IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR PASCO COUNTY CASE NO. CRC14-0216CFAES

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

VOLUME IX

CURTIS J. REEVES,

Defendant.

PROCEEDINGS:

STAND YOUR GROUND MOTION

DATE:

February 24, 2017

BEFORE:

HONORABLE SUSAN BARTHLE

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

PLACE TAKEN:

Robert D. Sumner Judicial Center

38053 Live Oak Avenue Dade City, FL 33523

REPORTED BY:

Dana L. Stockton, RPR

Notary Public

State of Florida, at Large

PAGES 1014 - 1213

VERBATIM PROFESSIONAL REPORTING, INC. 601 Cleveland Street, Sluite 380, Clearwater, Florida 33755 (727) 442-72828

```
1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
     APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE
 3
     STATE OF FLORIDA
 4
 5
     GLENN L. MARTIN, JR., ESQ
     STACY SUMNER, ESQ
 6
    MANNY GARCIA, ESQ
     Assistant State Attorneys
     Office of Bernie McCabe, State Attorney
 8
     Robert D. Sumner Judicial Center
     38053 Live Oak Avenue
 9
     Dade City, FL 33523
10
11
     APPEARING ON BEHALF OF
     THE DEFENDANT - CURTIS REEVES
12
13
     RICHARD ESCOBAR, ESQ
     DINO MICHAELS, ESQ
14
     RUPAK SHAH, ESQ
     ESCOBAR & ASSOCIATES
15
     2917 West Kennedy Boulevard
     Suite 100
16
     Tampa, Florida 33609
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS	
2		PAGE
3	PROCEEDINGS TAKEN AT COBB THEATER	1017
4	JEFFREY T. HUNTER, JR.	
5	Direct Examination	1037, 1043
6		
7	OPEN COURT PROCEEDINGS	1048
8	DEFENDANT'S CASE	
9	VERNARD ADAMS, M.D.	
10	Direct Examination	1050
11	Cross-Examination	1108
12	Redirect Examination	1122
13	Recross-Examination	1123
14		
15	ALLEN PROCTOR	
16	Direct Examination	1125
17		
18		
19		
20	EXHIBITS	
21	DEFENSE NO. 30	1058
22	DEFENSE NO. 101	1060
23	DEFENSE NO. 99	1076
24	DEFENSE NO. 34	1173
25	DEFENSE NO. 35	1176

1 VOLUME IX 2 (Whereupon, these proceedings were stenographically 3 recorded at Cobb Theater, Wesley Chapel, Florida.) THE COURT: All right. Counsel, let's 4 5 stand over by her. 6 All right. Good morning. Present we have 7 Mr. Martin, Mr. Garcia, Mrs. Sumner for the 8 State. 9 Mr. Thompson, Mr. Robert Kelly, Mr. 10 Escobar, Mr. Michaels and Mr. Shah. 11 MR. ESCOBAR: Stephanie, she's our 12 paralegal. 13 THE COURT: You've been doing a good job, 14 by the way. 15 And we've all had the opportunity to know, 16 first of all, that the Times filed the Motion 17 to Intervene yesterday late, 5:00. 18 And has all counsel -- I know Defense, 19 obviously, has had the opportunity to review 20 that, since I'm holding a response in my hand. 21 You guys, Mr. Martin, Mr. Garcia, have you 22 seen it? 23 MR. MARTIN: We don't have a dog in this. 24 We're out. 25 That's true. You don't care. THE COURT:

1 MR. MARTIN: So we're not saying a word.

THE COURT: Okay. And I have had the opportunity to review the -- briefly, the Defense's response.

Who wants to argue the response?

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we're going to base our argument strictly on what's written. I think it's a pretty clear memorandum. This is a private entity, a private place, and they have limited the media from being able to come in here. So we agree with that and support that.

THE COURT: All right. Is there any way that we can allow the same restrictions, the same scenario, as we do in the courtroom with the media? One camera, no electronics, other than that? Any way possible?

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor -- for the record, Robert Kelly. I'm here for Cobb Theaters today.

We have a real problem. As Your Honor's aware, there's a pending civil lawsuit going on. Until Your Honor just handed me the motion this morning we have never had an opportunity to be heard on this.

We certainly wanted to make the theater

available for Your Honor and for the court

personnel as part of Your Honor's hearing, the

stand your ground matter.

But we certainly have not had an opportunity to brief any of this, to file any objections. This was more of a courtesy requested by the Defense we wanted to extend need of court intervention.

But if we had known it was going to be this kind of commotion for the press, we certainly would have objected to this without a hearing well in advance of this visit.

THE COURT: All right. And that kind of covers a lot of my other questions about, you know, I wish we would have had this ironed out way before today.

I am hesitant to proceed without giving the Times an opportunity to be heard. If, you know -- I know, Mr. Kelly, that obviously your interest -- just as you just said, you haven't had the opportunity to be heard or argue or anything.

Here's -- here's typically how I envision this unfolding. We've got several options. I

can proceed today with the viewing, exclude the media.

I think -- well, I'm not going to do that.

I honestly believe that that is not the correct way to proceed. I'm not a big fan of skipping overdue process in any shape, form or fashion, and I am not going to just blow them off.

I read their motion and they -- the media has a lot of success in these types of scenarios. It's part of our basic

Constitutional rights and threads as a country that everything's in the open and everybody has access to everything nowadays.

And I do feel that this is clearly an evidentiary proceeding. Initially it seemed, you know, well, maybe not. But it is. It is. There's no question.

So the Defense's options at that point, if I cancel the viewing today, because I'm not going to exclude the media entirely, and we'll do this quickly is -- you know, I don't want to get ugly right off the bat.

But if they sincerely need the movie theater's cooperation, they can certainly list the movie theater as a witness and file a

motion to compel. And we could hear that quickly, as well as the Times' motion and, you know, go from there.

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, as the Court well knows, what's paramount to, certainly from my position, is my client's due process rights and my client's proper presentation of a defense in this particular case.

I certainly appreciate the media wanting to be here. That's their job and their business. And I know that there are certainly Constitutional issues that play a role here; however, there is a balancing test.

And what I don't want to happen is what I explained to the Court I didn't want to happen yesterday, and that is, that because of the media and because of their insistence to be here, it's a private location, privately owned, that those owners can exclude the media regardless of the Constitutional issues, that my client will be left out in the verge in a case that is so important to him and a presentation that's so important to him. And I think that presentation is going to be important to everyone in this community.

So I am really, really concerned about that particular issue. I don't think that they have to have a camera in here, first of all.

You know, this is not something that, I think, if they want to maybe come in -- and I haven't spoken to Mr. Kelly, so I don't want to step on anybody's toes, but I'm just talking here. You know, there may be, you know, some middle ground as to maybe having, you know, one or two of the individuals from the media, you know, attend personally.

But I can tell you in Federal court there are no cameras, absolutely no cameras. And so if in Federal court -- we go into Federal court and there are no cameras of any kind, video or otherwise, I am really at odds here as to why we think that in State court that there's some different standard that they get the benefit of.

And so I don't want to step on Mr. Kelly's toes, because he has been very gracious in going and jumping through a lot of hoops, you know, for the Defense and for us to be here.

But this camera and their insistence that they think they can bring a camera into every

1 proceeding is absolutely ludicrous.

So I agree that, you know -- as much as I hate to say this, strictly for the benefit of my client. I agree that the Court should, at the very least, listen to the media.

But I would like to do it today. I would like to do it this morning. I would like to do it right here so that we can get on with this presentation, because we set this presentation in this location of our witnesses for a reason. And we can't, you know, at this point in time, start changing that process because it really destroys our presentation.

And I know the Court's bending over backwards for us, as well, and I appreciate that. I don't want the Court to think I'm not appreciative of any of that.

And I think you can understand where we're coming from. And that, you know, in the State system, for whatever reason, we seem to think that the media can bring in, not only one camera, but 12 cameras. You know, we stop, you know, for every one of their whims. And they don't do that in Federal court. I think the Court knows that.

I go into Federal court and there's not a single camera, there's not a single video.

There's nothing in Federal court. And it's controlled and it's Constitutional and everybody has their rights.

They can do sketches. They've got sketch artists that are very, very good in Federal court. That's what they do, they just sketch away.

That's what I'm going to be asking the Court today. To bring cameras in here would create a circus.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KELLY: Judge, if I may? Just one
other opportunity?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KELLY: In this particular matter my client does not own the land on which this theater sits. There is a landlord. And from the get-go of this instance the media has been relegated to a staging area that is now occupied where Chucky E. Cheese and the Dollar General area are.

So I also feel uncomfortable without having the landlord have an opportunity to be

present in this issue, as well, because we do have media now coming onto their property.

You know, my client was under the impression yesterday afternoon that there would not be media, so we didn't feel a need to have to address that.

If they would prefer none at all, maybe someone has to come in and they don't want to have a full camera set up of what's going on or a reporter feels -- if Your Honor feels that a reporter needs to be here, that's certainly fine.

But they certainly did not want cameras, based upon the landlord's insistence and their corporate position of having a media staging area, and not have the media into the lobby and into the theater without the presence in this fashion.

MR. THOMPSON: If I might interject?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Just to draw a distinction between the Federal system and the State system. According to Florida Rule of Judicial Administration 2.450, the media is allowed to have one pool videographer and one pool digital

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

photographer in a courtroom proceeding.

THE COURT: Yeah, I mean, we're not in the Federal system so that -- I understand the argument. But we're not dealing with that and I'm not going to obviously address that at this time.

What if I entered an order, or we had some sort of a stipulation of whatever? I can order that any -- if a camera was brought in, nothing could be used in the civil suit without a hearing.

And that's -- you know, I know that's the procedure anyways. I'm sure there's been requests already, or if not, I don't know where you're at in the discovery process on that. But typically that comes and you have a couple-hour hearing on, you know, weighing the interest on that.

So that that -- obviously I was thinking about that yesterday, you know, how can I just let the media come in here with that pending. I totally understand.

I have to balance the media's right, if you will, to be present under the Rules with primarily Cobb Theater's private interest.

So if we have to have a hearing on it, I will give -- we'll have a hearing no later than Tuesday. But I -- you know, this is -- I can't help snags that develop in the Defense's case. I'm sure these three prosecutors can tell you, it happens. It happens all the time. And you have to -- you have to recover however you can.

And that -- you know, I just can't get in the middle of that. It's not -- this isn't something that -- I mean, certainly you can put on your case without the theater. Obviously you want that. But I can't just order people to do things. I can't just disregard the media. I just can't. I'm a public servant and I have to follow the law.

MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, if we have to wait until Tuesday. One of the issues that I wanted to address is this administrative rule that supposedly, you know, we think may carry weight over Constitutional issues.

And I think that could be certainly researched relatively quickly and let this media then, you know, have a hearing before the Court some time, hopefully today, if need be, so that we could, you know, get this issue

1 resolved and get this presentation done and 2 then get, you know, the order of my witnesses 3 aligned, you know, with that. I think that to wait until Tuesday to 4 5 decide this issue is, for my preference, very 6 late. 7 THE COURT: Well, my -- I don't care. 8 not having to prepare the briefs and prepare the arguments. But, you know, I'm not going 9 10 to -- we all know due process, I mean, those 11 who are going to have to prepare the briefs and 12 do the argument and get someone up here to 13 argue it, are liable to be screaming about 14 that. 15

And I'm sure Mr. Kelly would like to prepare something, as well. Obviously any decision I make is going to impact the theater, potentially. So, you know --

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, may I have some discussions with Mr. Kelly and see what his feelings are?

THE COURT: Sure.

THE COURT REPORTER: What is your name?

MR. THOMPSON: I'm Stephen, S-T-E-P-H-E-N, Thompson, T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N.

25

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT REPORTER: Who do you represent?

MR. THOMPSON: I'm the public information officer for the Sixth Circuit.

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, I've spoken to Mr. Kelly. And Mr. Kelly, please correct me if I say something that's not correct. You know, I would like to propose that we contact the media for a compromise of them being able to come in but without cameras.

And, you know, that may be a compromise they're willing to accept; otherwise, we're going to have a full-blown battle on this and they may not be able to be in here at all. So we're willing to -- correct, Mr. Kelly?

MR. KELLY: Correct. And that was my client's main concern was having the full video feed.

Obviously, Judge, we feel that there's no need for a reporter to be here. If Your Honor weighs that balancing test differently, we certainly understand. But we would request that a reporter could be here on behalf of the press and need not have a full video link of everything going on.

THE COURT: Can we call?

1 I think what we would have MR. THOMPSON: 2 to do with the television stations is now alert 3 them as to what's going to happen and give them 4 an opportunity to respond. Thus far, the only media entity that has 5 6 objected is the Tampa Bay Times. But when the 7 Tampa Bay Times did that, I'm sure they meant 8 to include their photographer on that. 9 THE COURT: Well, right now we only have 10 11 MR. ESCOBAR: St. Pete Times. 12 THE COURT: Right. 13 MR. THOMPSON: I mean, typically if this 14 were to go down it would be one -- and I know 15 this doesn't jibe with what you want -- but it 16 would be one pool videographer and that's it. 17 There wouldn't be five or six or the balance. 18 There would be one. 19 There would be one digital photographer, 20 two people in the back corner and one or two 21 fellows with notebooks and pads and that would 22 be it. 23 Judge, the only issue before MR. ESCOBAR: 24 the Court today is the St. Pete Times. We're

not -- in fact, I can tell you that Good

Morning America approached me yesterday and said, Rich, we just wanted to let you know, we're going to reach out to our lawyers. I 4 don't know what we're going to do but, you know, we may be filing a motion.

obviously have not.

The only one that has filed a motion is the St. Pete Times. And the St. Pete Times doesn't come in here, okay, with videos. may come in here with a camera.

But I am sure that if we contact the St. Pete Times, which is the only issue right now, those people over there, they have not objected to the issue.

My suggestion would be, let's not go ahead and start inviting everyone that's out there now to write their own motions and their own litigation when it's not at issue here. That would be horrible to do.

If the St. Pete Times has filed a motion. We could call the St. Pete Times and say, they can come in. They can come in and sit in the auditorium without a camera and without a photo. That's it.

MR. THOMPSON: Here's the thing.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

this motion was filed, I alerted all the media organizations as to what was going to happen today, because they're all interested in it.

So I told them that there would be a decision this morning as to whether Cobb

Theater would let folks in and then there would be a hearing if Cobb denied them.

MR. MARTIN: Is the St. Pete Times lawyer here?

THE COURT: No.

MR. KELLY: Judge, I'm -- not to be disrespectful, I am trying to e-mail and text my client. They are willing to offer a compromised position of the press coming in with no cameras, no cell phone, video, but they can attend. They just don't want to -- their real problem is the actual video recordings that are of concern.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's see if they'll accept that.

MR. THOMPSON: I can call Allison Steel -THE COURT: Yeah, call Allison Steel.

MR. THOMPSON: -- and say Bob is willing to have one guy with a notebook and a pen and no photographer.

1 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, I don't think 2 that's what Bob -- is that what you're saying? 3 The media can come in, just without cameras? THE COURT: 4 Right. Well, don't limit it 5 to one but, I mean, we don't want 50. We could 6 have a representative. 7 MR. THOMPSON: Is it okay with you if the 8 media comes in --9 MR. ESCOBAR: Without cameras, without 10 photos, without anything that memorializes it, 11 other than their pen and pencils. 12 THE COURT: Right. No electronics. See 13 if they'll accept that. 14 MR. THOMPSON: All right. What I'll do is first I'll call Allison Steel --15 16 MR. ESCOBAR: And tell her that we're all 17 trying to be very, very accommodating. 18 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. I'll call Allison 19 Steel. No cameras, no videographer and I'll 20 get an okay from her and then I'll drive over 21 there and let them know. 22 THE COURT: All right. 23 MR. THOMPSON: If you can give me 10 24 minutes. 25 MR. ESCOBAR: Can I drive over there with

1 you? 2 MR. THOMPSON: I have a Honda Civic. 3 MR. ESCOBAR: Okay. I can drive over 4 there. 5 Your Honor, can I be excused? 6 THE COURT: Sure. Thanks, Mr. Kelly. 7 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we have agreed 8 with the media. Can you hear me? 9 THE MEDIA: Yes. 10 MR. ESCOBAR: We've agreed with the media 11 that there will be one photographer, who is 12 standing there, that will take five photos of 13 you as you're seated in seat Number 9 in the 14 very back row, which is the seat that 15 Mr. Reeves was seated in. 16 After those five photos are taken, he will 17 leave the premises. He will put a camera and 18 any recording equipment in his car. He will be 19 allowed to come back in. 20 None of the rest of the reporting group 21 will have anything other than their pens and 22 their pads in order to memorialize the event. 23 They will not have cameras and they can't take 24 any still shots or video of any sort. 25

They have agreed to that and we're

appreciative for the media reaching a meeting of the minds in this particular case.

THE COURT: Absolutely. All right. While we're here on the record, we have everybody present again. Mr. Kelly from the Cobb -- represents the Cobb Theater, the prosecutors, the Defense team.

We're all going to go inside. This is a view. There's not going to be any argument or -- you know, we're going to view and be on our way. We really need to be mindful of the theater's time, as well.

MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, the only thing we're going to have to do, Mr. Martin and I are going to go up to the area where they're going to be setting up the lighting and setting up the volume level for the previews.

Once that is done and the disk has been given to the individual that's going to play it, then we will come back down. I believe -- Steve, we were talking about where they're going to be sitting. We talked about that.

The reporters are going to be seated at the very back of the theater, but not in the center section. They're going to be seated to

the right and to the left in that very back row so that they don't disturb anything that's happening with the Court and the Court's viewing of the previews.

THE COURT: All right. And so procedure-wise, we're going to go in. Am I going to go directly to the seat or --

MR. ESCOBAR: Yes. Mr. Michaels will direct you to that. Mr. Martin will then, when we come back down, verify that he agrees that that is the seat that Mr. Reeves was seated in. So we'll put that on the record so that we have a record that everybody's in position and ready to go.

THE COURT: All right. So the only real issues we're going to have on the record is going to be that indication that I'm seated in the same seat. And does -- you know, while we don't have anybody to talk about the lighting but you're going to have --

MR. ESCOBAR: We're going to memorialize that with the court reporter upstairs.

THE COURT: All right. So let's keep, you know, all our discussions to a minimum. We can argue and talk and elaborate once we get back

1 in the courtroom. But just a minimal for 2 direction and, you know, being where we're 3 supposed to be. 4 MR. ESCOBAR: Thank you, Your Honor, for 5 waiting for us and having this. THE COURT: 6 Thank you for arranging 7 everything. I really appreciate the Cobb 8 Theater hosting this -- not hosting it, but 9 allowing us. 10 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Judge. 11 THE COURT: And the media, as well. 12 All right. Let's get it done. 13 MR. ESCOBAR: Okay. We're back on the record. 14 15 (Whereupon, this testimony was taken in the 16 projection booth for Auditorium Number 10.) 17 JEFFREY THOMAS HUNTER, JUNIOR, 18 Thereupon, the witness herein, being first duly 19 sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 22 **Q**. Please state your full name. 23 Jeffrey Thomas Hunter, Junior. Α. 24 And Mr. Hunter, can you tell us just Q. 25 briefly what your position is here with Cobb

1 | Theater?

- A. I'm the field service technician for Cobb Theaters.
- Q. Okay. We are going to now be setting the lighting in the -- in the numerical or numbered order that it is set for previews at the Cobb Theater, the same one that it would have been set for January 13th of 2014. What level is that?
 - A. That is called mid-one.
- Q. Okay. And how is it that we set mid-one on your system?
- A. Right here we have a control panel. You can see it's labeled. The second button from the top is mid-one.

At that point you can see lights are dimming inside the auditorium. The two -- I should say the three relevant zones would be the wall sconces on the -- that are mounted on the side of the wall, those are set to 60 percent.

You have the high ceiling lights, which are the ceiling can lights that are located above the lower level seats, and that is set at also a 60 percent.

And then finally you have the low ceiling lights, which are the lights located in the center

1 bistro above those seats, and those are set at 2 60 percent. 3 0. The noise level of the previews themselves. 4 Α. Okay. The previews --6 I call it noise level. I probably should 7 call it volume. 8 Α. Volume. Over there we have our digital 9 cinema processor. It is a Dolby CP650. During the 10 trailers it is - the input format is set to U-1 and 11 the volume level is set to 4.5. That is on a scale 12 of 10. 13 That's Umbrella 1? MR. SHAH: 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. U-1. 15 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 16 Q. Can you go ahead and set that now? 17 I can. Α. 18 MR. ESCOBAR: Okay. Just for the record, 19 he has pressed U-1 and the reading on the Dolby 20 system reads 4.5. 21 Do you agree, Mr. Martin? 22 MR. MARTIN: I agree that's what it says. 23 MR. ESCOBAR: And just for the record, I 24 see that on the level -- lighting level the 25 mid-one is, in fact, pressed.

1 Do you agree with that, Mr. Martin? 2 MR. MARTIN: It is pressed. 3 MR. ESCOBAR: And both of us saw him 4 actually use the other apparatus, which is called --5 6 THE WITNESS: That is a Lutron GRAFIK eye. 7 MR. ESCOBAR: To set it at the appropriate 8 settings; is that correct, Mr. Martin? 9 MR. MARTIN: He used the device. 10 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 11 So the next step is just to place the DVD 12 into the system and play. If you could wait on 13 that. 14 Α. Okay. 15 MR. ESCOBAR: Mr. Shah will be here during 16 that process. Someone can step into the 17 CineBistro area and ask us when we're ready, 18 and I will go down to general. 19 I would imagine Mr. Martin would want to 20 come with me to general, as well as the court 21 reporter. 22 This ends the proceedings for the -- what room is this called? 23 24 THE WITNESS: This is the projection booth 25 for Auditorium Number 10.

MR. ESCOBAR: Okay. So we are now leaving 1 2 the projection room for Auditorium Number 10. 3 AUDITORIUM NUMBER 10 4 MR. ESCOBAR: Just our stipulation that 5 it's the ninth seat. Do you want to count 6 them? 7 MR. MARTIN: I have it at -- A, B, C, D, 8 E, F, G, H, I -- yeah. 9 MR. ESCOBAR: Okay. I have to do the same 10 thing. Okay. Back on the record. 11 Mr. Martin and myself, Richard Escobar, 12 Glenn Martin and Rick Escobar, are stipulating 13 to the fact that the Honorable Judge Barthle is 14 seated in Seat 9, which would have been the 15 seat that Mr. Reeves was seated in on 16 January 13th of 2014 at the time of this 17 incident. 18 Do you agree with that, Mr. Martin? 19 MR. MARTIN: Yes. 20 THE COURT: One other thing. Right now I 21 am assuming these lights are as bright as they 22 get? 23 MR. MARTIN: I wouldn't assume that. 24 MR. ESCOBAR: No. I wouldn't assume that. 25 But they're going to do the -- they're going to

1 put on the preview lights. 2 THE COURT: Okay. But this is not how the 3 lights were at the time --MR. ESCOBAR: No. 4 No. MR. MARTIN: No. It was not. 5 6 MR. ESCOBAR: No. When the actual preview 7 starts, that is when you'll be able to 8 experience that lighting. And you'll see that 9 on -- there's going to be sconces here. There 10 are sconces here that are not on. And you'll 11 see that some of that will be going on. 12 You'll see the camera up there. And 13 there's another camera right up there in 14 between the --15 THE COURT: Oh, okay. 16 MR. ESCOBAR: -- two speakers. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MR. ESCOBAR: That is what we refer to as 19 camera number 12. This is what we refer to as 20 camera number 11. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Got it. 22 MR. ESCOBAR: Okay. We're going to go up 23 and re-document the lighting and then we'll 24 come down again. 25 PROJECTION BOOTH AUDITORIUM 10

1 JEFFERY THOMAS HUNTER, JUNIOR, 2 Thereupon, the witness herein, being first duly 3 sworn, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 5 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 6 0. Full name for the record. 7 Α. My name is Jeffery Thomas Hunter, Junior. 8 Q. And Mr. Hunter, what is your position here 9 with Cobb Theaters? 10 I am the field service technician. Α. 11 Would you please place the lighting level Q. 12 in the lighting level that would be on during the 13 previews on January 13th, 2014. 14 For the record, he is pressing a button on an item that's called mid-one; is that correct? 15 16 That is correct. 17 Would you then press whatever other Q. 18 controls you press after pressing mid-one in order 19 to make the adjustments to have the same experience 20 as January 13, 2014? 21 That is already in place. If you would Α. 22 like me to, I can reverify the light levels. 23 Please reverify. Q. 24 There are three lights right now Α. Okay. 25 that are on. Three different zones that are on

1 inside the auditorium. The first are the wall sconces. 2 Those are 3 the lights that are mounted on the side wall of the 4 auditorium. Those are set at 60 percent. 5 Then you have the high ceiling can lights. 6 Those are located above the lower level seats. 7 Those are set at 60 percent. 8 And finally, you have the low ceiling can 9 lights that are located above the CineBistro 10 seating, and those are also set at 60 percent. 11 MR. ESCOBAR: Let the record reflect that 12 he has pressed all three of those buttons in 13 order to reflect his testimony here today. 14 Do you agree with that, Mr. Martin? 15 MR. MARTIN: Yes. 16 MR. ESCOBAR: That he pressed mid-one and 17 the remaining buttons in order to make happen 18 what he's just indicated on the record. 19 MR. MARTIN: Yes. 20 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 21 Okay. What about the volume level of the 0. 22 previews? 23 That is a Dolby CP650. It is our sound Α. 24 processor. During the trailers, during the 25 previews, it is set to U-1, and the volume level is

