHOULD BE

ONE, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE; OR TWO, DEATH IN THE

GAS CHAMBER.

IS THAT CLEAR SO FAR?

MS. ELIE: BASICALLY.

THE COURT: ANY QUESTIONS SO FAR?

MS. ELIE: NO.

THE COURT: OKAY. NOW, THE QUESTIONS WE ARE GOING TO ASK YOU ARE DESIGNED FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRYING TO EXPLORE YOUR

MIND AS TO WHAT YOUR FEELINGS ARE OR WHAT YOUR THOUGHTS ARE ON THE SUBJECT OF THE DEATH PENALTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? MS. ELIE: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: NOW, THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS 1 AM GOING TO ASK YOU, ARE REFERRABLE TO THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL. THE FIRST QUESTION I AM GOING TO ASK YOU IS, DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION OF THE DEATH PENALTY, IF YOU HAVE ONE WHATEVER IT MAY BE, THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT? DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. ELIE: YES.

THE COURT: WHAT IS YOUR ANSWER?

MS. ELIE: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE SECOND QUESTION IS, DO YOU REMEMBER THAT I TOLD YOU THAT ON THE GUILT PHASE, YOU ARE TO ANSWER THE QUESTION TRUE OR FALSE, WAS IT COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? THAT IS KNOWN AS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY,
THAT PREVENTS YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION
CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES?

MS. ELIE: NO.

THE COURT: NOW, THE NEXT TWO HAVE TO DO WITH THE PENALTY PHASE. ALL RIGHT?

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH
PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE FOR THE
DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED
ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL? IN OTHER WORDS, HAVING
FOUND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE DURING
THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WOULD YOU IMMEDIATELY SAY HE SHOULD
SUFFER THE DEATH PENALTY?

26

27

28

MS. ELIE: NO. THE COURT: WITHOUT HEARING ANY OTHER TESTIMONY ON THAT? MS. ELIE: NO. YOU MEAN PREJUDGING? THE COURT: YES. MS. ELIE: YES. PREJUDING THE TESTIMONY? THE COURT: RIGHT. YOU HAVE GOT TO HEAR ALL OF THE TESTIMONY? MS. ELIE: RIGHT. THE COURT: SO YOUR ANSWER IS NO, YOU WOULD NOT AUTOMATICALLY IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY WITHOUT HEARING EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE. IS THAT RIGHT? MS. ELIE: RIGHT. THE COURT: AND SIMILARLY, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONSIDERING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY HAVE BEEN PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL? MS. ELIE: WOULD YOU RUN THAT BY ME ONE MORE TIME? THE COURT: YES, I WILL. YOU TOLD US THAT YOU WOULD NOT AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY? IN OTHER WORDS --MS. ELIE: NOT AUTOMATICALLY, WITHOUT HEARING --THE COURT: RIGHT. WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, BEFORE YOU HAD HEARD ANY TESTIMONY ON THE PENALTY PHASE? 25

MS. ELIE: NO.

THE COURT: OKAY. NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE AND THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT

MR. BARENS: AND COULD YOU TELL US WHAT YOU MEAN IN THAT

REFERENCE? 1 MS. ELIE: CHILD MOLESTERS. HEINOUS CRIMES. 2 MR. BARENS: DO YOU FEEL THAT WITHOUT ANYTHING FURTHER. 3 JUST PHILOSOPHICALLY, THAT SOMEONE WHO TAKES A LIFE SHOULD 4 HAVE HIS LIFE TAKEN IN RETURN? A LIFE FOR A LIFE? 5 6 MS. ELIE: 1 THINK IT DEPENDS UPON THE CIRCUMSTANCES. MR. BARENS: WELL, LET'S SAY THE CIRCUMSTANCES IN THIS 7 INSTANCE, IN THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, WOULD INVOLVE SOME-..8 ONE WHO INTENTIONALLY, WITH PREMEDITATION, COMMITS A MURDER 9 10 OF A PERSON DURING THE COMMISSION OF A ROBBERY. MS. ELIE: YES. 11 MR. BARENS: NOW, INDEED, THAT THAT TYPE OF A PERSON, 12 THAT WE SHOULD ALWAYS GIVE THE PERSON THE DEATH PENALTY? 13 MS. ELIE: IF IT IS PREMEDITATED. 7.4 MR. BARENS: QUITE SO. NOW, THE JUDGE INDICATED TO YOU 15 THAT DURING THAT SECOND PHASE, THE PENALTY PHASE, THE 16 DEFENSE MIGHT AND PROBABLY WOULD INTRODUCE EVIDENCE SAY, ABOUT 17 THE DEFENDANT'S AGE AT THE TIME THE ALLEGED CRIME WAS COMMITTED 18 19 OR ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT HE HAD A CRIMINAL BACKGROUND OR EVIDENCE ABOUT HIS CHARACTER OR HIS CHILDHOOD AND ET CETERA. 20 21 AND I AM UNDERSTANDING CORRECTLY, THAT THAT WOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED BY YOURSELF. BUT RATHER, IF HE HAD 22 PREMEDITATEDLY TAKEN SOMEONE'S LIFE, THAT THAT IN YOUR MIND, 23 WOULD QUALIFY HIM FOR THE DEATH PENALTY AND THAT WOULD BE 24 25 IT? 26 MS. ELIE: YES. 27 MR. BARENS: AND AGAIN, 1 --

THE COURT: NOW. WHAT THAT QUESTION IMPLIES, IT MEANS

THAT YOU WOULDN'T LISTEN TO ANY KIND OF TESTIMONY ON THE PENALTY PHASE, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. MS. ELIE: NO. 1 DON'T MEAN THAT. THE COURT: THAT IS THE WAY HE PUT IT TO YOU. IS THAT WHAT YOUR ANSWER IS? MS. ELIE: NO.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

23

25

26

27

28

MR. BARENS: TELL ME WHAT THE DIFFERENCE IS BETWEEN WHAT YOU ARE SAYING NOW AS OPPOSED TO WHAT YOU SAID WHEN YOU ANSWERED ME TO BEGIN WITH.

MS. ELIE: YOU ASKED ME, IF A PERSON COMES FROM A BETTER FAMILY OR A BETTER BACKGROUND AND THEY ARE YOUNG WHEN THEY COMMITTED A PREMEDITATED MURDER, AS OPPOSED TO SOMEONE WHO IS OLDER WITH A RECORD, A LESSER BACKGROUND BUT COMMITTED A PREMEDITATED MURDER, WOULD I FIND THERE TO BE A DIFFERENCE?

MS. BARENS: YES.

(PAUSE.)

MS. ELIE: IT IS STILL A MURDER, RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: MURDER IS MURDER, ISN'T IT?

AND IF THEY TAKE A LIFE, THE ONLY THING WE CAN DO IN EVERY INSTANCE IS TAKE THEIR LIFE; ISN'I THAT YOUR STATE OF MIND?

THE COURT: OR IS IT YOUR STATE OF MIND?

MR. BARENS: IS IT YOUR STATE OF MIND? QUITE SO. IS IT YOUR STATE OF MIND?

MS. ELIE: I AM NOT SURE. I -- I AM GETTING CONFUSED BETWEEN THE GUILT PHASE AND --

MR. BARENS: WE DON'T WANT --

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, CAN THE RECORD REFLECT A LONG PAUSE BEFORE THAT LAST ANSWER WHICH WAS "I AM NOT SURE."

THE COURT: YES.

MR. WAPNER; THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, LET ME TRY TO RECREATE THE SETTING FOR YOU.

BEFORE WE EVER GET TO A PENALTY PHASE, THE PHASE

WHERE WE TALK ABOUT BACKGROUND AND YOUTH AND WE TALK ABOUT
CHARACTER AND PRIOR CRIMINAL CONDUCT AND ALL OF THAT STUFF,
IF YOU WERE A JUROR, YOU AND THE OTHER 11 PEOPLE HAVE TO HAVE
BELIEVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED
A PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL FIRST DEGREE MURDER DURING THE
COMMISSION OF A ROBBERY, AND YOU ARE CONVINCED OF THAT BEYOND
A REASONABLE DOUBT BEFORE WE EVER GET TO WHETHER OR NOT WE
SHOULD GIVE THE DEATH PENALTY OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT
THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. ELIE: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: YOU ALREADY ARE IN THAT STATE OF MIND,
YOU HAVE THAT BELIEF SYSTEM BY THE TIME WE GET TO THE PENALTY
PHASE, OKAY?

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

MR. BARENS: NOW, HAVING FIRST BELIEVED THAT, WOULD YOU BELIEVE THAT THE ONLY PENALTY THAT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THAT TYPE OF A DEFENDANT IS THE DEATH PENALTY, OR WOULD YOU SAY WELL, I WOULD NEED TO CONSIDER HIS BACKGROUND AND ALL OF THAT SORT OF EVIDENCE BEFORE I COULD MAKE A DECISION?

MS. ELIE: WHY WOULD THE BACKGROUND HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH IT?

MR. BARENS: IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY.

THE COURT: THE LAW SAYS IT HAS TO DO IN DETERMINING
WHETHER OR NOT HE IS TO RECEIVE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT
THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.
THE LAW IS YOU HAVE TO CONSIDER ALL OF THOSE FACTORS I JUST
TOLD YOU ABOUT, HIS BACKGROUND, SUPPOSE HE LED AN EXEMPLARY
LIFE AND HE JUST HAPPENED TO COMMIT THIS ONE MURDER DELIBERATELY,

.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

:5

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

21

24 25

26 27

28

AND THAT IS ONE OF THE REASONS THEY SAY THE JURY SHOULD DETERMINE WHETHER THE PENALTY SHOULD BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT OR LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, YOU HAVE TO CONSIDER THOSE THINGS BECAUSE YOU CAN'T IMMEDIATELY MAKE UP YOUR MIND THAT BECAUSE HE HAS BEEN FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE THAT HE WOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY WITHOUT CONSIDERING ALL OF THOSE OTHER FACTORS, HIS BACKGROUND AND SO FORTH. YOU CAN'T AUTOMATICALLY DECIDE HE WOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY WITHOUT HAVING ALL OF THAT. THAT IS THE REASON FOR HAVING TO HAVE THE SECOND PHASE, THE PENALTY PHASE.

MS. ELIE: FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT AND THE PENALTY PHASE, OKAY, NOW I UNDERSTAND. I THOUGHT THE TWO WERE THE SAME.

THE COURT: IT IS NOT THAT YOU HAVE ONLY ONE DECISION TO MAKE, SHALL IT BE DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER?

YOU ALSO HAVE TO CONSIDER LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. SO WHEN THIS LEARNED LAWYER TELLS YOU REGARDING DEATH, HE MEANS ONE OR THE OTHER, I ASSUME.

MR. BARENS: I DO, BUT I DON'T THINK THE JUROR DOES.

MS. ELIE: I UNDERSTAND NOW.

I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND BEFORE.

I THOUGHT THE DEATH PENALTY AND LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE BOTH WERE THE SAME THING, I MEAN.

MR. BARENS: OH, NO. ONE, YOU ARE QUITE DEAD AND ONE, YOU ARE QUITE LOCKED UP.

YOU SEE, YOU ONLY HAVE TWO CHOICES IF WE EVER GET TO THAT PART OF THIS PROCEEDING.

_

2

WHAT I NEED TO KNOW IS, IF YOU WERE TO HAVE TWO
CHOICES --

MS. ELIE: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: -- I GET A FEELING, IN ALL CANDOR, IN
TALKING TO YOU AND AGAIN I AM NOT SAYING YOU ARE WRONG --

MR. WAPNER: AGAIN, I OBJECT TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION

OF MR. BARENS' OPINION. IT IS NOT HIS OPINION.

MR. BARENS: I KNOW, BUT TO GET HER OPINION, I HAVE.

TO TELL HER THE OPINION I FORMED ABOUT HER TESTIMONY SO FAR.

MR. WAPNER: NO. HE CAN JUST ASK THE QUESTION.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. BARENS: WELL, LET ME ASK YOU THIS: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU WOULD EVER, IF YOU HAD A DEFENDANT YOU HAD ALREADY FOUND GUILTY OF A PREMEDITATED MURDER DURING A ROBBERY, DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD BE CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE FOR SOMEONE WHO HAD TAKEN A LIFE UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES?

MS. ELIE: YES.

8...

MR. BARENS: YOU COULD?

MS. ELIE: YES.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, NOW WHAT WOULD INFLUENCE YOU OR WHAT FACTORS MIGHT INFLUENCE YOU IN COMING TO THAT DECISION?

MS. ELIE: WELL, LIKE WE GOT BACK TO BEFORE, THE BACK-GROUND WOULD PROBABLY HAVE SOMETHING TO DO WITH THE SECOND,

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD HAVE TO LISTEN TO THAT SORT OF EVIDENCE?

MS. ELIE: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, WOULD YOUR BELIEF THAT A PERSON WHO

COMMITTED A FIRST -- IF YOU HAVE A BELIEF -- DO YOU HAVE A

BELIEF THAT A PERSON WHO COMMITS A PREMEDITATED MURDER SHOULD

MORE LIKELY GET THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME. I WOULD OBJECT TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION. MORE LIKELY THAN WHO?

MR. BARENS: MORE LIKELY THAN GET LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

MS. ELIE: WELL, THAT GETS BACK TO THE FIRST QUESTION.
WE STILL HAVE TO HAVE ALL OF THE --

MR. BARENS: EVIDENCE?

MS. ELIE: EVIDENCE.

MR. BARENS: YOU SEE, WHAT I AM LOOKING FOR, DO YOU

FEEL YOU HAVE ANY PREDISPOSITION THAT WOULD INFLUENCE YOU

ONE WAY OR THE OTHER JUST BECAUSE YOU HAVE SOMEONE -- AND

NOT THAT I AM UNDERSTATING THIS -- BUT BECAUSE YOU HAVE

SOMEONE WHO IS GUILTY OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER, WOULD YOU HAVE

A PREDISPOSITION TO BE MORE IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY

AS A RESULT OF THAT, BEFORE YOU EVER HEARD ANY MORE EVIDENCE? 1 2 MS. ELIE: NO. MR. BARENS: OKAY. YOU WOULD LISTEN TO ALL OF THE 3 4 EVIDENCE? MS. ELIE: RIGHT. 5 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT LIFE IMPRISONMENT 6 WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE MEANS PRECISELY THAT, THAT 7 8 THE DEFENDANT DOES NOT GET OUT? 9 MS. ELIF: IN SEVEN YEARS. MR. BARENS: YES, THAT IS THE OTHER KIND OF MURDER. 10 THAT IS THE NON-SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE DEAL AND THAT ISN'T EVEN REALLY SEVEN YEARS. 12 I AM TALKING ABOUT THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES MURDER 13 14 WHERE THE JUDGE TELLS US HE NEVER GETS OUT, NEVER EVEN BECOMES 15 eligible for a parole hearing; do you understand that? 16 MS. ELIE: YES. 17 MR. BARENS: AND THAT IS THE LAW. ALL RIGHT, YOU MENTIONED TO ME EARLIER THAT THE 18 19 PRISONS ARE OVERCROWDED AND I SUPPOSE -- IS IT YOUR BELIEF THAT ONE OF THE REMEDIES FOR OVERCROWDED PRISONS IS THE DEATH 20 21 PENALTY? 22 MS. ELIE: NOT NECESSARILY BUT MAYBE IT MIGHT SET AN 23 EXAMPLE. 24 MR. BARENS: ARE YOU OF A BELIEF THAT THE DEATH PENALTY 25 IS REALLY A DETERRENT TO CRIME? 26 THE COURT: DETERRENT TO MURDER, YOU MEAN? 27 MS. ELIE: I BEG YOUR PARDON?

MR. BARENS: WELL, IT IS A DETERRENT TO OTHER KINDS

_

OF CRIMES, TOO, I THINK.

YOU DON'T GO IN AND COMMIT AN ARMED ROBBERY IN

A LIQUOR STORE WHERE YOU MIGHT PULL THE TRIGGER, IF THE FELLOW

DEFENDS HIMSELF, EVEN THOUGH YOU WEREN'T INTENDING TO COMMIT

A MURDER WHEN YOU WALKED IN.

BUT BE THAT AS IT MAY, DO YOU THINK IT IS A DETERRENT TO MURDER, THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. ELIE: I THINK IN SOME CASES IT COULD BE.

MR. BARENS: IF IT IS A DETERRENT TO MURDER, DO YOU THINK IT HAS TO BE UNIFORMLY AND PREDICTABLY APPLIED AS A PENALTY?

MS. ELIE: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, IF WE ARE GOING TO UNIFORMLY APPLY

IT, HOW DO WE RECONCILE THAT WITH CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT THE

DEFENDANTS' SACKGROUNDS, IF DEFENDANTS HAVE TAKEN A LIFE IN

A PREMEDITATED SETTING, IS IT THEN APPROPRIATE IN YOUR OPINION

TO CONSIDER THEIR BACKGROUNDS BEFORE WE MAKE A DETERMINATION

AS TO LIFE OR DEATH?

MS. ELIE: THIS IS GOING BACK TO THE OTHER QUESTION

AND I AM SORRY, I AM CONFUSED WITH THE DEATH PENALTY AND LIFE

IMPRISONMENT AND SO MY ANSWER TO THE OTHER ONE WOULD NOT BE

YES. IT WOULD BE NO BECAUSE IT WOULD DEPEND ON ALL OF THE

EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

MR. BARENS: SO EVEN THOUGH WE HAVE A NEED TO PREDICTABLY APPLY THE DEATH PENALTY TO MAKE IT AN EFFECTIVE DETERRENT, YOU ARE SAYING, NONETHELESS, WE STILL HAVE TO CONSIDER THE BACKGROUND OF THE DEFENDANT BEFORE DETERMINING WHAT PENALTY IS APPROPRIATE?

 $\mathbf{i} = \Lambda \Omega I$

10F

MS. ELIE: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, NOW DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT

ALTHOUGH WE HAVE BEEN DISCUSSING THE DEATH PENALTY AT THIS

POINT IN TIME, THAT THERE IS NO REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE

THAT MR. HUNT IS GUILTY OF ANYTHING JUST BECAUSE WE ARE SITTING

HERE OR STANDING HERE TALKING ABOUT THIS?

MS. ELIE: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT HE HAS THE PRESUMPTION, AS YOU WOULD IF YOU WERE A DEFENDANT IN THIS COURTROOM, OF INNOCENCE, UNTIL A TRIAL HAS TAKEN PLACE AND THERE HAS BEEN A DEMONSTRATION OF EVIDENCE?

MS. ELIE: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT?

2

3

MS. ELIE: YES.

MR. BARENS: I THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. I PASS FOR

CAUSE. YOUR HONOR. 4

OF PAROLE?

EITHER WAY?

MS. ELIE: AM I THROUGH?

6

5

THE COURT: NOT QUITE. MR. WAPNER IS THE DEPUTY DISTRICT

ATTORNEY. HE WILL ASK YOU A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS.

8

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONGLY-HELD RELIGIOUS,

9

MORAL OR PHILOSOPHICAL BELIEFS THAT WOULD GET IN YOUR WAY

10

OF DECIDING THE QUESTION OF DEATH OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY

11

MS. ELIE: NO.

12 13

MR. WAPNER: IF IT GETS DOWN TO THE BOTTOM LINE IN THIS

14

CASE, YOU WOULD BE IN THE JURY ROOM WITH 11 OTHER PEOPLE TRYING

15

TO DECIDE WHETHER THE DEFENDANT SHOULD SPEND THE REST OF HIS

16

LIFE IN PRISON OR SHOULD DIE IN THE GAS CHAMBER. DO YOU THINK

17

THAT IS A DECISION THAT YOU ARE CAPABLE OF MAKING?

18

MS. ELIE: YES.

19

MR. WAPNER: ARE YOU CAPABLE OF MAKING THAT DECISION

20

21

MS. ELIE: YES.

22

MR. WAPNER: IF THE EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATES TO YOU THAT

23

THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT IS LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF

24

PAROLE, COULD YOU RENDER THAT VERDICT?

25

MS. ELIE: YES.

26

MR. WAPNER: AND IF THE EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATES TO YOU

27

THAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT IS DEATH, CAN YOU RENDER THAT

28

VERDICT?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Ç.

10

1:

12

13

14

- <u>E</u>

1€

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MS. ELIE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AND ARE YOU NOW CLEAR ON THE FACT THAT

BASICALLY WE ARE HAVING TWO TRIALS HERE, IF IT GETS TO THAT

POINT?

MS. ELIE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. ONE IS GUILT OR INNOCENCE AND ONE IS PENALTY?

MS. ELIE: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: AND CAN YOU KEEP OUT OF YOUR MIND, THE IDEA OF PENALTY WHEN YOU ARE TRYING TO MAKE A DECISION ON GUILT OR INNOCENCE?

MS. ELIE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IN OTHER WORDS, THE JUDGE IS GOING TO TELL YOU BEFORE YOU GO IN TO DELIBERATE ON THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE PART, THAT WHEN YOU ARE MAKING THAT DECISION, YOU HAVE TO MAKE IT BASED ON WHETHER HE IS GUILTY OR WHETHER HE IS NOT GUILTY, NOT BASED ON WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO HIM IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY.

MS. ELIE: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. ELIE: UH-HUH.

MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES?

MS. ELIE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: CAN YOU DO THAT?

MS. ELIE: YES.

MR. WAPNER: I PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BOTH LAWYERS HAVE PASSED FOR CAUSE. THAT IS SAYING THAT YOU ARE FULLY QUALIFIED TO SERVE

AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE IF YOU ARE SELECTED.

SO, WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS, TO COME BACK TOMORROW AFTERNOON AT 1:45 TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM. IF BY ANY CHANCE, IT MIGHT HAVE TO BE POSTPONED BECAUSE WE HAVE NOT GONE THROUGH THE ENTIRE LIST, WE HAVE YOUR TELEPHONE NUMBER.

WE'LL GIVE YOU A CALL. SO TENTATIVELY, YOU COME BACK TOMORROW AFTERNOON AT 1:45 TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM. ALL RIGHT?

MS. ELIE: OKAY.

THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

TRY NOT TO READ OR HEAR ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE.

MR. BARENS: IF WE COULD TAKE A MOMENT NOW, YOUR HONOR?

THE COURT: YES. ALL RIGHT.

(RECESS.)

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, IT IS STIPULATED THE DEFENDANT 2 IS PRESENT AND COUNSEL ARE PRESENT. 3 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAREN FELTS ENTERS 4 THE COURTROOM.) THE COURT: LET ME SEE, IS THAT MISS FELT? 6 MS. FELT: MRS. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MRS. FELT, WHERE DO YOU LIVE? WOODLAND HILLS. MS. FELT: THE COURT: AND HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS 10 CASE OR KNOW ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT IT, EXCEPT IT IS PENDING 11 HERE, AS I TOLD YOU? 12 MS. FELT: I CAN'T HONESTLY SAY THAT I HAVE BECAUSE I 13 DON'T RECOGNIZE THE NAME. 14 THE COURT: DID YOU EVER HEAR OF SOMETHING CALLED THE 15 BILLICHAIRE BOYS CLUE, DID YOU READ ANYTHING ABOUT THAT? 16 MS. FELT: NO. THE COURT: WHAT I AM GOING TO DO IS BRIEFLY TELL YOU 17 18 AGAIN WHAT THE CASE IS ABOUT AND THEN ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS 19 AFTER THAT. THE CHARGE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IS THAT HE 20 COMMITTED A MURDER AND IT WAS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND 21 22 THAT IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. 23 AND NOW IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT HAS 24 SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID --25 NOW NOT EVERY MURDER, YOU KNOW, EVEN IF IT IS DELIBERATE, PREMEDITATED AND INTENTIONAL CALLS FOR THE DEATH 26 PENALTY. IT IS ONLY CERTAIN MURDERS WHICH ARE COMMITTED UNDER 27

CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT QUALIFY IT FOR THE POSSIBLE

Q

DEATH PENALTY, YOU UNDERSTAND?

NOW, THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID THAT MURDER COMMITTED

IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A

BURGLARY, COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A RAPE, IN THE COURSE

OF A KIDNAPPING OR WHERE A CHILD IS MOLESTED AND DIES, OR

MULTIPLE MURDERS OR TORTURE-MURDERS, IN THOSE INSTANCES, THOSE

ARE SOME OF THE INSTANCES WHERE THE DEATH PENALTY MAY BE

IMPOSED AS TO THOSE PARTICULAR MURDERS; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. FELTS: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, SO THE JURY WILL BE CALLED UPON

IN THIS CASE FIRST TO DECIDE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DE
FENDANT, THAT IS THE FIRST PHASE OF THE TRIAL. IT IS CALLED

THE GUILT PHASE.

THE QUESTION OF PENALTY IS NOT INVOLVED IN ANY WAY.

WHAT THE JURY HAS TO DETERMINE AFTER THEY HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE GUILT PHASE IS, WAS THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF COMMITTING THE MURDER AND WAS IT MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND, IF SO, THEY HAVE TO ANSWER THIS QUESTION: IS IT TRUE OR IS IT FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? THAT MAKES IT A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE.

IF THEY SAY IT IS TRUE, THEN THE SAME JURY CONSIDERS WHAT THE PENALTY IS GOING TO BE.

AND BY THE PENALTY, THAT COULD BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THAT MEANS EXACTLY THAT.

THERE WON'T BE ANY CHANCE OF ANY PAROLE IF HE IS COMMITTED

TO STATE PRISON.