```
1
     set to 4.5, that is out of temp.
 2
          Q.
               And you have set that and it is in place?
 3
          Α.
               Yes.
 4
               MR. ESCOBAR: Is that correct, Mr. Martin?
               MR. MARTIN: Yes.
 5
 6
               MR. ESCOBAR: Can we stipulate that it's
 7
          all in place; is that correct?
 8
               MR. MARTIN:
                            That's correct.
 9
               MR. ESCOBAR: Okay.
10
     BY MR. ESCOBAR:
11
               Is that all that we need to do, other than
12
     placing the actual disk in your disk player, your
13
     DVD?
14
          Α.
               Yes.
15
          Q.
               That's it. Okay. We are going to leave
16
     you --
17
               Well, if you want, I can turn on the
          Α.
18
    projector lamp. Is that necessary?
19
               MR. MARTIN: You've got to have it on to
20
          play the CD, do you?
21
     BY MR. ESCOBAR:
22
          Q.
               Yeah. Can you do it right now?
23
               Yeah, I didn't know if that needed to be
          Α.
24
     on the record or not. That's just a button being
25
    pressed here.
```

Q. Okay. Go ahead and do whatever you normally do.

- A. This turns on the lamp.
- Q. Is it on now?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- A. It is currently on right now.
- Q. I see the light lit up in green.
- A. This is the light lit up in green. And then this right here that says douser. This is a metal plate inside of the projector that blocks the light from reaching the back of the lens.

I'm now going to press that button. And now a light is going through the lens onto the screen.

- Q. Okay. The remaining process is just to put the DVD in?
- A. The remaining process is just to put the DVD in and to switch the projector over to button number seven. This is different from how it would have been on the day of the incident.
 - Q. Because of the digital issue?
- A. Yeah, because of the digital issue.

MR. ESCOBAR: Okay. We're out of here.

Thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

24 AUDITORIUM 10

MR. MARTIN: The stenographer, she doesn't

1 have to take down the audio of the trailers and 2 all that stuff? 3 MR. ESCOBAR: No. She does not. And 4 we'll stipulate --5 MR. MARTIN: And would you put on the 6 record what exhibit number we're going to play 7 or whatever it is? MR. ESCOBAR: Exhibit Number 6. And we 8 9 are about to play it. I believe they're giving 10 us about five minutes for that process. 11 And, no, you do not have to -- if the 12 Court is okay with it --13 THE COURT: I'm fine. 14 MR. ESCOBAR: -- you do not have to record 15 on your stenographer machine the process. 16 (Whereupon, it was stipulated that the previews 17 would not be stenographically recorded.) 18 MR. ESCOBAR: For the record, the previews 19 were played in their entirety. Do you agree, 20 Mr. Martin? 21 MR. MARTIN: Yes. 22 THE COURT: All right. We're on the 23 Quick question. Is that the door that record. 24 Mrs. Turner held open in the back, anybody? 25 Mr. Michaels, is that the exit door down there?

```
1
               MR. MICHAELS: This is the exit door.
2
          That's the one that she indicated on the
 3
          photograph.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. And ex-boyfriend jumped
          from where, somewhere down here?
 5
 6
               MR. MICHAELS:
                              Somewhere down there.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. And that's the yellow
8
          rails we saw in the pictures. And the
 9
          witnesses were put in these seats over here,
10
          correct? I'm pointing to the left side of the
11
          theater.
12
               MR. MICHAELS: Yes, Your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: All right. Anybody else have
14
          anything? All right. I think we are good.
15
          Let's get back to the courthouse.
16
     (Whereupon, the portions taken at the movie theater
17
    have been concluded.)
18
    RECESS
19
    OPEN COURT
20
               THE COURT: Good afternoon, everybody.
21
               MR. MARTIN: Judge, just one quick
22
          announcement.
23
               THE COURT: Okay.
24
               MR. MARTIN: I've had discussions with Mr.
25
          Escobar. Apparently, during the testimony of
```

1 Dr. Adams there may be some demonstrative aids 2 used to assist in his testimony. 3 We've agreed that I could preserve his 4 demonstrative aid as it changes with the 5 mannequin with my camera so I can discuss it 6 with my Medical Examiner. 7 So with the Court's permission, if I may 8 do that, there will be no flash. I will not 9 disrupt the flow. It will be upon me to stay 10 out of the way and do what I need to do. But 11 with the Court's permission, if I can do that, 12 I would appreciate it. 13 THE COURT: That's just fine, Mr. Martin. 14 I don't care about cameras in here. I think 15 somebody else makes those rules. 16 MR. MARTIN: Just to let you know what we 17 were doing. Of course, if Mr. Escobar wants to 18 say anything. 19 MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, he can also get it on 20 YouTube probably tomorrow, because every day's 21 on YouTube. 22 THE COURT: I'm glad to know that. MR. MARTIN: 23 So if it's on the Internet, 24 it has to be true, right? 25

THE COURT:

Absolutely. All right.

1 get started then. 2 MR. MICHAELS: Judge, can I just have one 3 minute? I'm struggling with a piece of 4 evidence. I didn't know it was several pieces. 5 THE COURT: Oh, that's always nice to find 6 out. 7 MR. MICHAELS: Maybe I can have my 8 colleague, Mr. Shah. He's younger than me and 9 more technically savvy. 10 THE COURT: He's been the whiz. He's got 11 to hold the evidence and be in charge of that 12 earlier and manages to get things bugged in and 13 running when they need to be. 14 MR. MICHAELS: In that case, we'll call 15 Dr. Vernard Adams. Defense calls Dr. Adams. 16 THE COURT: All right. 17 (Whereupon, the witness was sworn.) 18 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 19 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, Judge. 20 VERNARD ADAMS, 21 Thereupon, the witness herein, being first duly 22 sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 23 DIRECT EXAMINATION 24 BY MR. MICHAELS: 25 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Adams. Please state

1 your name for the record. 2 Α. My name is Vernard Adams. 3 MR. MICHAELS: The court reporter already 4 has his spelling from earlier. Your Honor, may I approach the witness? 5 6 THE COURT: You may. 7 MR. MICHAELS: And I'm handing the witness 8 what is at this point is the Defense's Exhibit 9 104, which is Dr. Adams' CV. It's been 10 stipulated to with the entering of it into 11 evidence. 12 But while I begin my direct examination, I 13 would like for him to have it in case he has to 14 reference it at any point. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 BY MR. MICHAELS: 17 Dr. Adams, how are you employed? 0. 18 I'm self-employed as a consultant. Α. 19 And what sort of consultant are you? 0. 20 Α. I'm a consultant to litigation attorneys 21 and I appear as an expert witness when that's 22 required. 23 And what is your profession? Q. 24 Α. I'm a forensic pathologist. 25 And is that your field of expertise in Q.

terms of your consulting business?

A. Yes, it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

21

22

23

24

- Q. Let's talk about your education. What is your undergraduate degree in?
- A. My undergraduate degree was from the University of Maine at Orono, and it's a Bachelor's degree in chemistry.
- Q. And did you receive any honors as a result of obtaining that undergraduate degree?
- A. Yes. And here I'm going to have to refer to the CV because it's been a while.
- Q. 1975?
- A. Yes. Highest distinction and High Honors
 and Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Kappa Phi.
 - Q. Where did you go to medical school?
- 16 A. Tufts in Boston.
- 17 Q. What year did you graduate medical school?
- 18 A. 1979.
- Q. Tell the Court about your residency and your fellowship training.
 - A. After medical school I trained in pathology for six years. The first year was in anatomic and clinical pathology at the New England Medical Center in Boston, which is now known as the Tuft's Medical Center.

And then I went to Minnesota and spent four years at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, trained in anatomical and clinical pathology, two years each.

And then the final year was in forensic pathology at the Dade County Medical Examiner's office in Miami, in conjunction with the University of Miami.

- Q. Tell the Court about your work history, if you would, please.
- A. After I finished training, I went to work for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and I did that for two years working principally at Worcester based at the University of Massachusetts with some occasional work in Boston. So my title was Medical Examiner, and I had an academic appointment at the University of Massachusetts.

After that I went to Suffolk County, which is eastern, three quarters of Long Island, New York, and was a Deputy Medical Examiner there for just under two years. And I followed my boss, at that time, Dr. Charles Hirsch, into New York City when he took the chief job there when Elliot Gross left that chief job. And I spent a little over two-and-a-half years helping Dr. Hirsch get that office started.

And then I went to Tampa to become the Chief Medical Examiner in 1991. I did that for 21 years. And then I got a call from a woman that I trained with at Mayo, way back, and she asked if I was ready for a change.

And so I was a professor for three years at West Virginia University in Morgantown and taught residents how to do autopsies and write their reports, trained pathologist assistant students and gave them medical student lectures in cardiovascular pathology.

And at the conclusion of those three years, I returned to Tampa in 2015 and ramped up my consulting practice. I had always done some consulting on the side, as far as back as 1989.

- Q. And have you held any teaching positions?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Would you tell the Court about some of those?
- A. Well, I mentioned the one in

 Massachusetts. And Long Island, I had an

 appointment at Stonybrook State University at

 Stonybrook. All the Medical Examiner's offices had

 academic affiliations.

In New York City it was New York

1 University. And then in Tampa at the University of 2 South Florida.

And in Tampa I established a training

program, which initially was sponsored by

Hillsborough County. And then in the late '90s the

sponsorship was taken over by the University of

South Florida, so we were training one forensic

pathologist per year. And that program is still

ongoing.

And at this time I have no academic appointments. The last one was full professor at WVU.

- Q. And do you have any board certifications?
- 14 A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

16

17

- 15 | O. What are those?
 - A. In anatomic and clinical pathology and forensic pathology.
- Q. And are you currently licensed to practice medicine here in the State of Florida?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Have you been published? Have you
 written, for instance, chapters in books that are
 peer reviewed?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Approximately, how many publications?

A. A little over 20 articles, book chapters.

Let's see. Okay. Articles would be about 25; book chapters, 11. And then there were four educational publications and then some miscellaneous publications, including practice guidelines for Florida Medical Examiners. I was involved with that from the inception and right through the last iteration in 2010.

- Q. Tell us about the practice guidelines for Medical Examiner's, what is that?
- A. They're an extension of the Florida

 Administrative Code, because the Florida Medical

 Examiner's Commission has adopted them and

 incorporated them by reference into the code. So

 they form an extension to the Medical Examiner's Act

 Chapter 406 and Chapter 11G of the Florida

 Administrative Code. And they further delineate

 what the acceptable practice guidelines are for

 forensic pathologists working as Medical Examiners

 in Florida.
- Q. And now as a Medical Examiner -- an Assistant Medical Examiner, how many autopsies do you think you've performed in your career?
- A. Well, over the course of years, including cases I did when I was a trainee, it's 6,800.

In Hillsborough County, it would have been

Q. And of those, what percentage would be

- 2 homicides, if you know or if you can approximate?
- 4 about 10 percent. In New York City, probably
- 5 30 percent. So overall, I'm going to guess about
- 6 | 10 percent.

Α.

3

7

20

- Q. So about 10 percent of 6,800?
- A. Ten percent, 15 percent, somewhere in there. Yes.
- 10 Q. So over 500, at the very least?
- 11 A. Somewhere around there.
- Q. And of those homicides, what percentage could you approximate would be of gunshot wounds?
- 14 A. The majority.
- Q. And have you ever been qualified to
 testify -- I know it sounds like a funny -- a silly
 question, but have you ever been qualified to
 testify as an expert in the field of pathology in a
 court of law?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And approximately how many times?
- A. I don't keep track, but I consistently give an estimate of about 300 times.
- Q. And is that in State court?
- 25 A. State court and Federal court.

1 Judge, at this point I MR. MICHAELS: 2 would tender Dr. Adams as an expert, a medical 3 doctor, in forensic pathology. 4 THE COURT: Any objection? MR. MARTIN: Court's discretion. 5 6 THE COURT: All right. I'll allow him to 7 testify about the subject that he's here to 8 testify about. 9 MR. MICHAELS: Your Honor, may I approach 10 the witness? 11 THE COURT: You may. 12 At this time I would move MR. MICHAELS: into evidence what's marked as Defense Exhibit 13 104, and it's Court Exhibit Number 30. 14 15 (Whereupon, Defense Exhibit 30 was admitted.) 16 BY MR. MICHAELS: 17 Now, you were hired as a consultant by 0. 18 Escobar and Associates in this particular case; is 19 that true? 20 Α. Yes. 21 And what sort of information -- what **Q**. 22 materials were provided to you? 23 I had the autopsy report on Mr. Oulsen. Α. 24 Is that an autopsy report that was Q. 25 authored by Dr. Thogmartin in Pinellas/Pasco County?