1 E

1£

OR SHALL IT BE DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

NOW BEFORE THEY MAKE UP THEIR MINDS AS TO THAT, YOU HEAR ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AS TO THE GUILT PHASE OF IT, BUT THAT IS NOT QUITE ENOUGH. THEY ARE GOING TO HAVE TO DETERMINE --THERE WILL BE EVIDENCE WHICH WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE SAME JURY THAT THEY HAVEN'T HEARD BEFORE, FROM THE DEFENDANT AND FROM THE PROSECUTION, EVIDENCE FROM THE DEFENDANT TO SHOW, WHICH THE JURY MUST CONSIDER, FACTORS LIKE THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT, THE LACK OF ANY PRIOR CRIMINAL RECORD, HIS EDUCATION, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS PHYSICAL CONDITION, ANYTHING AT ALL THAT HAS TO DO WITH THE PERSON THAT MAY BE FAVORABLE TO HIM. ALL OF THOSE FACTORS MUST BE CONSIDERED BY THE JURY IN EVALUATING THE PERSON.

õ

1.4

THEY ALSO HAVE A RIGHT TO CONSIDER THE FACTS OF THE CASE ITSELF. THE PROSECUTION O' THE OTHER HAND, WOULD TRY TO SHOW AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, IN OTHER WORDS, TO SHOW THAT HE IS NOT ENTITLED TO ANY CONSIDERATION MITIGATING THE CRIME.

THE THINGS ABOUT HIM THEY WILL PROVE OR ATTEMPT TO PROVE OR SHOW, ARE UNFAVORABLE TO THE DEFENDANT.

IN OTHER WORDS, ONE SAYS FAVORABLE AND THE CTHER SAYS UNFAVORABLE. THE JURY HEARS ALL OF THAT AND CONSIDERS ALL OF THAT. THEN THEY MAKE UP THEIR MINDS, SHOULD IT BE ONE OR THE OTHER, SHOULD IT BE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR SHOULD IT BE DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

THEY ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO MAKE UP THEIR MINDS UNTIL THEY HEAR ALL OF THAT TESTIMONY BECAUSE IT IS IMPORTANT. AND THEN THE CURY DETERMINES WHICH IT SHALL BE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. FELTS: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, SINCE IT IS A QUESTION

OF LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS

CHAMBER, WE ARE NOW TRYING TO FIND OUT WHAT YOUR STATE OF

MIND IS, WHAT YOUR ATTITUDE IS AND EXPLORE YOUR STATE OF MIND

TO FIND OUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY.

THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION WHATEVER THAT OPINION

SO I WILL ASK YOU A SERIES OF FIVE QUESTIONS.

MAY BE, WHICH WOULD IN ANY WAY, AFFECT YOUR IMPARTIAL DECISION IN COMING TO A DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

- 5

MS. FELTS: OKAY. DO I --

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY,
WHATEVER IT MAY BE --

MS. FELTS: ARE YOU ASKING ME IF I BELEIVE IN THE DEATH PENALTY OR HOW I FEEL ABOUT IT?

THE COURT: NO, NO. I AM TELLING YOU, WHATEVER YOU
MIGHT FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY ONE WAY OR THE OTHER OR
NOT AT ALL, WOULD THAT OPINION THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE IN ANY
WAY, MAKE YOU -- PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION
AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. FELTS: NO. 1 DON'T THINK SO.

THE COURT: SIMILARLY, DO YOU REMEMBER THAT I TOLD YOU THAT IF YOU FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A RISBERY, THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, IS IT TRUE OR FALSE -- SIMILARLY, 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?

THE COURT: OKAY. THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS PRESUPPOSE
THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN CONVICTED OF MURDER IN THE FIRST
DEGREE IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. NOW WE ARE IN THE PENALTY
PHASE. ALL RIGHT?

MS. FELTS: UH-HUH.

MS. FELTS: NO.

THE COURT: NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING

THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE

FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY TESTIMONY THAT YOU

MIGHT HEAR ON THE PENALTY PHASE?

MS. FELTS: NO. THE COURT: SIMILARLY, THE SAME SORT OF QUESTION BUT RELATING TO THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY 6 PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 7 . : 8

MS. FELTS: NO.

THE COURT: OKAY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT COME INTO PLAY IN THIS CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. FELTS: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

GOOD AFTERNOON, MISS FELTS. I AM ARTHUR BARENS. I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT, IN THIS MATTER.

AND AS IT WAS THE JUDGE'S DUTY, IT IS MY DUTY IN THIS PROCEDURE AT THIS STAGE OF THE MATTER, TO INQUIRE AS TO YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY.

PARENTHETICALLY THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS AND NONE OF US ARE JUDGING ANY OF YOUR ANSWERS. YOU CAN'T POSSIBLY GIVE A WRONG ANSWER ABOUT YOUR OWN OPINION. OKAY?

MS. FELTS: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: WITH THAT IN MIND, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY? MS. FELTS: I THINK THAT IT HAS ITS PLACE.

. g 10

1

2

3

4

5

11

12

13 14

15

16

.. 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

22BF

. . . į

MS. FELTS: I THINK WE HAVE TO HAVE LIMITATIONS IN OUR SOCIETY AND THAT IS ONE OF THEM. IT IS AN EXTREME ONE. BUT I DO THINK THAT IT IS A NECESSARY ONE.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL US WHERE THAT PLACE IS?

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL US ANY SITUATIONS THAT COME
TO YOUR MIND WHEN YOU THINK THE DEATH PENALTY WOULD BE
APPROPRIATE AS A PUNISHMENT?

MS. FELTS: I THINK IF SOMEONE TAKES ANOTHER PERSON'S LIFE AND IT IS PREMEDITATED AND WITH MALICE AND THERE IS NO MENTAL INCAPACITY OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT, I WOULD THINK THAT WOULD BE APPLICABLE.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. NOW, ONE OF THE THINGS YOU HAVE BEEN TOLD, IS THAT THERE WOULD BE A SECOND PHASE, IF YOU GOT PAST THE GUILT PHASE.

SPECIFICALLY AS I CAN. IF YOU VOTED GUILTY ALONG WITH -IF YOU WERE A JUROR ALONG WITH 11 OTHER PEOPLE, THAT WOULD
MEAN THAT YOU WOULD HAD FORMED A BELIEF BEYOND A REASONABLE
DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT HAD IN FACT COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE.
PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL KILLING.

_ MS. FELTS: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: IN THIS INSTANCE, DURING THE COMMISSION

OF A ROBBERY. NOW, THE JUDGE WOULD TELL YOU WELL, YOU HAVE

TO CONSIDER IN REACHING A PENALTY, THE DEFENDANT'S BACKGROUND

IN TERMS OF HIS AGE OR HIS LACK OF CRIMINAL BACKGROUND OR

CHILDHOOD OR CHARACTER.

ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT NONE OF THAT WOULD MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO YOU?

MS. FELTS: NO. THAT IS NOT WHAT I SAID.

MR. BARENS: WHAT ARE YOU TELLING ME?

MS. FELTS: YES. THE CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD IN THE SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL, IF THERE WERE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WOULD

.

. 17

SWAY ME, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT I WOULD GO THE OTHER WAY.

MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THERE WOULD BE NO CIRCUMSTANCE WHERE YOU ARE BEING TOLD THAT THE DEFENDANT IS INSANE OR INCAPABLE OF FORMULATING THE INTENT TO COMMIT A MURDER? BECAUSE YOU WOULDN'T HAVE FOUND A FIRST DEGREE MURDER TO BEGIN WITH.

MS. FELTS: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD NOT HEAR ANYTHING ABOUT ACCIDENT OR UNINTENTIONAL OR ANY OF THAT SORT OF THING. YOU WOULD BE DEALING WITH THE TYPE OF PERSON YOU TOLD ME IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, THAT SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY.

ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT ALTHOUGH YOU BELIEVE THAT INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED MURDERS WITH MALICE SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT NONETHELESS, YOU THINK THAT THERE COULD SE FACTORS WHERE THEY SHOULD NOT?

MS. FELTS: YES.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. WHAT FACTORS DO YOU MEAN BY THAT?

MS. FELTS: I CAN'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION. THERE ARE

THE COURT: WELL, THE COURT WILL TELL YOU WHAT FACTORS
YOU HAVE GOT TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION. YOU WILL FOLLOW
THE COURT'S INSTRUCTIONS. IS THAT TRUE?

MS. FELTS: YES. AND TRY TO TAKE IN ALL OF THE OTHER -THE COURT: THOSE THAT I ALREADY ENUMERATED, THE AGE

OF THE DEFENDANT, THE LACK OF ANY CRIMINAL ACTIVITY, HIS
EDUCATION, BACKGROUND AND EVERYTHING ABOUT THE PERSON YOU
WILL BE HEARING ABOUT? YOU WILL CONSIDER THAT, WILL YOU?

MS. FELTS: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, DO YOU HONESTLY BELIEVE IN YOUR HEART, 1 THAT YOU ARE CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY 2 OF PAROLE FOR A DEFENDANT WHO HAD BEEN CONVICTED BEYOND A 3 REASONABLE DOUBT IN YOUR MIND, OF HAVING COMMITTED A MURDER Δ IN THE FIRST DEGREE DURING THE COMMISSION OF A ROBBERY, A 5 MURDER THAT WAS PREMEDITATED? 6 MS. FELTS: YES. 7 MR. BARENS: YOU COULD NONETHELESS, VOTE FOR LIFE 8 WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? ô 10 MS. FELTS: YES, SIR. MR. BARENS: DO YOU RECONCILE THAT OR CAN YOU RECONCILE 11 THAT WITH YOUR EARLIER RESPONSE THAT I TOOK TO UNDERSTAND 12 THAT YOU WERE SAYING PREMEDITATED MURDERS WITH MALICE SHOULD 13 GET THE DEATH PENALTY? 74 MS. FELTS: WHEN I ANSWERED THAT QUESTION, IT WAS A - 5 FLAT STATEMENT. BUT THERE ARE A LOT OF GENERALITIES THAT 16 17 WOULD ENTER INTO THE CASE. I WOULD HAVE TO TAKE THOSE INTO CONSIDERATION. 18 MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD? 19 20 MS. FELTS: YES I WOULD. 21 MR. BARENS: AND DO YOU THINK YOU COULD BE FAIR AND 22 GPEN-MINDED? 23 MS. FELTS: YES. MR. BARENS: TO THE DEFENDANT UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES? 24 25 MS. FELTS: YES. 26 MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT LIFE WITHOUT 27 POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE REALLY MEANS THAT? MS. FELTS: YES. 28

MR. BARENS: ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THAT? 1 MS. FELTS: YES. 2 MR. BARENS: NOW, HAD YOU THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THE DEATH 3 PENALTY BEFORE YOU CAME HERE TODAY? Δ MS. FELTS: NO. 1 REALLY HAD NOT. 5 MR. BARENS: DO YOU REMEMBER WHETHER OR NOT YOU VOTED 6 IN THE ELECTION IN CALIFORNIA WHERE THIS WAS A SUBJECT ON 7 8 THE BALLOT? MS. FELTS: I --THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW THAT SHE WAS OLD ENOUGH. 10 MS. FELTS: TO BE HONEST WITH YOU, I DON'T KNOW WHEN 11 12 IT WAS VOTED AGAIN. MR. BARENS: YOU PROBABLY WEREN'T OLD ENOUGH AT THE 13 TIME. I WILL AGREE WITH HIS HONOR. 14 ₹. I BELIEVE THAT YOU SAID THAT YOU HAD HEARD NO 16 PUBLICITY ABOUT THIS CASE WHATSOEVER? MS. FELTS: NO. I DON'T RECOGNIZE THE NAME. 17 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH IT WAS 18 REQUIRED OF THE JUDGE AND MYSELF AND THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY 19 IN A MOMENT, TO ASK YOU QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY 20 AT THIS STAGE, THAT THERE IS NO REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE 21 22 THAT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OF ANYTHING, JUST BECAUSE WE ARE HERE DISCUSSING THIS AT THIS STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS? 23 24 MS. FELTS: YES I DO. MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT HE HAS AN ONGOING 25 PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, THE SAME WAY YOU WOULD IF YOU WERE 26 27 A DEFENDANT IN THIS COURTROOM?

MS. FELTS: YES, SIR.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU FOR YOUR CANDOR AND YOUR TIME. 1 I PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. 2 3 MR. WAPNER: GOOD AFTERNOON, MS. FELTS. I AM FRED WAPNER, THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY 4 WHO IS PROSECUTING THIS CASE. 5 IF YOU GET DOWN TO DECIDING THE QUESTION OF PENALTY 6 IN THIS CASE. YOU WILL HAVE TO RENDER AN INDIVIDUAL VOTE AS 7 TO WHETHER THE DEFENDANT SHOULD DIE OR WHETHER HE SHOULD SPEND 8 THE REST OF HIS LIFE IN PRISON. IS THAT A DECISION YOU ARE 9 10 CAPABLE OF MAKING? MS. FELTS: 1 THINK SO, YES. 11 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONGLY-HELD RELIGIOUS, 12 MORAL OR PHILOSOPHICAL BELIEFS THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM 13 RENDERING A DECISION ONE WAY OR THE OTHER? 14 15 MS. FELTS: NO. 16 MR. WAPNER: ARE YOU AWARE OR HAVE YOU HAD ANY LEGAL 17 TRAINING? 18 MS. FELTS: NO. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. HAVE YOU SAT ON OTHER CRIMINAL CASES 19 20 OR MURDER CASES? 21 MS. FELTS: NO. 22 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I PASS FOR CAUSE. THE COURT: BOTH SIDES HAVING PASSED FOR CAUSE, WHAT 23 24 THAT MEANS IS THAT YOU ARE ENTIRELY ACCEPTABLE AS A JUROR 25 IN THIS CASE. 26 WHAT I WILL DO IS ASK YOU TO REPORT TOMORROW AFTERNOON AT 1:45 TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM. HOPEFULLY, WE 27 WILL GET THROUGH. IT MAY NOT BE POSSIBLE TO GET THROUGH. 28

1 WE HOPE WE WILL BE READY FOR YOU TOMORROW. 2 NOT, WE MIGHT GIVE YOU A CALL.	
2 NOT, WE MIGHT GIVE YOU A CALL.	IF
BUT IN OTHER WORDS, PLAN ON BEING HERE TOM	ORROW.
4 MS. FELTS: I WILL BE.	
5 THE COURT: THANK YOU.	
DON'T TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT THIS CASE.	
7 MS. FELTS: I WON'T.	
8. THE COURT: OR LISTEN TO THE RADIO OR TELEVISION	•
9 MS. FELTS: OKAY.	
10 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR FELTS EXITED THE	
11 COURTROOM.)	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
23	
23 24	
23 24 25	

23F

1 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRENDA GALL ENTERS 2 THE COURTROOM.) 3 MS. GALL: HI. 4 THE COURT: HI. HOW ARE YOU? 5 MS. GALL: GOOD. THANK YOU. 6 THE COURT: FINE. 7 IS THAT MRS. GALL OR MISS? 8 MS. GALL: MRS. a THE COURT: MRS.? 10 MS. GALL: YES. 11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MRS. GALL, WHERE DO YOU LIVE? 12 MS. GALL: MANHATTAN BEACH. 13 THE COURT: DID YOU EVER READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS 14 CASE OR KNOW ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT IT, EXCEPT WHAT I TOLD YOU 15 IN THE COURTROOM --16 MS. GALL: NO. 17 THE COURT: -- THE OTHER DAY? 18 MS. GALL: NO. 19 THE COURT: THE NAME BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB DOESN'T MEAN 20 ANYTHING? 21 MS. GALL: BOYS CLUB? 22 THE COURT: BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB? 23 MS. GALL: NO. 24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU WILL HAVE OCCASION, IF YOU 25 ARE A JUROR, YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT IT. 26 MS. GALL: IT SOUNDS INTERESTING. 27 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, I DID TELL ALL OF THE PROSPECTIVE 28 JURORS SOMETHING ABOUT THE CASE AND LET ME REPEAT IT BRIEFLY

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

YOU KNOW THAT THE CHARGE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IS THAT HE COMMITTED A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. GALL: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: NOW, IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS SOME SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID -- FIRST OF ALL, BEFORE I GO INTO WHAT THE LEGISLATURE SAID.

FIRST OF ALL, ANY FIRST DEGREE MURDER COMMITTED DELIBERATELY AND INTENTIONALLY AND BY DESIGN AND PLAN DOESN'T NECESSARILY INVOLVE THE DEATH PENALTY.

IT IS ONLY WHEN THAT MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE IS COMMITTED UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT IT THEN QUALIFIES FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE DEATH PENALTY; DO YOU UNDER-STAND?

> (WHEREUPON MRS. GALL NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: NOW, THE DEATH PENALTY INCLUDES LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THAT MEANS EXACTLY THAT: THERE IS NO POSSIBILITY OF ANY PAROLE. THE PERSON GOES FOR LIFE.

OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

(WHEREUPON, MRS. GALL NODS HER HEAD UP

AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: SO THE JURY WILL FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE ON THE FIRST PHASE OF THE TRIAL, WHICH IS CALLED THE GUILT PHASE, WHEN THE PENALTY IS NOT INVOLVED IN ANY WAY AND IT 15

NEVER EVEN TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE JURY WHEN THEY DECIDE THE GUILT PHASE, THE GUILT PHASE IS, IS THE DEEFENDANT GUILTY OF THE COMMISSION OF THE CRIME OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IF THEY SAY YES, THEN THEY HAVE A QUESTION THEY ANSWER AND THAT QUESTION IS: WAS IT TRUE OR WAS IT FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. GALL: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: NOW, IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, AS 1 TOLD YOU, IS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE WHICH QUALIFIES THE CASE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, LIKE IF IT WAS A MURDER COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY, DURING THE COURSE OF A KIDNAPPING OR A RAPE OR TORTURE OR A CHILD WAS MOLESTED AND DIES, OR MULTIPLE MURDERS, THOSE ARE INSTANCES WHERE THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE QUALIFIES THAT FARTICULAR MURDER FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

ALL RIGHT, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT NOT EVERY MURDER QUALIFIES, SO A MAN CAN COMMIT A DELIBERATE, BRUTAL AND PREMEDITATED, CALCULATED, PLANNED MURDER AND STILL NOT HAVE TO SUFFER THE DEATH PENALTY.

IT ONLY HAS TO BE DONE UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES
THAT I TOLD YOU ABOUT, ALL RIGHT?

MS. GALL: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: OH, YES, THERE IS A CASE WHERE IT IS VERY FIENDISH AND MAY HAVE BEEN INVOLVED AND SO FORTH, BUT WE WILL FORGET ABOUT THAT.

BUT MERELY COMMITTING A MURDER THAT WAS PLANNED AND INTENTIONAL, AND SO FORTH, DOESN'T MEAN IT QUALIFIES FOR

THE DEATH PENALTY; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. GALL: YES.

THE COURT: AS I TOLD YOU, THE JURY FIRST DETERMINES
THE ISSUE AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED THE
MURDER AND THEN DETERMINES WHETHER IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF
A ROBBERY.

NOW, AT THAT PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THE JURY WILL HEAR EVIDENCE FROM BOTH SIDES, THE PROSECUTION AND THE DEFENSE.

THE DEFENSE WILL INTRODUCE TESTIMONY, I ASSUME,
TO SHOW FAVORABLE THINGS, ASPECTS AND DEEDS AND EVERYTHING
ABOUT THE DEFENDANT. THEY WILL SHOW -- YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO
CONSIDER AND YOU WILL BE INSTRUCTED TO CONSIDER HIS AGE, HIS
PREVIOUS BACKGROUND, HIS EDUCATION, HIS MENTAL AND PHYSICAL
CONDITION, YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO CONSIDER THE FACT HE NEVER
WAS CONVICTED OF ANY KIND OF A FELONY IN THE PAST. YOU WILL
CONSIDER ALL OF THOSE. THOSE ARE CALLED EXTENUATING OR
MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE PROSECUTION WILL PRODUCE EVIDENCE, I ASSUME
WILL TRY TO SHOW EVIDENCE THAT IS UNFAVORABLE TO THE DEFENDANT'S
LIFE AND CHARACTER AND THE REASON FOR THAT IS THE DEFENDANT'S
FAVORABLE TESTIMONY WILL THEN TRY TO PERSUADE YOU NOT TO
IMPOSE THE ULTIMATE PENALTY AGAINST HIM.

AND THE PROSECUTION BY THE UNFAVORABLE ASPECTS
WILL TRY TO SHOW YOU THAT HE DOENS'T DESERVE ANY FAVORABLE
CONSIDERATION BY THE JURY, YOU SEE.

YOU DON'T MAKE UP YOUR MIND UNTIL YOU HEAR ALL OF THE EVIDENCE. MERELY BECAUSE HE HAS COMMITTED A MURDER

1 IN THE FIRST DEGREE IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY DOESN'T MEAN
2 HE SHOULD SUFFER THE DEATH PENALTY. YOU WILL WAIT TO MAKE
3 UP YOUR MIND UNTIL YOU HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, WON'T

MS. GALL: YES.

YOU?

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

27

28

THE COURT: NOW, THESE QUESTIONS ARE ASKED TO DETERMINE YOUR STATE OF MIND OR OPINION AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY.

NOW THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS HAVE TO DO WITH THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE ASPECT OF IT, AND NOT THE PENALTY ASPECT: NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY OBJECTION AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU IN ANY WAY FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL --IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. GALL: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, NOW SIMILARLY, ON WHETHER IT IS TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE WHETHER IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. GALL: NO.

THE COURT: THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS HAVE TO DO WITH THE PENALTY PHASE. ASSUMING HE HAS BEEN CONVICTED OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN WE HAVE THE PENALTY PHASE I TOLD YOU ABOUT WHERE YOU HEAR ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON BOTH SIDES, PRO AND CON AS TO THE DEFENDANT.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

THE COURT REPORTER: WHAT WAS YOUR ANSWER?

MS. GALL: I SAID NO.

THE COURT: SIMILARLY, AS TO LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT

THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION

CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE

FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE,

REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY

PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. GALL: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, NOW YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE

OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE

AND THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT

WE REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, ALL RIGHT?

MS. GALL: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, GO AHEAD.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

GOOD AFTERNOON, MRS. GALL. I AM ARTHUR BARENS
AND I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT.

AND AS WITH HIS HONOR, IT IS MY OBLIGATION AT THIS
POINT TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON
THE DEATH PENALTY.

MS. GALL: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: PARENTHETICALLY, THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS AND NONE OF US ARE GOING TO JUDGE YOU ON YOUR ANSWERS, AS YOU CAN NEVER BE WRONG ON YOUR OPINION, OKAY?

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MS. GALL: UNTIL YESTERDAY, I WAS FOR IT AND THEN --

THE COURT: PARDON ME?

MS. GALL: UNTIL YESTERDAY, I ALWAYS FELT THAT I WAS

FOR IT UNTIL I CAME IN HERE AND WAS REALLY IMPRESSED WITH THE 1 IDEA THAT I MIGHT REALLY BE INVOLVED IN THIS IN SOME WAY AND 2 3 NOW I AM A LITTLE MORE UNSURE OF MYSELF. 4 MR. BARENS: FROM THAT. SHOULD I TAKE IT THAT YOU STILL 5 BELIEVE IN THE DEATH PENALTY BUT YOU MAY HESITATE A BIT MORE BEFORE YOU COULD RENDER THAT TYPE OF DECISION? 6 7 MS. GALL: YEAH. MR. BARENS: NOW, WHEN YOU SAY THAT -- I AM GOING TO 8 SAY ON BALANCE YOU ARE FOR IT, IF THAT IS NOT ACCURATE, YOU 9 10 WILL CORRECT ME, WHEN YOU SAY YOU ARE ON BALANCE FOR IT, ARE THERE SITUATIONS IN WHICH YOU THINK THAT THE DEATH PENALTY 11 12 WOULD BE THE APPROPRIATE PENALTY? MS. GALL: YEAH, I THINK SO. 13 MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL ME ABOUT THAT? 14 15 MS. GALL: MURDER THAT WOULD GO INTO THAT CATEGORY. MR. BARENS: MURDER IS SOMEWHAT OF A CATEGORY IN AND 16 17 OF ITSELF, I SUPPOSE. ARE THERE CERTAIN TYPES OF MURDER OR CERTAIN 18 INSTANCES OF MURDER THAT YOU ARE REFERRING TO WHEN YOU SAY 19 THAT THOSE DEFENDANTS SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY OR ARE YOU 20 21 SAYING ALL MURDERERS? WHICH IS OKAY, TOO. 22 MS. GALL: NO, I DON'T THINK ALL MURDERERS, NO. MR. BARENS: OKAY, WHICH MURDERS ARE YOU REFERRING TO? 23 MS. GALL: I WOULD THINK -- I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE LAWS 24 ARE, BUT CHILD MURDERS FOR ONE; THAT, DEFINITELY. 25 26 MR. BARENS: HOW ABOUT A MURDER DURING ROBBERY? MS. GALL: I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THAT. 27

MR. BARENS: OKAY, WELL "I DON'T KNOW" IS A FAIR ANSWER

THE JUDGE HAS EXPLAINED TO YOU THERE ARE TWO DISTINCT SEGMENTS TO THESE PROCEEDINGS. FIRST, THERE IS THAT GUILT PHASE WHERE YOU HAVE TO DETERMINE IN YOUR OWN MIND BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT WHETHER THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED IN FACT, A FIRST DEGREE, INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

YOU WILL NEVER GET TO THE SECOND OR PENALTY PHASE

UNLESS YOU FIRST FOUND BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE MURDER

HAD OCCURRED AS 1 DESCRIBED; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. GALL: YES.

•

MR. BARENS: NOW, WHEN WE GET TO THE SECOND PHASE, THE
PENALTY PHASE, WHAT I NEED TO KNOW IS, WHETHER OR NOT YOUR
OVERALL BELIEF IN THE DEATH PENALTY WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY IMPAIR
YOUR ABILITY TO CONSIDER GIVING LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF
PAROLE TO A DEFENDANT WHO HAD INTENTIONALLY AND WITH
PREMEDITATION, TAKEN AWAY A HUMAN LIFE? WHAT DO YOU THINK?

MS. GALL: I THINK IF IT WAS WARRANTED, I WOULD PROBABLY

MR. BARENS: I AM NOT TOTALLY SURE I FOLLOWED YOUR ANSWER,
MS. GALL.

WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THAT ANSWER? SORRY. IF IT
WAS WARRANTED YOU WOULD PROBABLY ALLOW THE DEATH PENALTY TO
BE VOTED UPON? YOU ARE THE ONE THAT IS GOING TO VOTE.

MS. GALL: OH.

MR. BARENS: YOU ARE THE JUROR AT THIS POINT.

MS. GALL: YES. THIS IS ALL NEW TO ME.

ALLOW THE DEATH PENALTY TO BE DECIDED UPON.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. AS AN INDIVIDUAL, YOU KNOW THAT

THERE ARE 11 OTHER JURORS. YOU HAVE TO MAKE YOUR INDIVIDUAL

VOTE.

MS. GALL: SO YOU ARE SAYING THAT THE GUY IS GUILTY AND WE ARE TRYING TO DECIDE ON THE DEATH PENALTY AND IF I WOULD?

MR. BARENS: NO. WE ARE NOT GOING TO TRY THE DEATH
PENALTY. YOU ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO MAKE THAT DECISION ON
YOUR OWN. I WOULD NEVER BE TRYING THAT PERSONALLY.

I AM THE LAWYER FOR THE DEFENDANT, ACTUALLY. WHAT

I AM ASKING YOU IS, WHEN WE GET TO THAT SECOND PHASE, I WANT

TO MAKE SURE YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE. WE HAD

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ONE.

A GUILT PHASE TRIAL. AND JUST FOR THE SAKE OF THE QUESTIONS, 1 I AM ASSUMING -- I AM NOT SAYING THAT THIS IS GOING TO HAPPEN. 2 BUT I HAVE GOT TO CREATE A WAY TO ASK YOU THESE QUESTIONS. 3 LET'S ASSUME THAT YOU AND THE OTHER 11 PEOPLE, 4 DECIDED THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS GUILTY OF A FIRST DEGREE, 5 6 PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL MURDER. 7 MS. GALL: UH-HUH. 8 MR. BARENS: DURING A ROBBERY. 9 MS. GALL: UH-HUH. 10 MR. BARENS: OKAY? MS. GALL: YES. 11 MR. BARENS: NOW, WE ARE GOING TO START ALL OVER AGAIN 12 WITH THAT SECOND PHASE. WE ARE GOING TO ASK YOU WELL, WHAT 13 ARE WE GOING TO DO WITH THE DEFENDANT. 14 MS. GALL: YES. THAT IS THE CONFUSING PART. 15 16 MR. BARENS: OKAY. NOW, IN THAT SECOND PHASE, YOU ARE 17

GOING TO HAVE TWO CHOICES, LIKE THE JUDGE EXPLAINED TO YOU. YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE THE DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER CHOICE.

I AM TRYING TO FIND OUT WHAT IS YOUR STATE OF MIND WHEN IT COMES TO THOSE TWO CHOICES, ASSUMING THAT YOU FOUND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THAT FIRST TRIAL. OKAY?

MS. GALL: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU THINK --

MS. GALL: WHICH WOULD I VOTE FOR?

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, IT IS NOT A QUESTION OF WHICH

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. BARENS: I DIDN'T ASK THAT QUESTION.

2 MR. WAPNER: TO THE EXTENT THAT SHE UNDERSTANDS IT THAT
3 WAY, THERE IS AN OBJECTION.

MR. BARENS: I WOULD OBJECT MYSELF. I WILL OBJECT.

WE ALL OBJECT.

NOW, I WILL ASK YOU A QUESTION.

THE COURT: WE ARE NOT ASKING YOU NOW HOW YOU ARE GOING TO VOTE IN THE CASE IF YOU ARE SELECTED AS A JUROR.

ALL HE IS TRYING TO FIND OUT IS, IF YOU HAVE AN OPEN MIND, SO THAT YOU WILL HEAR ALL OF THE TESTIMONY ON THE PENALTY PHASE BEFORE YOU DETERMINE WHETHER IT WOULD BE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

WOULD YOU BE CAPABLE OF MAKING SUCH A DECISION?

MS. GALL: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT IS ALL WE ARE TRYING TO FIND OUT. GO AHEAD.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. COULD YOU FAIRLY AND OPEN-MINDEDLY CONSIDER BOTH ALTERNATIVES?

MS. GALL: YES.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. WOULD YOUR OVERALL BELIEFS THAT

THE DEATH PENALTY IS SOMETHING YOU ARE IN FAVOR OF,

SUBSTANTIALLY IMPAIR YOUR ABILITY TO VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT

POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MS. GALL: I DON'T THINK SO.

MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T THINK IT WOULD?

MS. GALL: NO.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THAT THERE COULD BE A SITUATION IN WHICH A DEFENDANT WAS CONVICTED OF AN INTENTIONAL,

PREMEDITATED MURDER DURING A ROBBERY, IN WHICH YOU ARE CAPABLE 1 OF VOTING FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? 2 3 MS. GALL: YES. MR. BARENS: YOU COULD? MS. GALL: YES. 5 MR. BARENS: WOULD IT BE UNLIKELY? 6 MS. GALL: NO. 7 MR. BARENS: YOU COULD OPEN-MINDEDLY DO THAT? 8 9 MS. GALL: YEAH. MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO CONSIDER AND LISTEN 10 TO THE EVIDENCE ABOUT THE DEFENDANT'S BACKGROUND IN TERMS 11 OF HIS AGE OR LACK OF PRIOR CRIMINAL RECORD OR CHARACTER AT 12 13 THAT POINT IN TIME? MS. GALL: YES. 14 MR. BARENS: SO YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO ENTERTAIN AND 15 CONSIDER THOSE ELEMENTS OR THOSE FACTORS BEFORE YOU WOULD 16 DETERMINE THE LIFE OR DEATH QUESTION? 17 18 MS. GALL: YES. MR. BARENS: WHEN YOU SAY THAT UNTIL YESTERDAY, YOU 19 WERE IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY, IS THAT A BELIEF YOU HAD 20 21 HAD FOR A LONG TIME? MS. GALL: PROBABLY. 22 MR. BARENS: WAS THERE SOMETHING IN PARTICULAR THAT 23 CREATED THAT BELIEF SYSTEM IN YOUR MIND? 24 MS. GALL: PROBABLY INFLUENCE FROM MY PARENTS. 25 THE COURT: I DIDN'T HEAR YOU. 26 MS. GALL: PROBABLY INFLUENCE FROM MY PARENTS. 27

MR. BARENS: PRAY TELL ME. YOUR PARENTS WERE NOT

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS? THEY WEREN'T, WERE THEY? MS. GALL: NO. MR. BARENS: WAS THERE SOMETHING THAT THEY TOLD YOU ABOUT PERHAPS IN YOUR RELIGIOUS UPBRINGING OR EDUCATIONAL PROCESS OR --MS. GALL: MY DAD WAS INVOLVED WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT. MR. BARENS: INDEED. WELL, THAT IS CERTAINLY UNDERSTANDABLE. BUT WE HAVE TO INQUIRE INTO THAT AT ANOTHER POINT. ô EVEN THOUGH YOUR FATHER PROBABLY TOLD YOU THAT PEOPLE WHO COMMIT VIOLENT, PREMEDITATED MURDERS SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY -- AND AGAIN, I DON'T NECESSARILY TELL YOU THAT I AM DISAGREEING WITH WHAT YOUR FATHER TOLD YOU --MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION. ASSUMING FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE, IF THAT IS AN APPROPRIATE OBJECTION. HE HAS NOW TOLD HER WHAT HER FATHER TOLD HER. HE HAS NOW ASSUMED --MR. BARENS: WELL, SHE CAN TELL ME.

THE COURT: I DON'T THINK WE HAVE TO PURSUE THAT ANY FURTHER. HOW SHE ARRIVED AT THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH HER ABILITY TO BE A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL JUROR IN THIS CASE.

MR. BARENS: THAT WAS MY QUESTION.

EVEN THOUGH YOU MIGHT HAVE GROWN UP WITH THAT ORIENTATION, AS YOU SIT HERE TODAY AS A PROSPECTIVE JUROR IN THIS CASE, CAN YOU NONETHELESS BE OPEN-MINDED IN TERMS OF POSSIBLY GIVING THAT TYPE OF A DEFENDANT, IF WE EVER GOT TO THE PENALTY PHASE, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MS. GALL: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THAT YOU COULD?

MS. GALL: YES.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. NOW, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT
ALTHOUGH I HAVE BEEN TALKING TO YOU AND THE JUDGE HAS AND
THE PROSECUTOR WILL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, THERE IS NO REASON
FOR YOU TO BELIEVE AT THIS POINT THAT MR. HUNT HAS DONE
ANYTHING WRONG OR IS GUILTY OF ANYTHING?

MS. GALL: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT?

MS. GALL: YES.

MR. BARENS: OR DO YOU BELIEVE THAT BECAUSE WE ARE HERE TALKING ABOUT IT, THAT SOMETHING MUST HAVE HAPPENED? THAT HE DID SOMETHING WRONG?

MS. GALL: WELL, SOMETHING HAPPENED. BUT I DON'T KNOW WITH WHOM OR WHY OR ANYTHING.

MR. BARENS: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT WHAT I AM REALLY TALKING ABOUT IS THAT ALL DEFENDANTS, INCLUDING YOURSELF IF YOU WERE ACCUSED OF A CRIME AND WERE IN HERE ON TRIAL IN THIS COURTROOM,

```
YOU ARE ENTITLED TO THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE UNDER OUR
1
     CONSTITUTION AND THE WAY WE DO THINGS IN THIS COUNTRY. DO
2
     YOU BELIEVE IN THAT?
3
           MS. GALL: YES.
           MR. BARENS: I THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CANDOR.
5
     I PASS FOR CAUSE.
6
           THE COURT: THANK YOU.
7
           MR. WAPNER: GOOD AFTERNOON, MS. GALL. I AM FRED WAPNER,
8
     THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY WHO IS PROSECUTING THIS CASE.
9
                 WHAT HAPPENED YESTERDAY? WHAT STARTED TO MAKE
10
     YOU UNSURE?
11
           MS. GALL: I NEVER FELT SO CLOSELY INVOLVED. AND I
12
     SAW A NICE, HEALTHY-LOOKING, CLEAN-CUT YOUNG MAN. AND IT
13
     JUST PUT A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE ON IT.
14
          MR. WAPNER: DID HE LOOK DIFFERENT THAN THE PERSON YOU
15
16
     EXPECTED TO SEE SITTING IN THAT CHAIR?
          MS. GALL: YES.
17
          MR. WAPNER: OKAY.
18
19
           MR. BARENS: SHE PROBABLY THOUGHT IT WAS MR. CHIER
     ACTUALLY. EXCUSE ME. SORRY, YOUR HONOR.
20
         MR. WAPNER: WELL, WE DO GET SOME LEVITY FROM TIME TO
21
     TIME IN THIS COURTROOM, NOTWITHSTANDING THE FACT THAT WE ARE
22
23
     DISCUSSING THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY.
                 IT IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR ME TO UNDERSTAND YOUR
24
     FEELINGS ON THAT.
25
26
                 FIRST OF ALL, LET ME EXPLORE THAT A LITTLE BIT.
27
    WHEN YOU SAW THE DEFENDANT SITTING THERE, HEALTHY, YOUNG,
    CLEAN-CUT, WHAT DID YOU THINK?
28
```