```
1
               Yes, it is.
                            I had the records of Pasco
          Α.
 2
     Fire Rescue, some reports and notes from the Florida
 3
     Department of Law Enforcement crime laboratory.
 4
          0.
               And are those ballistic reports that
 5
     you're speaking of?
 6
               Yes.
                     There was also some inventory of
 7
     evidence. And I had the deposition transcript of
 8
     Dr. Thogmartin.
 9
          Q.
               Did you also review photographs?
10
               I reviewed photographs from the autopsy
          Α.
11
     and photographs taken of Mrs. Oulsen.
12
               Of her hand?
          0.
13
          Α.
               Yes.
14
               Okay. Any other materials that you
          Q.
15
     reviewed in preparation for your testimony?
16
               I don't think so.
17
               Okay. Now, let's talk about Dr.
          Ο.
18
     Thogmartin's report. Do you agree or disagree with
19
     him, in terms of what the manner of death is?
20
          Α.
               I agree.
21
               Now, let's look at, if we can -- Mr. Shah?
          Q.
22
               MR. MICHAELS: Your Honor, may I approach?
23
               THE COURT:
                           You may.
```

Dr. Adams, I'm showing you what has been

24

25

BY MR. MICHAELS:

Q.

1 marked for Defense Exhibit purposes as Exhibit 101. 2 Are you familiar with those photographs? 3 Α. Yes. 4 And is that part of the group of materials 5 you described that you used in your preparation for 6 today's testimony and your preparation in terms of 7 being able to render an opinion to this Court? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Your Honor, at this time I MR. MICHAELS: 10 would move in -- I know the State doesn't have 11 an objection to evidence, Defense Exhibit 101, 12 for purposes of the record. And I'll get a 13 sticker, if I may bring it back to Mr. Shah so 14 we can publish it. 15 (Whereupon, Defense Exhibit Number 101 was 16 admitted.) 17 THE COURT: These are photos? 18 MR. MICHAELS: These are the photographs 19 that are on the thumb drive, as we've done with 20 all of them. 21 May I approach the witness? 22 THE COURT: You may. 23 MR. MICHAELS: Thank you. 24 MR. MARTIN: What's the amended evidence 25 number, Judge?

1 THE COURT: Thirty-one. 2 MR. MICHAELS: Thirty-one. So the 3 previous one was 30? 4 THE COURT: Yes, sir. MR. MARTIN: I heard 37, for some reason. 5 6 THE CLERK: It's 30. 7 MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Madam Clerk. 8 THE CLERK: You're welcome. 9 BY MR. MICHAELS: 10 This is JPEG Number 17. Do you recognize 11 that photo? It's up there on the screen. 12 Α. Okay. 13 MR. MICHAELS: Can we zoom that in at all, 14 Mr. Shah? Okay. Hold on. Move back a little 15 bit, please. Okay. 16 Your Honor, may I have the doctor step 17 down? 18 THE COURT: You may. 19 BY MR. MICHAELS: 20 Doctor, I see we have two wounds. 21 talk about the top one. Tell the Court what you can 22 tell the Court about the top wound. What are we 23 looking at there? 24 It might be better if we start with the 25 other photograph that shows the location of these.

Q. Okay. Move that, please.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A. All right. So this is more of a

bird's-eye view of the same wounds. And this is

showing the chest, the shoulders and the upper

extremities from the front. And the photograph that

was first displayed is just a closeup of these two

wounds.

The upper wound is an abrasion. That is a scraping. This is not a gunshot wound. It's just a scrape. And it's dark like that because the ooze that has come out of it has dried and when it dries it turns dark. This wound, the one that's closest to the ruler --

- Q. Now before we get to that, that second wound, Doctor --
 - A. Sure.
- Q. -- the top wound, what is -- can you determine what the cause of that particular wound is?
- A. It was caused by impact with a blunt object.
- Q. All right. And I think Dr. Thogmartin had the opinion that --
- MR. MARTIN: Excuse me, Judge. That is not proper Cross, pinning one expert against

another. He can ask his opinion. And that's an inappropriate cross to say Dr. Thogmartin had this opinion, what do you think about that.

MR. MICHAELS: Judge, I think he's putting the cart before the horse. Dr. Adams agrees with Dr. Thogmartin.

MR. MARTIN: It doesn't matter. That's not the way we do -- that's not the way we use another expert's report.

THE COURT: All right. Let's just stick to the questions. Thank you.

BY MR. MICHAELS:

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. What is your opinion in terms of what may have caused that?
- A. You mean more specifically than a blunt object?
 - O. Yes.
- A. It could be a secondary missile, a piece of lead that's shaved off the bullet that produced this wound. It could have been a button. It could be from somehow connected with resuscitation efforts.
- Q. Okay. So that wound didn't affect the manner of death; can we agree or disagree?
 - A. I agree with that.

Q. Okay. Now, you want to speak of the second wound. Let's talk that.

A. The other wound, the one that's more red here and close to the ruler, is a gunshot wound entrance. And the hair has been shaved for the purposes of photography, I assume by the Medical Examiner, although it's possible that it was shaved during life. I don't know. But it's shaved.

So you can see a little bit of stubble.

The red part here is subcutaneous collagen. That is the dermis, and subcutaneous fat stained with blood.

And along the margin of the wound is a darker red area here, here and here, and that is abraded skin, that's the margin of abrasion or abrasion collar, which is typical of a gunshot wound entrance.

Over here are a couple red dots, and I'm pointing to the left side of the photograph, the right side of the decedent. That could be artifactor shaving, or it could be a couple of stipples from gunpowder flakes that made it through the clothing. I don't have an opinion on that.

- Q. Why is the wound in a triangular shape; what would cause that?
 - A. If you look between those tags of abraded

skin here -- for instance, over here there's no abrasion, and that's where a micro-tear, a little laceration occurred. The skin tore right between the abraded sections. So it made the wound gape open larger than the hole produced by the bullet.

And that accounts also for the roughly triangular shape of the wound, because there are a couple of other small lacerations. There's one here. There's one here at about 3:00 and 4:00.

- Q. And what are we looking at there, Doctor?
- A. This is a closeup photograph of the same gunshot wound, and it shows a little bit of that nondescriptive abrasion. So can you more clearly see these areas where the skin is abraded on the edge here at 5:00, 4:00 and from 12:00, to say, 2:00 and a little bit down by 7:00.

In this area here, in your mind's eye, if you re-approximate those two skin margins and close the wound up, it becomes smaller and it's no longer triangular. And there's a little tear, a tiny little tear, there are tiny little tears here and here.

And then in the middle this beveled look and dark red area down here, that's the depth of the wound as far as the camera can see or the eye can

1 see. 2 And that's the entry point of the Q. 3 projectile? 4 Α. Yes. This is an entrance quishot wound. 5 Ο. What happened once the projectile entered 6 the body at that point? 7 It went through the left fourth rib and Α. 8 the fourth intercostal space, which is between the fourth and fifth ribs. It then perforated the 9 10 pericardial sac, which is the sac that encloses the 11 heart. 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It then perforated the heart, going through the right ventricle and the right atrium.

And the last part of the wound path was the lower lobe of the right lung.

- Q. So in layman's terms, demonstrating on me, where did the bullet go in?
- To the left of the anterior midline over Α. the fourth rib, and then it's going through the heart and it's going front to back and it's going a little bit from left to right and ending up in the lower lobe of the right lung.
- Okay. Mr. Shah reminded me, this is JPEG Q. 18. Okay. What are we looking at here, Doctor?
 - Α. This is the right hand and wrist of

Mr. Oulsen. And this red divot on the wrist is a gunshot wound, a grazing gunshot wound. And all these purple and red and dark purple dots comprise gunpowder stippling.

So this grazing wound is on the radial aspect of the wrist, which means it's the side of the wrist that has the base of the thumb. And the wound direction is clearly indicated by the gunpowder stippling as coming from your side to behind the screen. So this part that you see is the entrance part of this trough-like or gutter-like wound.

And all these stipels, these red marks, are little divots that are made in the skin by flakes of unburned or partially burned gunpowder. Some of them no longer have the flakes. Those would be the red ones. And the ones that look dark purple with black surrounded by a violet color, those are probably flakes of gunpowder that did not wash out. They often fall out -- they easily fall out during transport, but some of them stayed in, I think.

So this is a medium-density pattern of gunpowder stippling.

Q. And what does that mean? Before we get there, in your career certainly you've had an

opportunity to observe stippling?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And stippling patterns?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And have you rendered opinions regarding the distance of muzzle to target in cases involving stippling?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And in your opinion what distance are we talking about in this particular case with this particular hand?
- A. Outside limits would be more than two inches and up to 15 inches. But because this is medium density and not sparse, it's probably not up near 15 inches. It's probably less than 10.

And because the FDLE report indicated that soot went out to six inches, and there's no soot on the hand, this is more than two inches and it might be well more than two inches.

So it's in the range of intermediate range or close range. It's the same term. Two terms of same thing. This is somewhere in the middle. It's not so close to two inches and it's not close to 15. It's somewhere in the middle. Less than the length of an arm.

1 Now, Doctor, let me ask you -- by the way, Q. 2 is that photograph better for you to indicate these 3 on or are you okay here? This is fine. 4 Α. 5 Ο. Okay. Now, I noticed that the pattern of 6 stippling that you described is concentrated towards 7 the low -- the hand that -- on the side of the small 8 finger, the pinkie finger. What is that indicative 9 of to you? 10 If you could put your right hand up here 11 horizontally, and I'm going to rotate your arm a bit 12 like this. So now you still have the bullet grazing 13 across the radial part of the wrist. 14 0. Let's do it this way so the Judge can see 15 it. 16 THE COURT: I can see it. 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: I was trying to line it up with the photograph.

If you had turned your hand completely this way, all that gunpowder would be striking the ulnar edge of the hand, not the radial edge.

If he had turned this way, all the gunpowder would be striking the radial aspect, basically the thumb.

If it's up and down like this, you would expect a uniform pattern over the back of the hand. But As he pointed out, it's a little bit more dense down here, down here at the base of the little finger. And you can account for that simply by rotating the hand with respect to the trajectory of the bullet.

BY MR. MICHAELS:

- Q. Now, I noticed there's some darker areas here within that area that you indicated was stippling. What is that?
- A. Most likely the dark dots represent flakes of gunpowder that are still under the epidermis.
- Q. And the wound that's indicated here, the trenching or gutter wound, is that all skin, is that what we're talking about, all flesh through there?

 Does it appear to have struck any bones that you can see?
- A. According to Dr. Thogmartin, it grazed across an extensor tendon supplying the index finger, but it did not penetrate any bones. It just went through soft-tissue skin and subcutaneous soft tissue.
- Q. As we look closely here on the fingers, at least the two that we can see that are towards the

area of the hand that has the stippling, I don't see any stippling there. What would that be indicative of --

- A. Having no stippling on the fingers would indicate that the fingers are either curled out of the way when the muzzle is discharged or that there's something blocking or capturing the gunpowder, a shadow effect.
- Q. In your opinion, do you agree or disagree that what we see here is indicative of -- potentially is indicative of an individual making a fist?
 - A. It's consistent with that.
- Q. Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't give you that number either, Judge. It's JPEG 24. We just looked at.

The next one is 32, same hand. We get a better look at the fingers that I talked about. How is this photograph useful in your analysis, Doctor?

A. In this photo you can appreciate the trough-like nature of this grazing wound because the wrist and hand are aligned so that the wound is actually lined up so that the camera lens is mimicking the position of the muzzle.

And that means that this hand and wrist

are rotated enough to make this trough-like appearance accentuated, and so it's also bringing the -- rotating the hand, just like I did with Mr. Michaels' hand, to bring the hand up and show how the stippling is concentrated more up on this part of the hand.

- Q. Now, based on this injury, as well as the entry wound, how would they have to line up? What sort of position would the hand have to be in, the front of thorax, in other words, or where?
- A. Right. The right hand would have to be in front of the chest. If you have the entrance wound on the left fourth intercostal space, left fourth rib, then the hand has to be in front. And if you vary the distance, then you're going to vary the density of stippling. The density becomes greater and the extent of stippling is narrower. As it's closer to the muzzle, it gets sparser and more widely distributed as it's closer to the chest.

So it's going to be somewhere in front of the chest with the back of the hand presenting toward the muzzle.

Q. Okay. If you could turn towards me.

Please show me that position again where you just indicated to the Court where the hand would have to

be. Now, you have your fingers out, which is probably not likely in this scenario. Would you agree with me?

- A. Well, they could be out, if they're shadowed with something. If they're not blocked, then the fingers would wrapping around the fist.
- Q. Now, the individual -- the muzzle of the firearm would have to be where? If the muzzle of the firearm is -- we're going -- this is called the standard anatomical position, except you don't have your hands down, right?
- A. Right. What he's referring to, the standard anatomical position, is an anatomical reference system which comes in hand in forensic pathology, because we don't know the position of shooters and victims so we just use a standard model. It's on our body diagrams. It's a person standing straight up with the arms down at the sides and the palms facing forward. It's a little bit of an artificial position.
- Q. So if the individual is in that artificial position and then the hand is moved to accommodate the projectile that's traversing that wrist and going into the chest, where would the hand be if the firearm is straight out?

- A. Well, if we're both standing up and your finger was the gun, then the hand is in front of the chest, as I indicated before.
- Q. Okay. So it would have to line up that way?
 - A. Yes.

Q. Now, if an individual, for instance -MR. MICHAELS: May I? All right.
Can you see, Judge?
THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. MICHAELS:

- Q. Okay. If an individual is seated that way, could we still get that same sort of line, that same sort of trajectory, that traverses the wrist and enters the chest in a way that the autopsy suggests?
- A. Yes. Because the wound path through the torso, with respect to the standard anatomic position, did not have any upward or downward deviation.
- If the muzzle is low like that, you simply adjust the torso and lean it forward a little bit so that the wound track, which is horizontal in the standard position, is now not horizontal with respect to the floor.

1 And then to accommodate the slight 2 deviation from the left side of the body to the 3 right you simply rotate the torso a little bit so that the left shoulder is more forward than the 4 5 right. 6 And to complete the scenario, you bring 7 the right hand in front like this at some 8 undetermined distance. 9 **Q**. Okay. Thank you. 10 MR. MICHAELS: You can have a seat, 11 Doctor. 12 Judge, may I approach the witness? 13 THE COURT: You may. 14 BY MR. MICHAELS: 15 Let me show you what's been marked for 16 Defense purposes as Exhibit 99. Look those over, 17 please, if you would, Doctor. Do you recognize 18 those photos? 19 Α. Excuse me? 20 0. Recognize those photos? 21 Α. I do. 22 Q. And you've used those to render an opinion in this particular matter? 23 24 I will. Yes. Α. 25 Q. Okay. And they have helped you form an

1 opinion up to today coming in here to testify about 2 your opinion? 3 Α. Yes. 4 MR. MICHAELS: All right. Your Honor, may 5 I approach the clerk? 6 THE COURT: You may. 7 At this time the Defense MR. MICHAELS: 8 moves into evidence Defense Exhibit Number 99. 9 THE COURT: It will be admitted. 10 (Whereupon, Defense Exhibit Number 99 was admitted.) 11 MR. MICHAELS: Permission to publish? 12 THE COURT: Yes. 13 BY MR. MICHAELS: 14 Q. Okay. Next photo, please. Okay. 15 305, tell us what you can about this particular 16 photograph. What are we looking at in the terms of 17 the injury, Doctor? 18 This is the left hand of Mrs. Oulsen and Α. 19 it shows a gunshot wound involving the fourth and 20 fifth fingers. 21 Can I get you to step down, please, again? 0. 22 Α. Sure. 23 And so tell me what we're looking at. 24 see on -- in layman's terms, the pinkie finger, 25 there appears to be an abrasion. Tell me about

1 that.

- A. Here on the fifth finger the skin is abraded and contused a little bit. You can see it here and down here, closer to the tip of the finger, there's a shallow, small laceration or tear of the skin. So this is a surface wound. It doesn't perforate the finger here.
- Q. And does this photograph help you at all to describe this wound or do we need to get to another one?
- A. If you want to actually see the laceration and the abrasion and contusion, a closeup might be better, but this is adequate for my purposes.
- Q. What are we looking at in terms of these spots here?
- A. The spots on the back of the hand are gunpowder stippling, just as we saw before.
- Q. And again, I noticed that we don't see stippling on the lower part of the hand, the hand that's on the side of the small finger, pinkie; is that correct?
 - A. Right. Yes.
- Q. And it's difficult to tell, it looks like the fingers have some sparse stippling; would you agree with that?

A. The index finger has one or two; and the third finger has one.

- Q. On the thumb there appears to be some. Can you tell from that photograph what that is?
- A. They're a little bit shadow, so they could be freckles. I don't know.
- Q. And what can you say about this particular wound?
- A. This is another trough-like wound. It doesn't have an entrance and a discreet exit. It's one gutter-like, trough-like wound going from this side to this side. That is the side next to the third finger out to the side next to the fifth finger. And it's rubbing the skin as it goes and creating a trough and creating lacerations or tears that on other photographs you'll see radiate out toward the direction of the fifth finger.
- Q. This is 308. What are we looking at there, just kind of a --
- A. This doesn't provide any additional information. It's the same hand, basically the same view, from a little bit farther back.
- Q. Okay. Stop there. What are we looking at here, Doctor?
 - A. This also shows the hand and the camera

angle is different. So if you're looking -- so you can see that the fingernails look large and the rest of the hand recedes in the background, so it gives you an indication of the camera angle. And you can better see the lacerations and the abrasion and contusion on the fifth finger.

And you're now seeing the wound on the fourth finger from a different angle, so now you can see that there's a skin flap created by the bullet going under and tearing around it.

- Q. So the bullet is actually traveling this path?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Towards the small finger?
- 15 A. Yes.
 - Q. And in terms of the injury on the small finger, do you have any opinion as to how that abrasion or injury was caused?
 - A. It's caused by the bullet going by.
 - Q. All right. So in terms of -- there's no breaking of the skin; can we agree with that?
- A. Well, no. I mentioned there's a shallow laceration here.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you. Is this helpful at all?
- 25 A. Sure. This is the palmar aspect of the

same hand. And you can see the exit end of the gunshot wound of the fourth finger here. It's swollen and the skin is moist because it had been bandaged for a couple of days. And you can see some of those lacerations radiating out from the end of the wound path.

So this photograph principally shows the swelling and the radiated lacerations.

- Q. That was 323. Next. 326, similar photograph.
 - A. But closer.

- Q. Next. Next. This is 332.
- A. This is a photograph where the camera is viewing the finger's edge on. And the fifth finger is flexed a little bit so that you can see the side of the fifth finger and the side of the fourth finger. So you can see almost the entire extent of the gunshot wound of the fourth finger here and that flap of somewhat contracted whitened skin there.
 - Q. This is Number 344.
- A. This is another one from an oblique angle showing the dorsal part of the hand and the fingers, and it shows a stippling. And it shows the wound of the fourth finger and a little bit on the fifth finger.

Of all the photographs we've seen on this hand, this is the one so far that aligns with the camera that's most closely approximated to where the muzzle was.

- Q. Can you tell the Judge what you mean by that?
- A. This is the view that the bullet and the gunpowder would have had, not exactly, but it's closer than any of the other photographs.
 - Q. And why do you say that?
- A. Because you can see the concentration of the gunpowder here, but not in parts of the hand that are not in the photograph. You can see the entrance part of the gunshot wound in the fourth finger, but not on the exit part.
- Q. You can also see stippling on the finger with the entrance wound?
- 18 | A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

- Q. Now, when you look at the stippling, how would you describe that pattern?
 - A. That's a sparse pattern.
 - Q. And in terms of distance, do you have an opinion as to the distance?
- A. This would be closer to the maximum range for intermediate range.

- Q. And what is that number?
- A. Closer to the 15 to 18-inch standard maximum for a standard hypothetical handgun.
 - Q. And that's from the muzzle?
 - A. Yes. From the muzzle.
- Q. Now, we talked about the entry wound to the chest. Do you have any way to tell whether the hand that we're looking at is actually contacting the chest that received the projectile?
 - A. No.

- Q. Do you have any idea of what the position of that hand would be in relation to the muzzle of the firearm?
- A. Well, I'm assuming, once again, that there's one bullet. And I haven't heard anything to the contrary. Then the left hand of Mrs. Oulsen is closer to Mr. Oulson's chest than his right hand.
- Q. And in terms of position, again, if we go the standard anatomical position straight on, how would that hand have to be positioned?
- A. It's the left hand. And I want to make this so the Judge can see. The bullet is passing, grazing the dorsal surface of the fourth finger and then dinging the fifth finger. So it's trying to do this. It might actually be forcibly pushing the

fifth finger to the side. It might be slid to begin with and just sliding in between.

- Q. And in terms of the actual positioning of the hand, can you give an opinion to a reasonable degree of medical certainty exactly what the positioning of the hand was? In other words, if you had your pinkie spread out. We'll start there.
- A. Well, I've given you the position of the hand with respect to the muzzle.
 - Q. I understand.

A. And beyond that, I can say that the hand is attached to the wrist and the wrist to the arm.

As you get up each sequential joint to the torso, there's lesser certainty. You would have to ask the witnesses.

The most comfortable position to do that is this way. If you have the muzzle, that's the easiest way to do it. If I turn around and do this, it's more awkward, but it's not impossible.

Q. Okay. You can have a seat, Doctor. And again, we talked about standard anatomical position straight up and down. Similar to what you testified earlier concerning the injuries that we observed to Mr. Oulsen, the hand injuries to Mrs. Oulson, likewise, can they be oriented so that if, for

instance, Mrs. Oulsen is -- has her hand in front of
a torso that's tilted down and the muzzle of the
firearm is low, can we still get that sort of
straight trajectory that goes through the fleshy
part of the wrist, through the finger into the
chest?

A. Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And so again, it's all with orientation.

 If somebody is bending over and the shooter is slightly up, we're going to get that straight trajectory that we're looking for?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. To line everything up?
- 14 A. Right.
 - Q. Let's talk about -- let's talk about vulnerability in terms of one's body. What is the most vulnerable part of the human body?
 - A. Well, there are a couple in terms of physical trauma, I assume you're asking.
 - Q. Yes. Physical trauma.
 - A. All right. Well, the head has a thin -the squamous portion of the temporal bone is so thin
 that it has different characteristics for gunshot
 wounds.
 - Q. Doctor, let me ask you this. Would it

```
1
    help if you were to use a demonstrative aid?
2
          Α.
               Sure.
 3
               MR. MICHAELS: May I, Judge?
 4
               THE COURT: You may.
                             Judge, where do you want me
 5
               MR. MICHAELS:
 6
          to position this?
 7
               THE COURT: Probably right in front of the
8
          screen is good.
 9
               MR. MICHAELS: Okay.
10
               THE WITNESS: Shall I step down?
11
               MR. MICHAELS: If you would, please.
12
               THE WITNESS:
                             I'm not sure this is close
13
          enough to be effective for the Judge.
14
               MR. MICHAELS: Okay. All right. Judge,
15
          if we could more a little closer?
16
               THE COURT:
                           That's good.
17
    BY MR. MICHAELS:
18
               Feel more comfortable?
          0.
19
               It's up to the judge.
20
               THE COURT:
                           That's pretty good.
21
    BY MR. MICHAELS:
22
          Q.
               Okay. Now, you indicated the head was the
23
    most vulnerable. Let's talk about that. Why is
24
     that?
25
               This portion of the skull right here in
          Α.
```

the temple, this particular bone is the squamous portion of the temporal bone. It's thin. And a blow here can easily fracture or distort the bone.

- Q. And you're talking about a blow by a fist, a bat or anything?
- A. Anything. Could be a skier going into a tree, could be what you said. When that thin bone fractures, there are some arteries that travel on the inside of the skull between the skull and the dura mater. The dura mater being the tough lining of the skull.

Can I step toward it?

THE COURT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: On this model, Your Honor, you can see some grooves here. This is not real bone. This is a plastic model. Those grooves are for the arteries. One of them is the middle meningeal artery. And if there's a fracture in that thin portion -- and this is not sufficiently thin. It's not completely true.

If there's a fracture there that runs across one of those arteries, the artery gets torn, it then bleeds. And under arterial brochure the blood then strips the dura off the

1 skull, creates a lump that keeps getting bigger 2 and bigger and it pushes the brain. The brain 3 gets pushed to the side. The brain swells. 4 And then it's a neurosurgical emergency. 5 BY MR. MICHAELS: 6 Is the potential for that injury -- let me 7 Is it possible for a fist to cause that ask you. 8 injury? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. What about an object? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Let me show you what's been marked by the Q. 13 State as AP-13. 14 MR. MARTIN: All the markings need to go 15 on the back. 16 MR. MICHAELS: Do you have any objection 17 to stipulated to --18 MR. MARTIN: No. 19 MR. MICHAELS: I'll bring the bag for 20 Madam Clerk, but I just need the exhibit --21 next exhibit number. 22 THE COURT: Thirty-three. BY MR. MICHAELS: 23 24 Let me show you what's been marked as Q. 25 Defense Exhibit 33 -- I'm sorry. Court's Exhibit

33, so we don't get confused. Hold that, if you will.

Now, that particular object, could that cause an injury if you were to strike the skull such as you described to the Judge?

A. If it hits edge on, or particularly corner on, yes. Because the amount of kinetic energy in an object that's in motion is proportional to the mass of the object, weight, for practical purposes. And it's proportional to the square of the velocity.

So a small object traveling very fast can have a huge amount of kinetic energy. A bullet being a prime example. A cell phone, or something of similar size, if it's thrown fast enough can be injurious.

But here we have an irregular shape. And one of the characteristics of injury is that tissue injury is caused by sheer stress focused on tissue. And the amount of stress is inversely proportional to the time over which it's inflicted and the surface area over which it's inflicted.

So a small, hard object is more injurious than a big, flat object. And a blast injury is more injurious than an injury produced by a vice, for instance, where it's slow compression.

So if a corner hits, the energy's concentrated in a small area and the stress is increased. The faster the thing flies, the more injurious it is, because the stress proportional to the energy, which is proportional to the square of the velocity.

MR. MICHAELS: Your Honor, this exhibit has been stipulated to as the phone belonging to Chad Oulsen recovered from the scene.

BY MR. MICHAELS:

Q. Now, you were explaining to the Court about the various vulnerable areas. And we're talking about the head. And you described to the Judge the anterior of the skull.

Let me talk about the brain. As people age, does that affect the size of their brain?

- A. Yes. The brain actually loses volume with age and this creates -- or actually increases the amount of space between the brain and the skull, the subdural space.
- Q. And using the model, if you will -- here's the other part of it, if you need it. Show the Court why that's important to know when we're considering the vulnerability of that area for somebody who is aging.

1 A. If I can step over?

THE COURT: You may.

THE WITNESS: I'm showing you the inside of the top part of the skull. And from the middle of the brain, the top part, veins drain into the veins in the dura, essentially skull veins, if you will, by perpendicular veins that go straight up all along this area here.

And if the brain -- when the brain shrinks, those veins have to traverse a longer area. Most subdural hemorrhages are caused by lacerations of those bridging veins. And the smaller the brain relative to the skull, the longer the vein and the more stress is put on that vein if the brain moves with respect to the skull.

And if the head is in rotation and suddenly stops, the brain will continue to rotate while the skull becomes stationary. This is what happens when a person falls and strikes the back of the head on the floor or the pavement, the brain keeps rotating.

And then those bridging veins, one of them, at least, lacerates. Blood, venous blood, then accumulates in the subdural space

over a period of 15 minutes or more, and this becomes a neurosurgical emergency. And if it's enough, it has to be drained neuro-surgically and the person becomes neurologically impaired.

And if I can bring out that easel, I'll just sketch the concept a little bit. Consider this thing a cross-section through the head, and we'll make it a coronal section, which means it's from left to right and it's vertical.

So this is one side of the head. This is the other side. And this is the top. And the blue line is a vein that's draining from here into this dura sinus, which is a big tough wall vein, but then eventually makes -- the blood makes its way to the jugular vein in the neck.

I've indicated a fairly long vein here.

In a child -- I went and used it up -- the

brain tends to tightly fill the cranium, so

that bridging vein is going to be short.

So the older the person, the smaller the brain, the longer that bridging vein and the greater the risk of a subdural hemorrhage or subdural hematoma from a fall.

BY MR. MICHAELS:

2/24/2017

- Q. Can that also be caused by a strike of some sort?
- A. It can be caused by a strike, particularly if the strike knocks the person down. It's more close -- this is more classically associated with a moving head striking a fixed object, a fixed object striking a stationary head. But, of course, heads are never completely stationary, unless they're locked in a device and that doesn't really happen. If a head gets hit with a baseball bat, it's going to move.
 - Q. Or with a punch and hit an object that's fixed behind it?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. What about the face, what particular areas of the face are vulnerable to serious injury, to bone fractures and that sort of thing?
- A. The whole structure of the face is a series of thin bones separated by air-filled spaces. The air-filled spaces are sinuses, technically known as paranasal sinus. And then another thing that fills the space is the eyeballs and the fat around them.

You can see the cheekbone here, technically known as the zygomatic bone or zygomatic

process. And then this vertical strut around the orbit, which is the socket for the eye, that's the orbital bone. These are thin, strut-like bones, and they can be easily fractured with a fist blow.

The nose has a bit of a bony anchor here, part of the nose is cartilaginous and part of it is just soft tissue. A blow to the nose can fracture this, and it can actually shove a -- I don't know if you can see a nasal bone in there, that can be shoved up toward the brain.

A blow that hits the jaw on the side can break these thin condyles. A blow to the front can fracture the maxillary bone, which is the support of the upper teeth. A blow to the lower jaw can fracture the lower jaw.

Fractures of the jaw are more apt to happen in a person who has bone loss, which is one of the things that's associated with gum recession, more common in older people.

An impact to the face can not only affect the bones that I named and mentioned that are on the surface, but it can also fracture the deep part of the facial bony structure.

Q. And those sort of injuries, is it possible that they can being caused by an iPhone, like the

one you are holding that's in the evidence at this time?

- A. An iPhone could make an orbital fracture or a zygomatic fracture or a nasal fracture. It's probably not going to make a maxillary fracture or a mandibular fracture, unless those bones were to be very, very osteopenic.
- Q. Now, certainly the face is covered with skin?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. What sort of lacerations -- let me ask you this question. What areas of the face are more susceptible to lacerations?
- A. The areas where skin is fairly tightly stretched over bone, which would be the forehead and over the cheekbone.
 - Q. And again, a strike by an iPhone?
 - A. It could make a small laceration. Yes.
- Q. All right. Let's work our way down. I don't know if we're going to be able to put this on. I have a pin for that. Let's work our way down. Do you need this still, Doctor?
 - A. Just for the moment.
- 24 Q. Okay.
 - A. The junction of the skull and the cervical

spine is a weak point. The mammals, in particularly humans, have a unique first cervical vertebrae that permits a lot of rotation.

Humans can turn their heads, like I'm doing now, without turning the torso. Reptiles can't do that. Alligators, when they run, the head moves with the shoulders and they look funny, if you're in a safe place and it's not scary.

Humans have a more elegant look, but it's at a cost. The cranial cervical junction is more at risk of injury. About 40 percent of the rotational capacity of the cervical spine is in that one area. And I'm going to tip this forward a little bit.

You can see that the first cervical vertebra is like a washer around a bolt, and that bolt is the odontoid process or dens, because somebody thought it looked like a tooth, that's sticking up towards the skull. So it's like a washer around a bolt.

And you can see these holes here. It's called a transverse foramen on each side, and there's a series of them down the vertebrae. The vertebral artery, the left and right vertebral arteries, goes through those holes. And then when they enter the skull they merge to form the basilar

artery.

A blow to the junction of the head and the neck, particularly from the side toward the back -- in other words, behind the ear -- can result in an injury where those vertebral arteries are -- get a small laceration.

One of the vertebral arteries or one of the branches can get a small laceration from the transient dislocation of this bone causing a traumatic subarachnoid hemorrhage, which is virtually indistinguishable from the subarachnoid hemorrhage caused by the rupture of an aneurysm of a brain artery.

And that is a true neurological emergency that can produce sudden death. It could produce stroke and certainly debility.

While we have the skull off, the hyoid bone here lies between the larynx in the front of the neck and the tongue. You can think of the hyoid bone as being the skeletal for the tongue. It's at the base of the tongue. And this can be fractured with a chop to the throat.

The larynx can be fractured with a chop to the throat. The larynx in younger people is made of cartilage. In older people, it becomes too

osteophyte and more closely approximately to bone and it's easier to fracture.

So if the larynx becomes fractured it can collapse and a person can be partially suffocated and not get enough air to live.

I think that finishes with susceptible areas of the head and neck.

- Q. Now, let's go to the torso, if you would, Doctor.
- A. On the torso, on this model, you can see that the ribs mostly are on this hard white substance. But in the front it looks like they ran out of material and used some kind of translucent playdough. This is not by accident. The posterolateral and anterolateral aspects of the ribs are made of bone.

In a young person, this portion, which connects to the sternum is made of cartilage. This confers flexibility and elasticity to the bony thorax. These cartilages tend to become calcified or even osteophyte with advancing age, which makes the thorax less flexible. And so it makes more susceptible to rib fractures when a blow is directed at the thorax.

Q. In terms of -- go ahead, Doctor.

A. Moving on to the abdomen. During inspiration, the diagram descends and the liver and the spleen descend with it.

So a blow to an unguarded abdomen or an abdomen with a thin, aging abdominal muscular wall can result in laceration or tearing of the spleen or laceration or tearing of the liver, with a slow accumulation of venous blood which would cause it to -- a medical emergency after some passage of time.

- Q. In terms of laceration of the liver, have you seen specific instances of that happening and can you give the Judge some specific incidents?
- A. It's not an uncommon complication of cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Although the liver is in the peritoneal cavity, the dome of the liver is actually partially protected by the ribcage, because the diaphragm domes up here.

And so the chest compressions can actually produce lacerations of the liver that typically are right in the front and next to the falciform ligament that runs to the sternum.

They're usually small lacerations, but they can produce some bleeding. And when it's misinterpreted at autopsy, it causes legal problems.

CPR is more widely known to commonly produce fractures of the ribs and those fractures are typically in the front and those are only rarely misconstrued.

- Q. Now, in terms of protecting the liver and the spleen, would you agree or disagree with me that the body depends on the abdominal muscles?
- A. A person in a situation will -- where there's some reasonable expectation of a blow to the abdomen would tense those abdominal muscles to protect. Yes. And if they can't see the threat coming to the abdominal muscles, or don't have decent muscles, then they're not going to be able to afford themselves that protection.
- Q. And what is your experience in terms of observations of the aging when it comes to abdominal musculature?
- A. It's like the musculature, in general. The muscle mass is reduced. In advanced age the muscle loss is really advanced. We have 95 year olds in nursing homes who have so much sarcopenia, that is muscle loss, that they no longer are able to withstand gravity and are in wheelchairs simply because they don't exercise enough to maintain muscle mass in the antigravity muscles.

Q. And in terms of structure of the bones in the aged, do you find the bones you also talking -- you already talked about ossification in the ribcage. But what do we see in the skeletal structure in terms of an aging individual?

A. In the true bones the calcium, the mineral content, decreases. So they're osteopenic and they have less strength to withstand fractures. At the same time, the elastic tissue in the bone -- bones are not just mineral, they also have elastic tissue to afford some flexibility and some collagen, essentially gristle, to provide some more tensile strength. The elastic tissue goes down.

Bones of older persons are not as elastic, so they don't -- they don't bend as much when they're impacted. They're more at that point to fracture.

- Q. Let's talk about the anatomy of the hands.

 And again, this is an accurate model of the human skeletal system; would you agree with that?
- A. It's accurate. When you get down to the hands, everything here is strung together with wire and springs, so we really can't bend these approximate hand bones, but we can actually talk about the hand without using the skeleton because

the hands and feet are essentially bones covered with skin with some nerves and vessels. There aren't any organs in there.

- Q. What happens to the hand when one makes a fist?
- A. In a fist the fingers are curled in and then the thumb is brought across the middle bones of the index and middle fingers. There has been some scientific work that mark that this provides buttressing. So not only does the fist provide -- make a smaller object than an open hand, thereby concentrating the force and increasing the stress for a given amount of force, the buttressing from the thumb allows the fist to absorb more energy than an open hand.

It allows the energy to be transmitted through the hand and up through the wrist so that the fist can deliver a -- although the fist and the open hand deliver the same amount of force, force being measured in pounds, it's -- the fist is a more efficient weapon because it concentrates the force in space and in time, because the jerk or the acceleration is greater with the fist.

Q. Now, can a fist cause laceration of the skin over the bony areas of the face that you