MR. BARENS: OBJECTION, IRRELEVANT TO HER POINT OF VIEW 1 ON THE DEATH PENALTY AND THE SUBJECT OF GENERAL VOIR DIRE. 2 THE COURT: SUSTAINED. 3 MR. WAPNER: WELL, YOU SAID THAT YOUR OPINION ON THE DEATH PENALTY CHANGED WHEN YOU SAW THE DEFENDANT, RIGHT? 5 MS. GALL: UH-HUH. 6 MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE TO SAY YES OR NO. 7 MS. GALL: YES. 8 MR. WAPNER: TELL ME HOW IT CHANGED. 9 MS. GALL: I DIDN'T FEEL AS STRONGLY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. 10 I SAW SOMEONE SITTING THERE THAT I THOUGHT LOOKED WORTHWHILE 11 AND MORE SOCIALLY ACCEPTABLE THAN WHAT I EXPECTED TO SEE. 12 MR. WAPNER: WOULD IT BE -- WELL, OKAY. LET ME PUT 13 14 IT TO YOU IN THIS SITUATION. YOU HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE GUILT 15 PHASE OF THE TRIAL. YOU HAVE DECIDED THAT THE EVIDENCE PROVES 16 17 BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT INTENTIONALLY KILLED SOMEONE DURING A ROBBERY. 18 YOU HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE IN THE PENALTY 19 PHASE OF THE TRIAL. NOW, YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM DECIDING 20 THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE DEFENDANT SITTING IN THAT CHAIR 21 OVER THERE, SHOULD SPEND THE REST OF HIS LIFE IN PRISON OR 22 WHETHER HE SHOULD DIE IN THE GAS CHAMBER. 23 AND THE JUDGE WILL TELL YOU THAT YOU HAVE TO RENDER 24 YOUR OWN, INDIVIDUAL VERDICT ON THAT QUESTION. CAN YOU MAKE 25 26 THAT DECISION? 27 MS. GALL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY HESITATION OR RESERVATION

```
ABOUT YOUR ABILITY TO MAKE THE DECISION?
1
           MR. BARENS: OBJECTION. OF COURSE SHE HAS TO HAVE
2
     HESITANCY.
3
           MR. WAPNER: HOW DOES HE KNOW? THE JUROR IS THE ONE
4
     THAT ANSWERS THE QUESTIONS.
5
           MR. BARENS: WE KNOW THESE ARE HARD DECISIONS, JUDGE.
6
           MR. WAPNER: I AM NOT ASKING FOR MR. BARENS' OPINION.
7
           THE COURT: WELL, WHEN YOU GET THROUGH, I WILL MAKE
8
     A RULING. YOU MAY ASK THE QUESTION.
9
10
           MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.
           MS. GALL: I THINK I WOULD BE ABLE TO MAKE THE DECISION.
11
     I KNOW IT WOULD BE A VERY HARD ONE TO DO, THOUGH.
12
           MR. WAPNER: ONCE YOU MAKE THAT DECISION, YOU HAVE TO
13
     COME INTO COURT AND THE FOREPERSON ON THE JURY GIVES THE
14
     VERDICT TO THE BAILIFF, WHO GIVES IT TO THE JUDGE AND THE
15
16
     CLERK THEN READS IT.
                 KNOWING THAT, THAT THE VERDICT IS GOING TO BE
17
     READ IN THE PRESENCE OF THE DEFENDANT, IS THAT STILL A VERDICT
18
19
     THAT YOU CAN RENDER ONE WAY OR THE OTHER?
20
           MS. GALL: YES.
           MR. WAPNER: OKAY. DOES THE FACT THAT THE DEFENDANT
21
     IS, TO USE YOUR WORDS, SOCIALLY ACCEPTABLE, IS THAT GOING
22
     TO AFFECT YOUR DECISION ONE WAY OR THE OTHER?
23
           MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THAT
24
     QUESTION. IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THE JUROR IS ENTITLED TO
25
     CONSIDER THAT TYPE OF A THOUGHT PROCESS IN MAKING A DECISION
26
27
     ON LIFE OR DEATH.
```

THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. MR. WAPNER: ARE YOUR BELIEFS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY ROOTED IN ANY MORAL OR PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS? MS. GALL: I DON'T THINK I COULD DEFINE IT. BUT GOSH, I DON'T KNOW HOW TO ANSWER THAT. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. DO YOU SEE THEM AS MORE OF A POLITICAL STATEMENT IN TERMS OF THE DEATH PENALTY BEING SOMETHING NECESSARY TO SOCIETY OR --MS. GALL: THAT IS HOW I SEE IT.

25F

1 MR. WAPNER: I WILL PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, BOTH SIDES HAVE PASSED FOR CAUSE. WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT YOU ARE ENTIRELY ACCEPTABLE AS A 3 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR IN THIS CASE. 5 MS. GALL: OH, OKAY. 6 THE COURT: SO WHAT I WANT YOU TO DO IS TO GO TO THE 7 JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM TOMORROW AT 1:45. HOPEFULLY, WE MIGHT GET 8 THROUGH WITH MOST OF THESE BY THAT TIME. IF NOT, WE WILL HAVE 9 TO CONTINUE IT UNTIL A WHILE LATER. WE HAVE YOUR TELEPHONE 10 NUMBER AND WE WILL CALL YOU IF YOU DON'T HAVE TO COME AT 11 1:45. UNLESS YOU HEAR TO THE CONTRARY, YOU WILL BE HERE 12 TOMORROW AFTERNOON AT 1:45 IN THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM. 13 MS. GALL: OKAY. 14 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT? 15 MS. GALL: OKAY. THANK YOU. 16 THE COURT: DON'T READ ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE IF ANY-17 THING IS REFERRED TO ON TELEVISION OR IN THE NEWSPAPERS. 18 MS. GALL: OKAY. 19 THE COURT: DON'T TALK WITH ANYBODY ABOUT IT, ALL RIGHT? 20 MR. GALL: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU. 21 THE COURT: SEE YOU TOMORROW. 22 MS. GALL: OKAY. 23 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR GALL EXITS THE 24 COURTROOM.) 25 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR GAIL GLORIOSO ENTERS 26 THE COURTROOM.) 27 THE COURT: MRS. GLORIOSO? 28 MS. GLORIOSO: YES.

THE COURT: THAT IS A VERY ATTRACTIVE NAME. IS IT A 1 MARRIED NAME? ARE YOU MARRIED? 2 3 MS. GLORIOSO: YES. THE COURT: WHERE DO YOU LIVE, MRS. GLORIOSO? Δ MS. GLORIOSO: IN SANTA MONICA. 5 THE COURT: HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS 6 7 CASE OR DO YOU KNOW ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT IT EXCEPT WHAT I 8 TOLD YOU HERE YESTERDAY? 9 MS. GLORIOSO: NO. 10 THE COURT: THE NAME OF JOE HUNT OR THE PHRASE 11 BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB, DOES THAT MEAN ANYTHING TO YOU AT ALL? 12 MS. GLORIOSO: NO. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, I AM GOING TO BRIEFLY JUST AGAIN 13 14 TELL YOU WHAT THE CASE IS ABOUT AND THEN ASK YOU SOME 15 QUESTIONS. 16 THE PURPOSE OF THE QUESTIONS IS TO DETERMINE WHAT YOUR STATE OF MIND IS WITH RESPECT TO THE DEATH PENALTY. 17 BUT FIRST LET ME REPEAT WHAT I TOLD THE OTHER 18 19 JURORS. THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE IS CHARGED WITH THE COMMISSION OF THE CRIME OF MURDER, MURDER IN THE FIRST 20 21 DEGREE AND THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A 22 ROBBERY. 23 IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS SPECIAL 24 SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID THAT IN 25 CERTAIN -- NOT EVERY MURDER, YOU KNOW, EVEN IF IT IS DELIBERATE AND PREMEDITATED AND INTENTIONAL CALLS FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. 26 27 IT IS ONLY WHERE THAT MURDER IS COMMITTED UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL

CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THE DEATH PENALTY MAY COME INTO PLAY.

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

27

28

NOW, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THIS CASE IT IS ALLEGED THE MURDER WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT IS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE. A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE MIGHT BE 1T WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY OR COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A KIDNAPPING OR IN THE COURSE OF A RAPE OR IN THE COURSE OF A MOLESTATION OF A CHILD AND THE CHILD DIED, OR TORTURE, MULTIPLE MURDERS. THERE ARE ANY NUMBER OF THEM, 19 OR MORE, WHERE IF THE MURDERS WERE COMMITTED UNDER THOSE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THEN THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY MIGHT BE CONSIDERED.

NOW WHEN I TALK ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, IT HAS TWO ASPECTS. THE JURY, AS I WILL TELL YOU LATER, DETERMINES WHAT THE PENALTY IS GOING TO BE: SHALL IT BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITH OUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE -- WHICH MEANS EXACTLY THAT, LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. HE NEVER GETS OUT.

OR IT MEANS DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER, THAT IS THE DEATH PENALTY; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: NOW, IF YOU ARE SELECTED AS A JUROR, THE JURY WILL FIRST HEAR THE PARTICULARS ABOUT THE CRIME ITSELF, THE ALLEGED COMMISSION OF THE MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT IS THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL. YOU WILL BE CALLED ON TO DETERMINE WAS THERE A MURDER, MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IF IT WAS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, WAS IT COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

YOU SEE, IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, I TOLD YOU, IS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE.

5

1ô

0

5

2€

7

SO THE JURY WILL THEN FIRST DECIDE, WAS IT MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IF SO, WAS IT TRUE OR WAS IT FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

IF THEY SAY TRUE, THEN THAT SAME JURY HEARS

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE ON THE SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL AND THAT

IS KNOWN AS THE PENALTY PHASE WHERE THEY DETERMINE WHAT THE

PENALTY WILL BE.

HOWEVER, BEFORE THEY MAKE UP THEIR MINDS AS TO WHAT THE PENALTY WILL BE, THEY HAVE GOT TO HEAR OTHER EVIDENCE, OTHER EVIDENCE FROM THE PROSECUTION AND EVIDENCE FROM THE DEFENDANT.

THE DEFENDANT, IN ORDER TO GET THE LESSER OF THE
TWO PENALTIES, WILL ATTEMPT TO SHOW YOU THINGS WHICH ARE
FAVORABLE ABOUT HIM THAT YOU MIGHT CONSIDER. YOU MUST
CONSIDER HIS AGE. YOU MUST CONSIDER HIS BACKGROUND. YOU MUST
CONSIDER HIS PHYSICAL AND MENTAL CONDITION. YOU HAVE TO
CONSIDER HIS ABSENCE OF ANY PRIOR CRIMINAL CONDUCT. NOW, THESE
ARE ALL FAVORABLE FACTORS SO AS TO MINIMIZE THE PENALTY OR
MITIGATE THE PENALTY WHICH WILL BE INFLICTED, IF ANY.

THE PROSECUTION, ON THE OTHER HAND, WILL SHOW

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, I ASSUME. BY AGGRAVATING

CIRCUMSTANCES, I MEAN THINGS ABOUT THE DEFENDANT ABOUT WHICH

ARE FAVORABLE, SO AS TO NOT MITIGATE THE OFFENSE.

AND YOU HAVE TO DECIDE THE ULTIMATE PENALTY, WHICH WOULD BE DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. GLORIOSO: YES.

THE COURT: YOU DON'T MAKE UP YOUR MIND UNTIL YOU HEAR ALL OF THE EVIDENCE.

OF COURSE, YOU ALSO CONSIDER THE FACTS OF THE COMMISSION OF THE CRIME ITSELF. IF YOU HAVE ALREADY CONVICTED HIM, OF COURSE, THAT WILL ALSO BE CONSIDERED BY THE JURY. IT IS AFTER YOU HEAR ALL OF THAT, THAT YOU THEN RETIRE TO THE JURY ROOM AND DISCUSS THE MATTER THOROUGHLY WITH THE OTHER JURORS AND THEN CONSIDER WHAT IT SHOULD BE, ONE OR THE OTHER. ALL RIGHT?

MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: NOW, WITH THAT AS A BACKGROUND, I AM GOING
TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS. THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS HAVE TO
DO WITH THE GUILT PHASE OF THE CASE: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION,
WHATEVER THAT OPINION MAY BE, REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY
WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS
TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. GLORIOSO: COULD YOU REPEAT THAT?

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION AS TO THE DEATH

PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, OR IT MAY NOT BE ANY AT ALL, WHICH

WOULD IN ANY WAY PREVENT YOU FROM DETERMINING THE GUILT OR

INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

THE COURT REPORTER: WHAT WAS THE ANSWER?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO, I DON'T HAVE NO OPINION ON IT.

THE COURT: NO OPINION TO PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION; IS THAT CORRECT?

MS. GLORIOSO: YES.

THE COURT: THE NEXT QUESTION -- YOU REMEMBER, I TOLD YOU THAT YOU HAVE TO FIRST FIND HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND THEN YOU HAVE TO FIND WHETHER IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT IS THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE I INDICATED TO YOU.

NOW, 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?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO.

THE COURT: NOW, THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS -- WE WILL

ASSUME THAT THE JURY HAS FOUND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER

IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND THAT IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY AND NOW WE ARE ON THE PENALTY PHASE QUESTION: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO.

THE COURT: AND SIMILARLY, THE SAME QUESTION BUT RELATING
TO LIFE IMPRISONMENT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE
DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE
IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS
OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MIGHT BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE
OF THE TRIAL?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE

OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE

AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT

THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. GLORIOSO: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

GOOD AFTERNOON, MRS. GLORIOSO. I AM ARTHUR
BARENS AND I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT. AND AS WAS
THE JUDGE'S OBLIGATION, IT IS MY DUTY NOW TO ASK YOU SOME
QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY.

AND PARENTHETICALLY, I WISH TO INDICATE TO YOU

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS AND NO

ONE IS GOING TO JUDGE YOU HERE BECAUSE YOU CAN'T BE WRONG ABOUT

YOUR OWN OPINION, OKAY? 1 2 MS. GIORIOSO: UH-HUH. MR. BARENS: WITH THAT IN MIND, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT 3 THE DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY? 4 5 MS. GLORIOSO: WELL, I THINK IN SOME CASES, YOU KNOW, THAT IT SHOULD BE USED, DEPENDING UPON THE CASE OR THE 6 7 CIRCUMSTANCES. 8 MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL ME WHAT CASES COME TO YOUR 6 MIND AND WHEN YOU THINK IT POSSIBLY SHOULD BE EMPLOYED? MR. GLORIOSO: THE ONLY CASE THAT COMES TO MY MIND WAS 10 17 I HAD READ THE BOOK ON, WAS THE TED BUNDY CASE. 12 THE COURT: THE WHAT? 13 MS. GLORIOSO: TED BUNDY. 14 MR. BARENS: TED BUNDY IS ONE WE MIGHT REFER TO AS A 15 SERIAL MURDERER? 16 MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH. MR. BARENS: TWENTY PEOPLE, OR GOD KNOWS HOW MANY PEOPLE. 17 18 AND CERTAINLY, I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYONE IN THE WORLD THAT 19 WOULD PROBABLY DISAGREE WITH YOU THERE. 20 ARE THERE ANY OTHER INSTANCES IN WHICH YOU THINK 21 THE DEATH PENALTY MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE? 22 MS. GLORIOSO: I WOULD SAY A PLANNED MURDER IF, YOU KNOW, 23 SOMEBODY PLANS IT OUT. 24 25 26 27

26

MR. BARENS: OKAY. A PREMEDITATED MURDER?