```
described?
 1
 2
          Α.
               Oh, yes.
 3
          0.
               Can a fist cause a nose fracture?
 4
          Α.
               Yes.
               Or a tooth fracture?
 5
          Ο.
 6
          Α.
               Yes.
 7
               Or a fracture of the squamous part of the
          0.
 8
     skull?
 9
          Α.
               Yes.
10
               Laceration of the meningeal artery?
          Q.
11
          Α.
               Yes.
12
               The epidural hemorrhage -- can it cause
          Q.
13
     epidural hemorrhage?
14
          Α.
               Yes.
15
          0.
               What about cause a brain contusion, a rib
16
     fracture?
17
               A fist with a good blow can cause a rib
          Α.
18
     fracture, especially in an elderly person. And a
19
     fist can actually push the person down so they fall
20
     and hit the back of the head and get a subdural
21
     hemorrhage.
22
               And then you mentioned a brain contusion.
     A blow to the head can cause the skull to -- a skull
23
24
     has a little bit of elastic, and so whether or not
25
     there's a fracture, and there's more likely to be
```

one in an older person, the inwardly bending bone will slap the brain and can cause a contusion; however, most brain contusions are contrecoup contusions that are caused when the blow is to the opposite side of the head from the contusion, most often from a fall to the back of the head.

- Q. You can have a seat, Doctor, if you would, please.
- A. I haven't finished with the lower part of the torso.
 - Q. Oh, I apologize.

A. In a male, the gonads are outside the body, the testees. And they are richly innovated, supplied with nerves, very sensitive to pain. And a sharp blow to the testees will cause pain. And in a person with heart disease that will -- the pain will raise the tone in the sympathetic arm of the autonomic nervous system which makes the heart more likely to have an arhythmia, such as ventricular fibrillation or flatline asystole.

If the heart is diseased, that is much more likely to happen. So in a person with an elderly or diseased heart, who has a blow to the testees, can have instant death, with nothing to show for it at autopsy but a contusion of the

testees, and a heart that might be enlarged or has some old chronic disease.

- Q. Now, when you talked about the fist. You talked about less area and, therefore, a more concentrated delivery mechanism to actually deliver a blow to parts of the body, correct?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And would you agree with me that part of that concentrated delivery system are these knuckles?
- A. The knuckles and also the first bone or proximal phalanx of the hand. In some cultures the blows are delivered with the knuckle between the proximal and middle bone; and western cultures it's usually tightly-closed fist with the blow delivered by the proximal knuckles, as you indicated.
- Q. You can have a seat, please. Are you -- are you familiar with the phenomenon of a one-punch homicide?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Can you tell us about that?
- A. From my experience with it, it has largely been with a conto-stylis lesion, which I alluded to earlier, with a blow to the side and back of the head that causes a laceration of a vertebral artery.

People tend to think of these deaths as freak occurrences, but they're easily explained by the arrangement of the human anatomy.

A one-punch homicide could result in a more -- not immediate death, but a delayed death, simply by punching a person and having them fall down and get a subdural hemorrhage.

One punch to the right part of the skull, the temple area, could produce the epidural hemorrhage from the lacerated meningeal artery. And almost any form of head trauma can be complicated by pneumonia, once a person is the hospital, or brain swelling, which if not controlled can lead to brain death.

MR. MICHAELS: Can I have a moment, Judge?
THE COURT: You may.

17 BY MR. MICHAELS:

- Q. Is there a reason why aging people break their hips?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. What is that?
- A. Many of them have osteoporosis. Their bones are under-mineralized and then their balance isn't so good and their antigravity muscles aren't so good. They tend not to pick their feet up as

much and they trip. And when they fall and impact the hip, that greater trochanter, that part of the hip that sticks out on the side, takes the impact.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then the neck of the femur, which is the part of the thigh bone between the part sticking out to the side and the round ball that goes into the hip joint, that is the most common place to get a fracture of the femur, which is commonly called a hip fracture.

- Q. And does that have anything to do with the degeneration of the bones or is it just because old people fall?
- A. It has to do with the degeneration of the bones, the loss of calcium and elasticity. It has to do with the greater propensity to fall because the balance isn't as good and the antigravity muscles aren't maintained, as well.
 - Q. What do you mean by antigravity muscles?
- A. The muscles that allow us, not only to stand up, but also to walk. A normal gait will have a certain portion during the cycle of the gait where only one foot is in contact with the ground. And particularly going up and down stairs where there's only one foot in contact with the ground.

We have antigravity muscles. The abductor

muscles, the abductor muscles, the hamstrings, the quadriceps, they're all working to maintain posture.

And we don't think about it, but that's kind of a -- that's a real stunt to be able to go up and down stairs and be balanced on one foot and not fall down. We almost all do it. The elder can sometimes get to a point where they can't manage it.

But in a situation that's not going up and down stairs or just walking, sometimes the balance isn't so great because those situations aren't practiced and trained. Most elderly people aren't going to want to stand up, pick up one foot and tie their shoe. They're going to sit down to tie the lace on the shoe.

- Q. And are all your opinions that you've made today within a reasonable degree of medical certainty?
 - A. Yes.

MR. MICHAELS: May I have a moment, Judge?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. MICHAELS: I don't have anything further. But before the State proceeds, let me properly mark the cell phone, if I may?

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: While he's doing that, may I

1 get some of the exhibits that I need? 2 THE COURT: You may. 3 MR. MARTIN: Can we put Sammy the Skeleton back in his closet over there and take the 4 5 easel down so I can talk. 6 May I proceed, Your Honor? 7 THE COURT: You may. 8 CROSS-EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. MARTIN: 10 Q. Good afternoon. 11 Α. Good afternoon. 12 One of the first things that Mr. Michaels Q. 13 asked you about is whether or not you agreed with 14 Dr. Thogmartin's manner of death; do you remember 15 that? 16 Α. Yes. 17 The manner of death in this case is 0. homicide? 18 19 Α. Yes. The cause of death is gunshot wound? 20 0. 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. In your discussion with Mr. Michaels you 23 indicated to us that there's, I'll call it, either 24 intermediate or intervening objects in front of Mr. 25 Oulson's chest, that being Nicole Oulson's left hand 1 | and his right wrist, correct?

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

- Q. All right. And you demonstrated for us the possibility of positioning of the human body, if you will, in order for the gutter wound, if you will call it, of the wrist, right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And the fingers -- and I can't bend it because I'm standing here -- but of the fourth and fifth finger of Mrs. Oulsen and the wound to the chest, and you indicated it was front to back, a little bit left to right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And because we're such a close distance of muzzle to initial target, that's a pretty straight line; would you not agree?
- A. I didn't understand the question.
- 18 Q. Sure. I'll start over.
- 19 A. Sure.
 - Q. Because the wrist to muzzle distance is relatively short -- you said a couple inches to maybe out to 10, and you gave the parameters of why you said 10 and not 50, right?
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. So with that distance from the wrist and

- then the distance, if you will, from the gutter wound of his wrist through the hand of Mrs. Oulsen to his chest is a relative short distance. We're talking probably less than two feet, right?
- A. Probably, yeah, less than the length of a person's arm extended.
- Q. Yeah. So this would be the maximum.

 Well, you have to get it. So it's like here, right?
 - A. Oh, yeah, the actual arm.
 - Q. Yeah, the actual --

- A. But I often give approximations of inches.

 I don't give exact measurements, and oftentimes

 juries are happy to hear, it's less than the length

 of a person's arm.
- Q. Right. But in this particular case that would be true, but you have to bend the arm to make it less than the length of a person's arm, right?
- A. We'll just bring in a third arm to do the measurement.
 - Q. There you go. Let's not get hung up with how far, but what we're talking about. We're talking about a straight line, right?
 - A. Yes. That's right.
- Q. And you would -- if you would just kind of take my pen, if you will, and put it approximately

where the wound on Mr. Oulsen is as you move,

Mr. Wilson, around to whatever position the muzzle

has to track, because we're in a straight line;

would you agree?

A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

- Q. Okay. In fact, when we're talking about positions of individuals who were shot and based on path of a wound, a Medical Examiner is constrained, if you will, or limited by the known circumstances of surrounding the shooting and what other people say; would you agree with that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And some of the known circumstances in this case is we have a wound to Mr. Oulsen's chest, correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. We have the wound to Mrs. Oulsen's hand, right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 O. We have the wound to Mr. Oulsen's wrist?
- 21 A. Yes.
 - Q. We have the trajectory or path of the bullet, basically front to back, a little bit left to right, correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

Q. We have an approximate muzzle to target, the initial target, the wrist, distance of somewhere two-inches to 10 inches, correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. We have not only the injury of Mrs. Oulsen's hand but the position of her hand, like you indicated, would be the backside of her hand towards the muscle and the palm towards Mr. Oulsen's chest?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And then you have witness testimony, such as Mrs. Oulson's testimony, that I'm sure you've read. Corporal Hamilton's testimony that I'm sure you've read, correct? So we have witness testimony.
 - A. No. I have not read that.
 - Q. Have not read Mrs. Oulson's?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. Or Corporal Hamilton?
- 19 A. No.
 - Q. All right. One of the things that we can look at in attempting to determine, like you said, what's happening beyond the wrist, the arm and the shoulder back -- once you get past the shoulder gets really fuzzy -- for a Medical Examiner to say where the position of a body is; is that right? Like for

1 | Mrs. Oulson.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. That's basically what I said. Yeah, you can feed me a scenario and I can say whether the findings are consistent with it.
- Q. And that was my going to be my next question. That's what we do with a Medical Examiner, we feed a hypothetical or scenario and you can say yea or nay?
- A. Yes.
- 10 Q. All right. Just like you did with 11 Mr. Michaels?
- 12 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And I believe you indicated with Mr. Michaels that a scenario that is consistent, that you would say yea to, is that Mrs. Oulson with her left arm across her body, correct, with her hand horizontal or parallel to the ground?
- 18 | A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And you twisted the hand a little bit, but basically this would be her arm position?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And you indicated that the position potential, consistent with, on Mr. Oulsen at the time he was shot, you indicated that if the gun was low he potentially could have been leaned over a

little bit. And I'm not trying to say how far you leaned, but you know what I'm talking about, this lean?

A. Yes.

- Q. All right. Now, we also -- if the gun is low and there's no angle to the gun, he can flex his hips and knees, can't he, and kind of shrink like an accordion this way?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And when we talk about known circumstances, artifacts within the theater would also be known circumstances, like the back of a chair. If there's no gun -- if there's not a hole caused by a bullet through the back of the chair, we can logically assume that the bullet flew over the back of the chair, right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So when we talk about constraints and when -- where the bullet passed especially in this case, since we don't have a bullet through the hole in the chair, we can assume then based on whatever position we put Mr. Oulson and Mrs. Oulson as whatever, as the chair being an obstacle, the bullet has to come across the chair. So we are bound by a certain area that doesn't go below the

top of the chair?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Because there's no bullet hole.
- A. Right.
- Q. Okay. We talked about stippling and how stippling -- you talked about sparse and dense stippling. I think those are the two terms you used, if I remember right.
- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And basically what we're talking about, as the muzzle gets closer to the initial target -- I'll call it the cone of the stippling -- further away is wider, and as you get closer it becomes more concentrated and gets tighter as a group, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now, when you talked about the stippling and Mr. Michaels asked you, is the stippling on Mr. Oulsen's back of his hand consistent with a fist.

 Do remember that discussion you had?
- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. It's also consistent with the muzzle being at such a distance from the wrist that the cone is so small in diameter that it just didn't cover past the knuckles, correct? His fingers could

1 have been out and the stippling just didn't make it 2 that far because it's so close? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Okay. And you can't say to any degree of 5 medical certainty which one of those is correct? 6 Α. That's right. 7 0. All right. That's one of those yea or 8 nays consistent with? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Okay. We had some discussions about the 11 cell phone and injuries that could be caused by the 12 cell phone and what could have happened if someone 13 is struck by a cell phone. Do you remember that 14 conversation with Mr. Michaels? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Okay. Let me show you what's been Q. 17 introduced into evidence by the Defense as -- this 18 is yours down here, right, that blue one and that's 19 his. 20 It's been introduced into evidence as 21 Defense Exhibit Number 27. 22 MR. MARTIN: May I approach, Judge? 23 THE COURT: You may.

I'm just going to give you a chance to

24

25

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q.

look at that. Have you seen that picture before?

A. Yes.

- Q. I showed it to you when I took your deposition, right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. We've had some discussion about it already?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And you talked about the cell phone, and if it's thrown real hard to the temporal area, it could cause significant damage and injury to the body, correct?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. By that photograph, and I believe that we have a little bit of an area of left and right temple in that picture, is there any injury like that to Mr. Reeves?
 - A. There's no fracture of the temporal bone. But that wouldn't show in the photograph because there's no break in the skin. But as far as I know, there is no such injury.
 - Q. All right. You also talked about the bones in the face. Again, as far as what you would expect from blunt trauma of a cell phone being thrown, as Mr. Michaels said at a high rate of

```
1
     speed, whatever that is, we just have force and
 2
     velocity, like you explained to us. Is there any
 3
     injury to his nose that would be consistent with
 4
     being hit with a blunt object, like an iPhone,
     thrown from a distance of approximately, you know,
 5
     20 to 30 feet away?
 6
 7
          Α.
               No.
 8
          0.
               How about to the orbital sockets of his
 9
     eyes?
10
          Α.
               No.
11
               To his forehead?
          Q.
12
          Α.
               No.
13
          Q.
               To his cheeks, left or right?
14
          Α.
               No.
15
               To his chin?
          Q.
16
          Α.
               No.
17
               To his neck? Well, does the picture go
          Ο.
18
     down that far?
               It shows a little bit of the throat.
19
20
     the answer's no.
21
               Okay. In the event that -- and you see
          0.
22
     Mr. Reeves is wearing glasses in that picture?
23
          Α.
               Yes.
24
               In the event that a blunt object was
          Q.
25
```

either thrown at Mr. Reeves and hit his glasses,

would you not expect to find some type of abrasions or lacerations as the glasses are forced up against the skin of Mr. Reeves' face?

- A. There might be or there might not.
- Q. How about abrasions or lacerations on his nose based on the nosepieces of his glasses?
 - A. There might be or there might not.
- Q. The only reason I bring this up is because you and I have discussed it before.

MR. MARTIN: May I approach the witness?

THE COURT: You may.

12 BY MR. MARTIN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. When you and I talked before you pointed out to me, and I'm pointing to an area behind his glasses, a red area. Do you remember our conversation about that?
- A. Yes. The left upper eyelid has a red area.
- Q. Okay. Now, the eyelid is a very fragile part of the human body, isn't it? I mean, it's very, very thin.
 - A. Oh, the skin is skin.
- 23 Q. Yeah.
 - A. Certainly not like the sole of the foot.
- 25 Q. Correct. And there's tiny -- I don't want

to miss -- what's in there that gets the blood around, the vessels?

- A. Blood vessels.
- Q. Blood vessels. Okay. And any type of manual rubbing or manipulation can cause a redness on the eyelids like we see on Mr. Reeves; can it not?
 - A. It can.

- Q. Okay. Now, if a blunt object was, in fact, thrown or even -- we talked about a fist being punched -- and it hit Mr. Reeves in the area -- we see the redness of his eyes -- would you not expect to see some sort of corresponding damage, lacerations of the glasses, since we see right behind his eyeglasses is the eyelid and the red area. You would expect to see some type of markings on his face, right?
- A. You might. You might not. You might have an impact if the eyeglasses are knocked askew and then there's this wheel-and-flare reaction in the mild confusion.
 - Q. Wait a minute. Excuse me. A wheel and --
- A. Wheel-and-flare reaction.
- Q. Explain that to me. I didn't know what that is.

- A. If you take your fingernail and rub it along your skin --
 - Q. Okay.

- A. -- you'll get a raised white area and it will also be red at some point. It's called a wheel and flare. It depends on nerves and it goes away quite rapidly.
- Q. All right. With that little red area right there, that's somewhat inconsistent with that iPhone being thrown at a high rate of speed, because you talked about if you got hit by the edge, it's small, and there's more force because it's small. You would expect much more damage to the face than that little red area behind the glasses; would you not?
- A. It depends on how hard it's thrown. It's consistent with an iPhone being thrown. It's consistent with other things, too. It's nonspecific.
 - Q. Consistent with just constant rubbing?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. So you can't say to any reasonable degree of medical certainty that what we see behind his glasses, that red area, is, in fact, blunt trauma?
 - A. That's right. I have no opinion.

1 MR. MARTIN: May I have a moment with 2 counsel, Judge? 3 THE COURT: You may. 4 MR. MARTIN: If I may retrieve the exhibit? 5 6 THE COURT: You may. 7 MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Dr. Adams. 8 Thank you, Judge. I have no further 9 questions. 10 Madam Clerk, here's your exhibit back. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 Redirect? 13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MICHAELS: 14 15 I know you testified that the redness you see is consistent with being hit by an iPhone, but 16 17 you can't give an opinion within a reasonable degree 18 of medical certainty, correct? 19 Α. That's right. 20 And as far as rubbing the eyelid, can you 21 give any opinion within a reasonable degree of 22 medical certainty that that redness is caused by 23 rubbing the eye? 24 Α. No. I can't. 25 MR. MICHAELS: Thank you.

1 THE COURT: May this witness be released? 2 MR. MARTIN: May I -- may I just follow up 3 on that, Judge? 4 **RECROSS-EXAMINATION** 5 BY MR. MARTIN: 6 We talked about the positioning on the 7 body and that Medical Examiners --8 MR. MARTIN: And I'm just laying a 9 predicate, Judge. I'm not going there. I'm 10 just trying to lay the predicate. 11 BY MR. MARTIN: 12 We talked about the Medical Examiners are Ο. 13 constrained or limited by the known circumstances 14 and witness testimony, right; do you remember that? 15 We talked about it. 16 We did. 17 Okay. Now, in regarding Mr. Michaels' 0. 18 question, and as far as any degree of medical 19 certainty whether or not it's caused by rubbing, can 20 we not, just like in the body position, rely on 21 witness testimony as to what they observed and as a 22 hypothetical? If someone saw him rubbing his eyes 23 then we can say, okay, it may or may not be, right? 24 I mean, we can do the same analysis with

the injuries. We can rely on the known

1 circumstances and witness testimony to try to give 2 meaning and content to the injuries we see, just 3 like we discussed about the body position, right? Sure. You can evaluate the witness 4 Α. information as to how reliable it is. 5 6 matter for the Judge. 7 Right. And once that's done, either Ο. 8 accept or reject, apply it to the injuries that we 9 see, and it either corroborates or doesn't 10 corroborate the testimony, right? 11 Α. Yes. 12 13

MR. MARTIN: All right. Thank you. No further questions.

> THE COURT: Thank you.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MICHAELS: He may be released, subject to recall. We'll keep him under subpoena.

THE COURT: Okay. Doctor, you're free to go, particularly for today. It's a slim possibility that you may be recalled for something. You'll get plenty of advanced notice. I'm certain on that. But probably you're good to go. But you'll still remain under subpoena.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Travel's not a problem.

```
1
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 2
               THE WITNESS:
                             Thank you.
 3
               THE COURT: We're going to take a short
 4
          recess, maybe 15 minutes, and we'll be back
 5
          following that.
 6
     RECESS
 7
     OPEN COURT
 8
               THE COURT: Mr. Escobar?
 9
               MR. ESCOBAR: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
10
          Again, the Defense would call Detective Allen
11
          Proctor.
12
               THE COURT: All right.
13
     (Whereupon, the witness was sworn.)
14
                        ALLEN PROCTOR,
15
     Thereupon, the witness herein, being first duly
16
     sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
17
                      DIRECT EXAMINATION
     BY MR. ESCOBAR:
18
19
               Good afternoon, Detective Proctor.
          0.
20
          Α.
               Yes, sir. Good afternoon.
21
               Would you please state your full name and
          0.
22
     please spell your last name?
23
               Allen, A-L-L-E-N, middle initial W, last
          Α.
24
     name Proctor, P-R-O-C-T-O-R.
25
               Mr. Proctor, would you please tell the
          Q.
```

1 | Court your educational background?

2 A. I graduated from Grandridge High School in

- 3 1979. I started attending Hillsborough Community
- 4 | College in January of 1985 as a Department of
- 5 | Corrections -- Department of Corrections trainee.
- I then started at Hillsborough Community
- 7 | College in 1987 and I took a law enforcement academy
- 8 class. I graduated from St. Leo University in 2003
- 9 | with a Bachelor's degree in criminology.
- 10 Q. Okay. What is your current occupation?
- 11 A. I'm retired.
- 12 Q. What was your former occupation?
- A. I was a deputy sheriff for Pasco County
- 14 | Sheriff's office.
- 15 Q. Okay.
- A. And counselor, too, I am a part-time
- 17 | electrician now also, so part-time.
- 18 Q. A lot less stress?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. I will continue to call you detective,
- 21 just out of respect.
- 22 A. Well, there's no need for that, sir, but
- 23 whatever you feel more comfortable with.
- Q. I will call you Mr. Proctor.
- 25 A. That will be -- whatever.

Q. Mr. Proctor, you started your career in law enforcement at the Zephyrhills Correctional Institution in 1985; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

- Q. And what was your position back in 1985 with that particular outfit?
 - A. I was a correctional officer.
 - Q. Okay. And at a jail, at a prison?
- A. At a prison, Florida Department of Corrections Zephyrhills Institution.
- 11 Q. Okay. And in 1988 you became a sheriff 12 with the Pasco Sheriff's department?
- 13 A. That's correct. August of 1988.
- Q. And it looks like you completed your academy the latter part of 1987; is that correct?
- 16 A. That's correct. My law enforcement 17 academy.
 - Q. Okay. Now, when you started with the Pasco Sheriff's department, you worked patrol for about five years; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And then in 1993 you became a detective in property crimes?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- Q. And what does a detective in property

crimes do? 1 2 Α. We attempt to investigate crimes involving 3 property; burglaries, grand thefts, things like that. 4 5 Not homicides? 0. 6 Α. That's correct. 7 Q. Okay. 8 Α. Not normally. There were some involvement 9 even back in that day. 10 Like support? Q. 11 Α. That's correct. 12 Okay. Now, did you ever go into a Q. 13 division called the division of crimes against 14 persons? 15 Α. Yes, sir. I did. 16 And what was the division of crimes Q. 17 against persons? 18 That was crimes against a person; robbery, Α. 19 battery, sexual battery, and death. 20 Okay. Did the name or title to that 21 particular division at some point in time change? 22 Was there like a restructuring of the Pasco 23 Sheriff's office in name and title? 24 Α. Yes, sir.

Okay. And you were in that crimes against

25

Q.

persons, I guess, until the change occurred in '03,
'04?

- A. Something like that. Yes, sir.
- Q. How long were you in that division of crimes against persons?
 - A. Until I retired.
 - Q. Okay. But when you started, do you know what year you started?
 - A. In crimes against persons?
- 10 Q. Yes.

3

6

7

8

9

16

- 11 A. In January of 1995.
- Q. So from '95 to 2003, 2004 it was called crimes against persons?
- A. About that. I'm not for sure exactly when we made the change over to major crime.
 - Q. Okay. And then the name changed to major crime?
- 18 A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And so somewhere around 2003, 2004
 you are now in major crimes and you are still
 investigating crimes against persons in that
 particular division, as well as homicides?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, in all of your career as a detective you have been asked to be the lead

1 | homicide detective in three cases; is that correct?

- A. No, sir.
- Q. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- A. I was the lead detective and probably, there again, I sort of lost track, probably about 35.
 - Q. Thirty-five?
 - A. As the lead detective.
 - Q. In what kind of cases?
- 10 A. Homicides.
 - Q. In homicides. Page 27, Lines 24 through 25; Page 28, Lines 1 to 6. Do you remember me taking a depo of you back in March of 2015?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Do you remember me asking you the following questions.

Question: How many homicides would you say you were assigned as a lead detective at this point. And Mrs. Sumner says, in all of his career. I said, uh-huh. And you said, I really don't know, probably three.

- A. That's not what I recall saying, sir.
- Q. Do you want to --
- A. Maybe that's what it says there, but I
 don't believe that's what I said. I recall -- or I

have worked approximately 35 homicides as the lead detective.

- Q. Going to the same deposition, do you remember me taking that same deposition on Friday March 27th of 2015?
- A. I don't remember the date, sir. I think I've had two occurrences to be in front of you in deposition.
- Q. Page 25, Lines 15 through 25. Okay. And so how many homicides would you say between 1995 and '03 you were the lead detective. Well -- you say, I have no idea. Question: In excess of 10. Answer: '95 to '03? Yes.

So in excess of 10?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Today you're saying 35?
- A. Over my career, from January of 1995 until May of 2016, I believe, sir. And, there again, 35, it might be 34. It could be 32. But it's -- I would believe it's up in the 30s.
- Q. Okay. Now, out of the cases that you've been assigned as a homicide detective you've only dealt with one case that dealt with the issues involving self-defense?
- A. There's only one case that I can recall

1 off the top of my head. Yes, sir.

- Q. And do you know if that case was before or subsequent to the shooting incident there at the Cobb Theater?
 - A. I think it was before.
- Q. And was that a burglary of a home and the owner or occupant of the home fired upon the intruder?
 - A. It wasn't the burglary of a home.
 - Q. What was it?
- 11 A. Burglary of an auto.
- 12 Q. Burglary of an auto?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

20

21

22

- Q. Okay. And the owner of the auto fired upon the intruder?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, Detective, you've never taken any courses dealing with the issue of self-defense; is that correct?
 - A. I've had some training in it. I do not recall, probably in an in-service maybe -- or at -- or back then our monthly, weekly major crimes meetings we'd talk about that briefly.
- Q. Well, I'm not talking about the
 discussions. I'm talking about an actual course on

self-defense and the investigation of homicides dealing with self-defense.

- A. No, sir. Not that I recall.
- Q. In fact, you're only familiar with the law of self-defense to some degree?
 - A. I don't know everything there is to know about that law. That's correct.
 - Q. In fact, you have only read the law of self-defense and the use of deadly force to a limited degree?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, on the afternoon of January 13th,
 2014, Mr. Proctor, would you tell us where you were?
 Detective Proctor, I feel more comfortable --
- 15 A. That's fine.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

20

21

22

- Q. -- since I took a depo of you saying detective, I'm going to continue.
- A. I was -- I was working that day as a detective in the major crimes unit.
 - Q. Okay. And you had someone else there in major crimes that had recently come into that division, an individual by the name of Aaron Smith; is that correct?
- A. I don't know. I don't recall how long he had been in that unit, our unit.

Q. Well, you would agree that it was very shortly before this incident, correct?

- A. There again, sir, I don't recall how long it was before he was in our unit.
- Q. Well, he was an individual that was shadowing you when he first came into the unit, correct?
 - A. He did shadow me. Yes, sir.
- Q. What -- when someone like Mr. Smith comes into that unit, major crimes, can you tell the Court what formal training is given to that individual in order for him to competently perform his duties as a homicide detective?
- A. Normally they are not the lead detectives on homicides until after they have had some experience working death cases.
- Q. Well, I want to know, first of all, the formal training. Is there like a class that they go to for four to six weeks and, you know, start learning the ins and outs of homicide investigations or is this more of a shadowing-type of, hey, let me see how Detective Proctor does it and then I can learn from that process?
- A. No, sir. There is formal training before normally you are assigned a -- as the lead on a

1 homicide. There is training that they send us away
2 to receive.

- Q. Okay. Do you know if by January the 13th of 2014 Mr. Proctor (sic) had achieved going to the homicide investigative course? That's what it's called, correct?
 - A. Mr. Proctor had been. That's me.
 - O. Excuse me. Mr. Smith.
- A. Sir?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

- 10 Q. Mr. Smith.
- 11 A. Do what?
- 12 Q. Had he gone to the initial homicide 13 investigative course by January 13th, 2014?
- 14 A. I don't recall, sir.
- Q. But you agree he was shadowing you initially when he came in?
 - A. He was shadowing me originally when he came in, but I'm unsure as to whether or not he was shadowing me at that time or not.
 - Q. Now, you get to the Cobb Theater the day of January 13th, 2014 at about 2:15; is that correct?
- 23 A. Can I review my report, sir?
- Q. Any time you need to, please feel free to.

 Just let me know where you're referring to. If

there's something that refreshes your recollection, 2 I'm certainly going to give you the opportunity.

- Α. I have my supplement here on Page 76 of this report.
 - Is 2:15, correct? Ο.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Α. That's correct. I arrived on scene at 2:15.
- Q. Okay. And this case originally was assigned to some other homicide detective, not yourself, correct, a Detective Soto?
- I believe originally they were going to give him this case, but he was on the west side of the county.
- 0. Okay. And that was going to take some time to get him there?
 - That's correct.
- Now, when you get to the scene of this 0. particular theater at 2:15, did anyone -- anybody tell you exactly what time the incident occurred, the shooting incident?
- No, sir. I don't recall them giving me a Α. direct time. I knew that it had probably been within the last 45 minutes of me arriving on scene.
- Okay. And did you meet with anyone in Q. order to develop a game plan as to how you were

going to investigate this particular incident?

- A. I think the majority of us in the Sheriff's office who were trained on how to investigate these type scenes. I spoke to acting Sergeant Tim Harrison on the scene and Major John Corbin, received a briefing from them as to what occurred. There might have even been additional people there. And Major Corbin asked that I take over the lead as the lead detective in this case.
- Q. Okay. So you had a conversation, but nobody really directed you as to what to do. You knew how to do it?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. And so what was your game plan?

 Since this plan was really your plan, what was your game plan in the investigation of this particular shooting incident?
- A. I was aware that witnesses were there.

 They were in the process of being interviewed. I was directed to the Sumter County deputy, a Corporal Hamilton, and I conducted those interviews with them.
- Q. Well, you were aware that officers were interviewing witnesses. Do you know what officers were -- had been assigned to interview witnesses

1 | when you first got there?

- A. I knew there were several other detectives there. I'm not aware of which ones were doing interviews and which one -- I wasn't aware, but I knew there were other interviews being conducted as I interviewed the Hamiltons.
- Q. Did you give any instructions to those detectives that were conducting interviews as to how you wanted those interviews to be conducted?
 - A. No, sir. They're trained in that aspect.
- Q. Well, can you tell me if all those individuals that were conducting interviews were homicide detectives?
- A. Probably not originally, but as it progressed, the majority of the interviews were conducted by homicide detectives.
- Q. Well, did you get a list from anyone to find out, hey, give me the running list of who's, you know, conducting interviews and where those individuals are?
- A. At that particular time, sir, I was not aware of that.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. I was doing the interviews of the Hamiltons.

1 Q. Well, we're not there yet.

2 A. Okay.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I'm taking you baby steps.
- 4 A. Okay.
 - Q. We're going to take you baby steps all the way through. Okay?
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. Now, before doing any interviews with -- I guess your first ones were the Hamiltons. Did you bother going into the Theater 10 in order to get a layout of the actual theater?
- 12 A. I did not go into Theater 10 at that time.

 13 No, sir.
 - Q. And why not?
 - A. I had been in those theaters before, several times in the past. I knew the general layout of the theaters. I was told that this occurred on the back row, in the row immediately in front of it. I didn't feel the need to do it at that time. We had people already securing the -- it was already secured.
 - Q. Well, but in addition to the general layout of the theater, you may have physical evidence there at the scene that you may want to take a look at, the locations, so that when you

conduct interviews you may be able to reference some of that physical evidence and start tying together the sequence of events, right?

- A. In this particular case, sir, I did not feel the need to do that.
 - Q. Why not?

- A. I knew that it occurred on the back row.

 I knew that I had competent people there. And I knew that as the interviews progressed, that I would get a complete briefing as to what had occurred.
- Q. Who was the competent person that was in charge of the crime scene for this particular case?
- A. Aaron Smith was. He was the detective assigned to the crime scene.
- Q. You're talking about the Detective Aaron

 Smith that had just joined your major crimes unit in

 December of 2013?
- A. Sir, I don't remember when he joined the unit. I knew that he was a sharp deputy. He knew how to work a case.
- Q. Well, let me ask you. How many times since you were there -- and you're the responsible party when you're the lead detective, correct?
 - A. Ultimately, yes, sir.
 - Q. And so tell me how many times prior to

this particular incident you were aware that

Detective Aaron Smith had been assigned the lead

crime scene detective of a homicide.

- A. I don't know if he was.
- Q. So this could have been his first assignment of that sort?
- A. On a homicide, that's correct. I don't recall any -- if he had been the lead on it or not. I know that he had worked several scenes. I had worked several scenes with him. And he knew how to work a scene.
- Q. Well, the scenes that you had worked with him in the past were interviewing witnesses, right?
 - A. No, sir.

- Q. So what had he done at these other scenes?

 And if you can give me a date, that would be great.

 Tell me what he's done at other homicide scenes when you were there.
- A. I'm not talking about homicide scenes, sir, I'm talking about death scenes.
 - Q. Okay. Well, death scenes.
- A. I don't recall. I know that I have been on scenes with him in the past reference to death. That's been several years ago. He was very competent.

- Q. Well, let me ask you a question.

 Certainly the lead detective of the crime scene is a very, very important position?
 - A. As all -- everything is important.
 - Q. I'm not discussing other ones. We'll discuss other ones in particular. But that position is a very important position?
 - A. Yes, sir.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Now, you don't believe you've ever been in Theater 10 before this, correct?
- A. I don't recall being in Theater 10, sir.

 There again, I might have been. But I have been in that theater on occasion and I can't remember which theater I had went into.
- Q. In fact, the last time you remember going into the Cobb Theater prior to January the 13th of 2014 was at least a year before?
- 18 A. Possibly, sir.
 - Q. Now, when you first arrived did you realize that someone had been placed into custody?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And did you realize that the person that had been placed into custody was a 27-year veteran law enforcement officer, along with 12 years as the head of security for Busch Gardens?

- A. I wasn't aware of all that information. I knew that he was a retired TPD employee.
 - Q. Employee. Like a --
 - A. Law enforcement patrolman. I might have been told that he was captain. I don't recall at that time. But I knew that he was ex-TPD.
 - Q. Was that issue important to you at all?
- A. No, sir.

- Q. It wasn't. His training, his background, none of that really was important to you in an investigation like this where there's a shooting and a possible self-defense issue?
- A. Like I said earlier, everything's important. But there again, him being ex-TPD had nothing to do with the way I conducted that interview.
- Q. Well, I'm not talking about the employment address that he enjoyed for 27 years. I'm talking about the experience that you gain while you're a police officer for 27 years.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. That was important, right? Are you having a difficult time with that question?
- A. I don't understand what you mean about it being important.

- Q. Well, when you've worked 27 years in law enforcement, especially if you ask that individual the number of courses that they've taken, the kind of training, the kind of position, the kind of experience throughout all those years, that may make it rather important, correct?
 - A. It could have. Yes, sir.
 - Q. So instead of going into the theater and looking for whatever evidence was there in the theater, you decided that you were going to go and interview an individual by the name of Corporal Hamilton?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. And so when you do these interviews, you would agree that taking a tape recorder with you is important?
- A. In this particular case I felt the need to do that.
- Q. It's important in a homicide, slash, shooting incident, right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And so what you want to do when you're interviewing individuals, any individual, is that you want to make sure that when you go in there that you have that recorder on when you go in there.

And the beauty of Florida law is that you don't even have to tell the individual that you're recording him, right, because you're a police officer?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Because you want to try to capture every single word that that witness exchanges with you, correct?
- A. In this particular case I felt the need to do that.
- Q. Okay. And so --
 - A. I did. I felt the need to do that. But I haven't always done it in all homicides that I've conducted interviews with -- conducted interviews.
- Q. Okay. So was this a unique one that you felt the need to do that?
 - A. The reason I did this was because I knew that I was going to be super busy and I wanted to make sure that everything I had was memorialized on tape.
 - Q. Okay. And so you go in to interview

 Corporal Hamilton, but when you start the interview

 process with Corporal Hamilton you don't turn on

 your tape?
- A. I do turn on my tape.
- 25 Q. Immediately?

- A. Right. Yes, sir. The minute we walked into that room.
- Q. So you're telling me under oath today that you did not have about five minutes of conversations with Corporal Hamilton, is that what you're telling me today under oath?
 - A. There again, sir, I did not listen to it.
 - Q. Page 94 --

- A. There's a possibility. And there again, I did not listen to the CD that I might have conducted a brief interview with him off tape.
- Q. Why would you conduct any interview with a witness off tape?
- A. I wanted to make sure I knew what he was going to tell me.
- Q. Why would you need to know and make sure what he was going to tell you? Whatever he tells you concerning the incident is relevant, correct?
- A. I wanted to make sure that he was of the right mind to be able to talk to me at that time.
- Q. What do you mean the right mind? Do you have a psychology degree?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Do you have some special knowledge that you can tell when someone is thinking clearly or not

thinking clearly based upon the events that they
have witnessed?

A. Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. You do? Tell me how that works.
- A. Well, I can tell if somebody is able to communicate with me in such a way that I would be able to understand them.
- Q. Did you think that Corporal Hamilton, which you knew was a police officer, was not going to be able to communicate with you?
- A. There again, sir, we all handle stress, we all handle these incidents in a different way.
- Q. So was Corporal Hamilton getting some special treatment --
 - A. No, sir.
 - Q. -- because he was a corporal in another department?
- 18 A. No, sir.
 - Q. But you did and remember talking to him for about five minutes before you even decided to turn on your tape?
 - A. There again, sir, I don't remember if I had an off-taped conversation with him or not. The tape stands for itself.
- MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, at this time I'm

going to make an objection to the line of questioning. It's the same objection I've made with other witnesses dealing with relevancy as far as the, I'll call it, the attacking of the investigation in an immunity hearing.

I'll rely on all my previous arguments for the Court. But in order to preserve and be consistent, I'd like to make that objection now. And I already know what the Court's ruling is, but I think I need to preserve that for this witness.

THE COURT: Thank you.

13 BY MR. ESCOBAR:

Q. Page 94 --

THE COURT: So noted. Overruled.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

17 BY MR. ESCOBAR:

- Q. Page 94, Lines 22 to 25. How long was the tape. 1432 to 1438, six minutes; does that sound right?
 - A. If that's what it says there, sir.
- Q. Do you want to check and see if you've got your notes?
- A. I don't have those notes. The only thing
 I have is the written report. I don't have copies

of the property receipt.

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

- Q. Six minutes on tape, five minutes off tape. You say, that's correct?
- A. All right, sir. I stand corrected. I didn't recall that.
 - Q. Well, did you take notes of the conversations that you had with Corporal Hamilton prior to turning on the tape?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Where are they?
- 11 A. I destroyed them. I used those notes to 12 interview him on tape.
 - Q. Now, in addition to interviewing Corporal Hamilton, I would imagine that when you initially interviewed him that you did so in a location away from other people?
- 17 | A. I did.
- Q. Okay. And would you tell the Court where that was?
 - A. I believe they called it the party room there at the theater.
 - Q. And who was present in that party room at the time that you interviewed Corporal Hamilton?
 - A. Just he and I.
- 25 Q. Now, you are certainly familiar with the

word witness contamination?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. You've learned of that process as early as the academy, don't interview witnesses together, right?
- A. That is part of the training that I have been taught in the past.
- Q. Including as early as your initial training in the police academy?
- A. We do our best to try to separate witnesses when we do the interviews.
- Q. Because if you don't and they start listening to somebody else's testimony, they may actually adopt that testimony as their own and actually believe that it's their own testimony, correct?
 - A. Anything's possible, sir. Yes, sir.
- Q. And then once they're contaminated, it's impossible to tell what testimony is the product of their own or what testimony is the product of someone else, right?
- A. There are ways to make sure that what they're telling me is what they actually saw. It's nothing that they had heard, but they actually witnessed it their selves.

- Q. And police officers, if you're going to interview police officers, you don't do it together either, do you? There's no exception -- the contamination rule doesn't have an exception for police officers.
 - A. I'm not quite sure I follow you, sir.
 - Q. If you're going to interview two police officers, or a police officer and another witness, you don't interview them together.
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. However, in this case, you violated that very Golden Rule, didn't you?
- A. I did allow Mr. Hamilton -- or Corporal Hamilton to sit in with his wife during that interview.
- Q. Is there some exception that we have in our training to say, just five seconds ago said, no, I can't interview a police officer and a layperson. That's a big no-no. Why the exception in one of the most high-profile shooting incidents that Pasco County has ever had?
- A. The reason I allowed Corporal Hamilton to be there with her?
- Q. Yeah.
- A. Was because she was very upset. I felt

like she would do better with him there. Corporal Hamilton did not ask her any questions, make any statements during that interview. He was simply there to be with her.

- Q. And Corporal Hamilton could have adopted now her particular statements as his own at some point in time. It's contamination.
 - A. I've got him on tape as to his statement.
- Q. How long was his taped interview? You're not talking about a thorough interview of Corporal Hamilton, are you?
- A. I'm talking about a six-minute interview where I got the majority of the information that I needed for this case.
- Q. You think that a six-minute interview in a shooting incident is a thorough interview, is that what you call a thorough interview?
 - A. No, sir.
 - MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, this has become badgering and argumentative.
- THE COURT: Let's move on.
- 22 BY MR. ESCOBAR:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. And when you interviewed Mrs. Hamilton you likewise gave her the Corporal Hamilton,
- 25 | five-minute, we're not going to turn the recorder

on, right?

- A. Let me recall. Let me see if I can find that, sir. That's correct.
 - Q. Do you have a reason for that?
- A. No, sir. I wanted to make sure that she was able to communicate everything that I needed.
- Q. What made you think that she wasn't going to communicate? Did she appear to be a full-bodied, able person?
- A. She was upset. I wanted to make sure that I understood what she was going to tell me when I put it on tape.
- Q. So let's assume that she's upset and she tells you on tape everything that's on her mind.

 What's the problem with that?
 - A. I had taken notes during the original interview. I used those notes to go off of -- to conduct the tape.
 - Q. Detective, you are aware, are you not, that a person's -- a person being upset, maybe crying, may be relevant both to the prosecution and to the Defense to memorialize that activity so that we can determine whether she's under stress, anxiety, all those things. You're not just capturing words. You're capturing her being at that

point in time. That's the reason that you record it from the very beginning; isn't that the truth?

Haven't you been trained on that?

- A. I'm not for sure if I understand the question, sir.
- Q. That you want to record people from the very beginning so that you don't miss anything, including whether they're fearful, including whether they're anxious, including whether they're crying. You want to -- you want to capture that individual as you first see it?
- A. I didn't do that in this case, sir. I didn't feel the need to do that.
- Q. You also shredded your notes of the five-minute interview of Mrs. Hamilton, as well, correct?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. Now, after the interview of Corporal Hamilton you were pretty well aware that there were some cuss words that had taken place in the theater shortly before the shooting incident, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. But the one area that you forgot to ask these witnesses was, demonstrate for me how loud those cuss words were, right?