MS. GLORJOSO: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. BEFORE YOU WOULD EVER GET TO A PENALTY
PHASE IN THIS TRIAL, YOU UNDERSTAND AS THE JUDGE EXPLAINED
TO YOU, THAT WE FIRST WOULD HAVE A GUILT PHASE.

DURING THE GUILT PHASE, YOU WOULD HAVE TO BELIEVE
THAT THE DEFENDANT IN FACT, AND BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT,
COMMITTED AN INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED, PLANNED, MURDER DURING
THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

YOU WOULD FIRST HAVE TO BELIEVE THAT BEFORE WE EVER GOT TO A PENALTY PHASE. DO YOU FOLLOW ME WITH THAT?

MS. GLORIOSO: YES.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. NOW, ASSUMING THAT TO BE THE CASE,
ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT IN ANY CASE WHERE YOU HAD A DEFENDANT
WHO HAD COMMITTED A PREMEDITATED, PLANNED MURDER DURING THE
COURSE OF A ROBBERY, LET'S SAY, WOULD YOU ALWAYS FEEL THAT
THAT DEFENDANT SHOULD BE GIVEN THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO.

MR. BARENS: NOT ALWAYS?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO.

MR. BARENS: WHEN FOR INSTANCE, WOULD IT NOT BE APPROPRIATE?

MS. GLORIOSO: WELL, IN THE CASE OF A ROBBERY, I DON'T KNOW IF A PERSON ALWAYS PLANS TO COMMIT MURDER.

THEY MIGHT BE ROBBING A PLACE AND HAVING A WEAPON WITH THEM BUT NOT PLANNING TO KILL A PERSON.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. MS. GLORIOSO, STAY WITH ME ON THIS
POINT. YOU WILL NEVER BE CONSIDERING A PENALTY PHASE IN THIS

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

27

28

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD?

MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: WHAT I AM TRYING TO SQUARE WITH YOU NOW,

MONEY. LET'S GIVE THAT AS A GIVEN. THERE IS NO DOUBT ABOUT IT. IT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, AT LEAST. OKAY?

DEFENDANT PLANNED AND INTENDED TO KILL SOMEONE AND STEAL THEIR

CASE, UNLESS YOU FIRST BELIEVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT IN

THE GUILT PHASE, THAT THE DEFENDANT PLANNED THE MURDER AND

INTENDED TO COMMIT THAT MURDER. LET'S YOU AND I AGREE FOR

A MOMENT HERE, IN THIS QUESTIONING, THAT YOU BELIEVED THE

MR. BARENS: GIVEN THAT, WHAT I AM ASKING YOU IS, IS IT YOUR STATE OF MIND OR OPINION, THAT THOSE DEFENDANTS SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. GLORIOSO: YES.

MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. NOW, THE COURT WOULD INSTRUCT YOU WELL, YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO CONSIDER DURING THE PENALTY PHASE, FACTORS ABOUT THE DEFENDANT'S AGE AT THE ALLEGED COMMISSION OF THE CRIME, OR HIS CHARACTER OR POSSIBLE LACK OF PRIOR CRIMINAL BACKGROUND.

NOW. ALTHOUGH I AM SURE YOU WOULD LISTEN TO THAT DURING THE PENALTY PHASE, ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT YOU REALLY WOULDN'T CONSIDER ANY OF THOSE FACTORS BUT RATHER, SINCE IT WAS A PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL MURDER IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, THAT WE SHOULD ALWAYS GIVE THOSE DEFENDANTS THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO. I THINK I WOULD LOOK AT THE OTHER FACTORS, TOO.

28

OBVIOUSLY, MRS. GLORIOSO, IS A BIT OF AN INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN 1 YOUR FIRST ANSWER AND YOUR SECOND RESPONSE, WHICH IS CERTAINLY 2 UNDERSTANDABLE TO ME, BECAUSE THERE ARE GRADATIONS OF REALITY 3 IN ALL OF THIS PROCESS. YOU FIRST TOLD ME THAT YOU THOUGHT DEFENDANTS 5 6 WHO COMMIT PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL MURDER AND THERE IS A 7 DEAD PERSON, SHOULD GET THE DEATH PENALTY? MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH. 8 MR. BARENS: BUT, YOU ARE TELLING ME IN THE SECOND 9 INSTANCE, WHICH I CAN UNDERSTAND, THAT SOME OF THOSE PEOPLE 10 SHOULD NOT GET THE DEATH PENALTY? 11 MS. GLORIOSO: I GUESS I WOULD HAVE TO WEIGH THE 12 EVIDENCE. I GUESS I WOULD HAVE TO LISTEN TO ALL OF THE 13 14 EVIDENCE. 15 MR. BARENS: EVIDENCE OF WHAT? 16 MS. GLORIOSO: WELL, LIKE YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT, THE AGE FACTOR. 17 18 MR. BARENS: YOU COULD CONSIDER THAT? 19 MS. GLORIOSO: I WOULD CONSIDER IT, YES, SIR. MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD CONSIDER WHETHER OR NOT THERE 20 21 WAS A PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY? 22 MS. GLORIOSO: YES. MR. BARENS: AND YOU WOULD CONSIDER PERHAPS CHARACTER 23 24 EVIDENCE? 25 MS. GLORIOSO: YES. 26 MR. BARENS: IS IT BELIEVABLE TO YOU IN YOUR HEART OF

HEARTS, THAT YOU COULD VOTE -- THAT YOU ARE CAPABLE OF VOTING

FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, FOR A DEFENDANT WHO

26A-4 COMMITTED A PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY? MS. GLORIOSO: YES. MR. BARENS: YOU COULD DO THAT? MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH. MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES? MS. GLORIOSO: YES. MR. BARENS: NOW, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT I COULD HIGH JUMP SEVEN FEET. BUT IT IS NOT REALISTIC. NOW, WHEN YOU TELL ME THAT IT IS POSSIBLE THAT YOU COULD DO THAT, ARE YOU SAYING IT IS POSSIBLE BUT REALLY IMPROBABLE? MS. GLORIOSO: AS FAR AS WHAT? 26B FO

26B-1

MR. BARENS: THAT YOU COULD VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT
POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? OR, ARE YOU SAYING THAT YOU WOULD
OPEN-MINDEDLY APPROACH THAT AS EASILY AS YOU COULD APPROACH
VOTING IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY FOR A DEFENDANT WHO
COMMITTED AN INTENTIONAL MURDER?

MS. GLORIOSO: I COULD VOTE FOR BOTH. I MEAN, I COULD VOTE --

MR. BARENS: EITHER WAY?

MS. GLORIOSO: EITHER WAY.

MR. BARENS: RIGHT. WHEN YOU EARLIER SAID THAT YOU WERE IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY, IS THAT A POINT OF VIEW THAT YOU HAVE HAD FOR A LONG TIME?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO.

MR. BARENS: IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT CAUSED YOU TO HAVE THAT POINT OF VIEW?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO, JUST READING -- WELL, I DON'T READ THE NEWSPAPERS. IT WAS JUST LISTENING TO SOME CASES WHERE THERE HAVE BEEN YOU KNOW, CONTINUOUS MURDERS AND THEY SIT IN JAIL FOR A LONG TIME.

AND THE PAROLE COMES UP AND THEY DON'T GET PAROLE,
BUT THEY SIT IN JAIL.

I AM TALKING ABOUT MORE OR LESS FROM THE BEGINNING.

LIKE I WAS SAYING, THE TED BUNDY CASE, WHERE THERE ARE A LOT

OF PEOPLE INVOLVED.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH
I WAS REQUIRED TO ASK YOU QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY
NOW AND THE JUDGE WAS AND THE PROSECUTOR IS IN A MOMENT, THAT
FROM THAT, THERE IS NO IMPLICATION OR REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE

```
THAT MR. HUNT HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG?
1
           MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH, YES.
2
           MR. BARENS: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT?
3
           MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH.
4
           MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T BELIEVE BECAUSE WE ARE HERE
5
6
     TALKING ABOUT THAT, THAT HE MUST HAVE DONE SOMETHING WRONG
     OR WE WOULDN'T BE TALKING ABOUT THIS TO BEGIN WITH?
7
8
          MS. GLORIOSO: WELL, I DO BELIEVE HE HAS DONE SOMETHING
     WRONG.
9
10
           MR. BARENS: YOU BELIEVE THAT?
           MS. GLORIOSO: I DON'T KNOW. WHAT I KNOW IS THAT HE
11
     HAS DONE A MURDER AND A ROBBERY, BUT I DON'T KNOW THE
12
     CIRCUMSTANCES.
13
          MR. BARENS: OKAY. WELL, SEE, NO ONE -- HIS HONOR NEVER
14
     INTENDED TO MAKE YOU THINK THAT JOE HUNT COMMITTED A MURDER
15
    OR A ROBBERY. ARE YOU SURPRISED TO HEAR THAT?
16
          MS. GLORIOSO: WELL, I GUESS I WORDED IT WRONG. YEAH.
17
     I -- NO. I -- YES, I AM SURPRISED.
18
19
          MR. BARENS: YOU THINK THE JUDGE SAID TO YOU --
          MS. GLORIOSO: NO. I REALIZE NOW WHAT HE SAID.
20
          MR. BARENS: WHAT DID HE SAY?
21
          MS. GLORIOSO: THAT HE IS NOT MORE OR LESS ACCUSING
22
23
    THE PERSON.
24
          MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THE JUDGE THINKS THAT
25
    MR. HUNT DID ANYTHING WRONG?
          MS. GLORIOSO: I DON'T KNOW.
26
27
          MR. BARENS: WHAT DO YOU THINK?
28
          MS. GLORIOSO: I THINK THAT IS WHY HE IS GOING TO COURT.
```

MR. BARENS: OKAY. DO YOU THINK BECAUSE IT IS REAL IMPORTANT THAT WE GET TOGETHER ON THIS, MS. GLORIOSO -- IS THERE ANY REASON IN YOUR MIND THAT YOU THINK THAT THE JUDGE IS SAYING TO YOU, LISTEN, MR. HUNT HAS COMMITTED A ROBBERY AND A MURDER AT THE SAME TIME AND WE HAVE GOT TO FIGURE OUT WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO WITH HIM?

IS THAT WHAT YOU THINK THIS IS ALL ABOUT?

THE COURT: DON'T YOU REMEMBER THAT I TOLD YOU? DON'T

YOU REMEMBER THAT I TOLD YOU THAT IF YOU ARE SELECTED AS A

JUROR, YOU FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE

OF THE DEFENDANT, WHETHER HE COMMITTED A MURDER AND IT WAS

MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE?

MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: RIGHT?

MS. GLORIUSO: YES.

THE COURT: IF YOU DECIDE -- IF THE JURY DECIDES IT
WAS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THEY HAVE GOT TO CONSIDER
WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

DID I INDICATE ANYTHING TO YOU WHICH WOULD GIVE YOU THE IDEA THAT HE HAS COMMITTED MURDER?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO.

THE COURT: WELL, MERELY BECAUSE HE IS SITTING THERE,
THE LAW SAYS THAT HE IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT.

MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: AS HE SITS THERE, HE IS PRESUMED TO BE
INNOCENT. UNTIL HE IS PROVEN GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT,
HE IS NOT GUILTY OF ANYTHING. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MERELY BECAUSE HE IS SITTING THERE, DOESN'T MEAN

```
THAT THERE IS ANY BASIS -- THERE IS ANY REASON FOR YOU TO
 1
 2
     BELIEVE THAT HE IS GUILTY.
           MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH.
 3
           MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES?
 Δ
 5
           MS. GLORIOSO: YES.
           MR. BARENS: MS. GLORIOSO --
6
           THE COURT: PARDON ME. YOU REMEMBER, I ASKED YOU THOSE
7
     QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY.
8
     I ONLY ASKED YOU TO FIND OUT WHAT YOUR STATE OF MIND WAS IN
9
10
     THE EVENT THAT THE JURY FOUND HIM GUILTY.
                 THEN THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY BECOMES
11
12
     APPLICABLE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?
13
           MS. GLORIOSO: YES.
           THE COURT: I WAS GOING TO ASK YOU THAT QUESTION ON
14
     THE ASSUMPTION THAT HE FIRST HAD BEEN FOUND GUILTY. BUT HE
15
     IS NOT GUILTY YET OR AT ALL. HE IS PRESUMED INNOCENT.
16
17
           MR. GLORIOSO: YES.
18
           THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?
19
           MS. GLORIOSO: YES.
           THE COURT: YOU WILL FOLLOW THAT BECAUSE THAT IS THE
20
21
     LAW OF THE CASE?
22
           MS. GLORIOSO: PARDON ME?
           THE COURT: YOU WILL FOLLOW THAT?
23
24
           MS. GLORIOSO: YES.
25
           MR. BARENS: MS. GLORIOSO, I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT
     YOU DON'T THINK THAT I AM GIVING YOU LAWYER TALK AND THE JUDGE
26
27
     IS GIVING YOU JUDGE TALK.
```

NOW, IN YOUR HEART OF HEARTS, LET ME ASK YOU

```
SOMETHING. DO YOU THINK THAT THAT FELLOW DOWN THERE PROBABLY
 1
     COMMITTED A MURDER OR WE WOULDN'T BE HERE TALKING ABOUT DEATH
 2
 3
     PENALTIES AND LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND GAS
 4
     CHAIRS?
 5
           MS. GLORIOSO: I DON'T KNOW.
 6
           MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T KNOW?
 7
           MS. GLORIOSO: I --
 8
           MR. BARENS: WHAT DO YOU REALLY THINK?
 9
           MS. GLORIOSO: I THINK YES.
10
           MR. BARENS: OKAY. I KNOW YOU DO BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT
11
     YOU TOLD ME EARLIER. I DON'T THINK YOU WERE KIDDING ME.
12
           MR. WAPNER: AGAIN, I DON'T THINK IT IS APPROPRIATE
13
     FOR COUNSEL TO INJECT HIS OPINIONS TO THE JUROR.
14
           MR. BARENS: I DON'T KNOW WHERE IT SAYS THAT IN THE
15
     LAW --
16
           THE COURT: LET'S FIND OUT WHAT MS.GLORIOSO THINKS.
17
           MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU TOLD ME AND YOU ARE ENTITLED TO
18
     YOUR POINT OF VIEW, THAT THAT IS THE POINT OF VIEW YOU HAVE
19
     GOT. I AM GLAD THAT YOU HAVE TOLD ME THAT. I THANK YOU.
20
                 WE RESERVE OUR CHALLENGE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
21
           MR. WAPNER: GOOD AFTERNOON, MS. GLORIOSO. I AM FRED
22
     WAPNER, THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY WHO IS TRYING THIS CASE.
23
                 ARE YOU WILLING TO GIVE THE DEFENDANT IN THIS
24
     CASE, THE BENEFIT OF BEING PRESUMED INNOCENT UNTIL HE IS
25
     PROVED GUILTY?
26
          MS. GLORIOSO: YES.
```

27F

27

MR. WAPNER: HOW DO YOU RECONCILE THAT WITH WHAT YOU 1 JUST TOLD MR. BARENS? 2 3 MS. GLORIOSO: LISTENING TO THE EVIDENCE, LISTENING. MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK THAT SOMETHING MUST HAVE 5 HAPPENED OR ELSE WE WOULDN'T BE HAVING A TRIAL ABOUT IT? MS. GLORIOSO: YES. 6 7 MR. WAPNER: DOES THAT NECESSARILY MEAN TO YOU THAT 8 THE DEFENDANT DID ANYTHING? 9 MS. GLORIOSO: NO. MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU EVER SAT ON A TRIAL BEFORE? 10 11 MS. GLORIOSO: NO. MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU READ ANY OTHER BOOKS ABOUT CRIMINAL 12 13 TRIALS BESIDES THE ONE ABOUT MR. BUNDY? 14 MS. GLORIOSO: NO. MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE HEARD ABOUT OTHER CRIMINAL CASES? 15 :ĉ MS. GLORIOSO: I HAVE READ A LITTLE ABOUT IT IN THE 17 PAPER AT SOMETIME. 18 MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE HEARD ABOUT CASES ABOUT MISTAKEN 19 IDENTITY, FOR EXAMPLE? 20 MS. GLORIOSO: YES. MR. WAPNER: SO THERE ARE SOME CASES, FOR EXAMPLE, WHERE 21 22 SOMEONE IS CHARGED WITH A CRIME AND IT TURNS OUT THAT SURE ENOUGH, THERE WAS A CRIME BUT THEY GOT THE WRONG PERSON? 23 24 MS. GLORIOSO: YES. 25 MR. WAPNER: THE PERSON WHO WAS CHARGED IN THAT CASE 26 IS ENTITLED TO THE BENEFIT OF THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, 27 AREN'T THEY?

MS. GLORIOSO: YES.

MR. WAPNER: YOU DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THE FACTS 1 2 OF THIS CASE, DO YOU? MS. GLORIOSO: NO . 3 MR. WAPNER: ARE YOU WILLING TO LOOK AT THE DEFENDANT 4 IN THIS CASE AND SAY, YOU ARE PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT UNTIL 5 THE PROSECUTOR PROVES OTHERWISE? 6 MS. GLORIOSO: YES. 7 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK THAT IS HOW IT SHOULD BE? 8 MS. GLORIOSO: YES. 0 MR. WAPNER: IF WE GET TO THE PENALTY PHASE IN THIS 10 CASE. YOU WILL HAVE, FIRST OF ALL, ALREADY DECIDED THAT THE 11 DEFENDANT WAS GUILTY OF A MURDER BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT 12 AND THAT IT HAPPENED DURING A ROBBERY, AND THEN YOU WILL BE 13 REQUIRED TO LISTEN TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE 14 AND THEN YOU WILL GO INTO THE JURY ROOM AND DECIDE WHAT THE 15 PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE. WHEN YOU GET TO THAT POINT, YOU ONLY 16 HAVE TWO CHOICES, DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER OR LIFE IN PRISON 17 WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT 18 THOSE WOULD BE YOUR TWO CHOICES? 19 20 MS. GLORIOSO: YES. MR. WAPNER: AND KNOWING THAT THOSE WOULD BE YOUR TWO 21 CHOICES, ARE YOU PREDISPOSED TO VOTE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER 22 JUST BASED ON YOUR BACKGROUND AND YOUR BELIEFS AND HOW YOU 23 24 THINK? 25 MS. GLORIOSO: YES. MR. WAPNER: YOU ARE PREDISPOSED TO VOTE -- MAYBE THAT 26 27 IS NOT A GOOD WORD TO USE. 28 MR. BARENS: BUT THAT IS THE WORD THAT WAS USED.

COULD WE GET THE FULL ANSWER OF THE JUROR? THE COURT: DO YOU KNOW WHAT HE MEANT BY THAT QUESTION? BY PREDISPOSED, YOU HAVE MADE UP YOUR MIND YOU ARE GOING TO VOTE FOR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER RATHER THAN LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR OTHERWISE. HAVE YOU MADE UP YOUR MIND ABOUT HOW YOU ARE GOING TO VOTE WITHOUT HEARING THE EVIDENCE? MS. GLORIOSO: OH, NO.

27A

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

SO WHEN YOU SAY -- MAYBE I WILL ASK IT A DIFFERENT

WAY.

WHEN YOU FINISH THE GUILT PHASE, THAT IS, YOU HAVE

DECIDED -- LET'S ASSUME THAT YOU HAVE DECIDED THAT HE IS

GUILTY AND THAT IT WAS DUIRNG A ROBBERY, WOULD THAT BE THE

PND OF IT FOR YOU? WOULD YOU THEN SAY, WELL, I ALREADY KNOW

THING ELSE?

MS. GLORIOSO: NO.

MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO LISTEN TO THE REST OF THE CASE?

WHAT PUNISHMENT I AM GOING TO DECIDE ON, WITHOUT HEARING ANY-

MS. GLORIOSO: YES.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER.

I WILL PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: JUST LET ME MAKE SOME INQUIRIES.

ONE OF THE QUESTIONS ON THE PENALTY PHASE, ASSUMING NOW THAT YOU MAY HAVE FOUND HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, I ASKED YOU ONE OF THE QUESTIONS ON THE PENALTY PHASE, I ASKED YOU WHETHER OR NOT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY AUTOMATICALLY WITHOUT HEARING ANY TESTIMONY ON THE PENALTY PHASE AND YOU SAID NO; IS THAT CORRECT?

MS. GLORIOSO: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, AND YOU ALSO SAID THAT YOU WOULD NOT AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE WITHOUT HEARING EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE; ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU SAID?

MS. GLORIOSO: YES. 1 THE COURT: DID YOU MEAN THAT? 2 3 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.) THE COURT: AS YOU SIT THERE, ASSUMING THAT YOU FIND 5 THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, WOULD YOU CLOSE YOUR MIND AND SAY, I 6 AM GOING TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY WITHOUT HEARING ANYTHING 7 8 FURTHER? 9 MS. GLORIOSO: NO. 10 I WOULD LISTEN FURTHER. 11 THE COURT: ARE YOU SURE ABOUT THAT? 12 MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH. THE COURT: AND THE FACT THAT THE DEFENDANT IS SITTING 13 THERE, YOU THINK REALLY -- THAT IS WHAT YOU INDICATED -- YOU 14 1.5 THINK REALLY HE MUST HAVE DONE SOMETHING, OTHERWISE HE WOULDN'T 16 BE SITTING THERE? 17 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.) 18 THE COURT: I TOLD YOU THAT HE IS SURROUNDED BY THE 19 PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND HE IS INNOCENT FOR ALL PURPOSES 20 UNLESS THE CONTRARY IS PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. 21 MS. GLORIOSO: UH-HUH. 22 THE COURT: HE IS ENTIRELY SURROUNDED WITH THAT KIND 23 OF SAFEGUARD; ARE YOU GOING TO TAKE IT AWAY FROM HIM? 24 MS. GLORIOSO: NO. 25 THE COURT: YOU ARE SURE NOW? YOU ARE SURE NOW? 26 MS. GLORIOSO: 1 AM SURE. 27

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, WILL YOU STEP OUTSIDE JUST FOR

A MINUTE. I WILL HEAR SOME ARGUMENT.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLORIOSO EXITS THE COURTROOM.)

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I KNOW COUNSEL HAS A MOTION.

COUNSEL AND I HAVE DISCUSSED IT, AND IF IT IS ACCEPTABLE WITH

THE COURT, I THINK THAT THIS WOMAN FALLS INTO THE CATEGORY

FIRST ESTABLISHED BY MRS. BLANK, AND ALTHOUGH SHE IS SOMEWHAT

MORE OPINIONATED, I THINK COUNSEL AND I SEEM TO AGREE THAT

SHE PROBABLY WOULDN'T BE AN APPROPRIATE JUROR FOR THIS TYPE

OF CASE.

THE COURT: I THINK SO, TOO.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WOULD YOU CALL MRS. GLORIOSO

13 | IN?

ONE OF THE JURORS, 1 RECOGNIZE HER NAME, SHE IS
THE DAUGHTER OF JUDGE MENDELSOHN, JUEL JANIS.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLORIOSO REENTERS

THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: WE THINK YOU WILL MAKE A VERY FINE JUROR.

BUT BECAUSE OF THE ANSWERS YOU GAVE, IT IS A LITTLE DOUBTFUL

WHETHER OR NOT YOU MIGHT QUALIFY AS A JUROR ON A DEATH PENALTY

CASE, SO WE ARE GOING TO EXCUSE YOU. YOU GO TO THE JURY

ASSEMBLY ROOM AND TELL THEM YOU HAVE BEEN EXCUSED FROM THIS

CASE BUT YOU ARE EMINENTLY QUALIFIED TO SERVE ON SOME OTHER

KIND OF A CASE.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR GLORIOSO EXITS THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, WE WILL TAKE AN ADJOURNMENT NOW UNTIL TOMORROW MORNING.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, IS IT 10:30 TOMORROW? 1 2 THE COURT: I WOULD LIKE YOU TO COME IN EARLIER AND TRY 3 TO GET THROUGH AS MANY AS POSSIBLE. 4 MR. BARENS: I APPRECIATE THAT BUT IT IS JUST I HAVE 5 BOOKED MY LIFE FOR 10:30 LIKE PAVLOV'S DOG, WHEN I DO 10:30, 6 I ALWAYS DO 10:30. 7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THE FIRST TWO ARE COMING IN AT 10:00. 8 WE WILL HAVE THEM WAIT IF YOU CAN'T MAKE IT. 9 MR. BARENS: DID YOU SET IT AT 10:00 O'CLOCK TOMORROW, 10 YOUR HONOR? 11 THE COURT: WE TOLD THEM TO COME IN AT 10:00 O'CLOCK 12 AND THE OTHERS ARE COMING IN AT 10:30. 13 MR. BARENS: I AM SORRY, YOUR HONOR. I WAS NOT AWARE 14 OF THAT PREVIOUSLY. 1.5 THE COURT: TRY TO MAKE IT AS EARLY AS YOU CAN. 16 MR. BARENS: I WILL, INDEED. 17 I DID WANT TO ASK A QUESTION ON YOUR WAY OUT, JUST 18 A SINGLE QUESTION, YOUR HONOR. 19 (AT 4:32 P.M. AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN 20 UNTIL WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1987 AT 21 10:00 A.M.) 22 23 24 25 26 27