```
1 A. I did not ask them that question.
```

- Q. You would agree that if someone's aggressive and loud, that has an impact on someone else, correct?
 - A. It could be. Yes, sir.
- Q. And in self-defense issues it's very important.
 - A. It could be, sir.
 - Q. Were you in a hurry?
- 10 A. No, sir.

2

3

4

5

8

- 11 Q. Because her interview only took five 12 minutes, as well?
- MR. MARTIN: Argumentative, Judge.
- 14 THE COURT: I'll overrule.
- 15 BY MR. ESCOBAR:
- 16 Q. It only took five minutes, right?
- A. I don't recall the exact time without the proper property receipt. That's correct.
- Q. Two supposed eyewitnesses to a shooting incident and you spent five minutes with them?
- 21 A. Yes, sir. Five minutes on tape.
- Q. Oh, five minutes and five minutes off. So 10 -- 10 minutes?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. Is that what you would consider a thorough

interview?

- A. At the time, sir, I thought that I had conducted a thorough interview with them.
- Q. You agree, would you not, that your responsibility as the lead homicide detective is to gather every bit of information from those witnesses, every bit on tape, not only for the benefit of the prosecution, but just as well for the benefit of the Defense, correct?
- A. I took a taped statement from them. I interviewed them each approximately 10 minutes each.
- Q. You would agree that your obligation is to do it very thoroughly, not only for the prosecution but also for the Defense?
- A. At the time, sir, I thought that was a thorough interview.
- Q. So is your statement, yes, that's your responsibility to do a thorough interview of the witness for the benefit of the prosecution and the Defense?
 - MR. MARTIN: He's answered the question.
 - MR. ESCOBAR: No, he has not. He has not answered that question.
 - MR. MARTIN: He indicated he did a thorough interview.

1 THE COURT: It's a two-part question. 2 Break it down, rephrase. BY MR. ESCOBAR: 3 4 Q. Is it your responsibility to conduct 5 thorough interviews of witnesses that are 6 eyewitnesses to an incident? 7 Α. It depends on what your terminology in 8 thorough means, what you would consider thorough. 9 They told me what they saw. They explained to me, 10 to the best of their knowledge, what had occurred. 11 You didn't ask them any questions, did 12 you? It was more like, just tell me what you know? 13 Α. Yes, sir. 14 15 16

Because your style is, you expect people to just kind of volunteer things that they may think you know, or want to hear, right? That's your style of interviewing. Just tell me what you know and then you pack it up and you go away?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- I -- in these interviews that I did, I was not confrontational. I tried to do my best as to let them tell me what had occurred.
- Q. You think confrontation equals asking questions?
 - Α. I believe I did ask questions.
 - Q. Do you think that confrontational equals

1 asking questions? 2 Α. No, sir. 3 You would agree that if you would have asked at the very least how loud, how loud was 4 5 Mr. Oulsen cursing. That that would have given you 6 a better understanding of what took place in that 7 theater, correct? 8 Α. Yes, sir, maybe. 9 That could have given you a better **Q**. 10 understanding of what this gentleman right here at 71 years old was feeling, correct, Detective? 11 12 That could have given me an understanding. Α. 13 Yes, sir. 14 0. It would allow you to assess fear, 15 correct, Detective? 16 It might have, sir. Yes, sir. Α. 17 And fear is an absolute very important Ο. 18 aspect of self-defense? 19 MR. MARTIN: Judge, that's going to call 20 for a legal conclusion on his part. 21 MR. ESCOBAR: It's an investigative --22 MR. MARTIN: No. 23 MR. ESCOBAR: It's a factual investigative 24 conclusion. It's not a legal conclusion. 25 MR. MARTIN: That's a legal conclusion and

1 it's in the terms. 2 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain. 3 BY MR. ESCOBAR: You finished those two witnesses and both 4 0. 5 of them indicated to you hand movement from the 6 lower row to the upper row, correct, hand movement? 7 There again, their taped interviews stand. Α. 8 I don't recall if they mentioned hand movement. 9 They did talk about some hand movement. That's 10 correct. 11 And hand movement is very important in 12 your analysis of what we call a threat assessment, 13 correct? 14 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, I'm going to 15 object to that. There hasn't been any 16 predicate that he even knows what a threat 17 assessment is. So that's a term of art from 18 Dr. Cohen. So let's --19 MR. ESCOBAR: From only Dr. Cohen or from 20 half the experts around the nation? 21 MR. MARTIN: Only Dr. Cohen in this 22 courtroom. 23 Let's not argue, gentlemen. THE COURT: 24 I'm going to sustain. 25 BY MR. ESCOBAR:

- Q. Do you know what a threat assessment is?
- 2 A. No, sir.

- Q. You have no --
- A. I've heard of threat assessments before. But to have the terminology, I don't recall.
- Q. Have you ever taken any courses yourself within your department on threat assessment and how to evaluate individuals that are about to attack police officers and what to look for and distance and creating distance? That's a subject that you've never --
- A. Yes, sir. In that aspect, I have been trained to some degree with that.
- Q. And as a police officer, you do that every day out on the streets; do you not? When someone is about to attack you, or to certainly exert some force on you, you've got to be able to assess that threat and act accordingly?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Because if you don't properly assess that threat and act accordingly, as a police officer on the street, you could die?
 - A. It could happen. Yes, sir.
- Q. So you do know what the word threat assessment is?

- A. In that terminology. Yes, sir.
- Q. And certainly hand movements are very important to the issue of threat assessment?
 - A. Yes, sir. Could be.

- Q. Now, you were aware, were you not, that both of Hamiltons indicated to you that Mr. Reeves, immediately after firing the shot, put that gun right on his knees and removed his hands from that weapon?
- A. I don't remember if he had his hand or not on the gun when the corporal removed it. He, according to this, sir, he had laid the gun down, apparently on his knee.
- Q. Did you evaluate that during your discussions with Corporal Hamilton?
- A. I don't recall, sir. I'm sorry? Did I evaluate that with Corporal Hamilton?
- Q. Did you evaluate that statement that Corporal Hamilton gave you that Mr. Reeves, immediately after the shooting, had placed that weapon on his knee and took his hands off it?
- A. I don't recall talking to him about that, sir.
 - MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, at this time I'm going to object to this line of questioning. I

can understand the line of questioning we've been talking about witness contamination, how that might play. But whether or not how he evaluated the testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton -- this isn't a bond hearing. This isn't a motion to suppress on PC of arrest and the exclusion of evidence. That's where we get this type of testimony.

This is an immunity hearing. So I can understand why you would want to hear about witnesses maybe being together. But how he evaluated certain witness's testimony, that's not the purpose here. The purpose is to determine whether or not Mr. Reeves was reasonable in this particular case. And that's -- that's not Mr. Proctor's job. That's your job. So for the purposes of an immunity hearing, this isn't relevant, Judge.

THE COURT: Response?

MR. MARTIN: So I object to this line of questioning. It's not relevant.

MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, his investigation and how he conducted his investigation and every aspect of how he conducted his investigation is extremely important and critical, and your

1 analysis of credibility and competency in this
2 particular case.

It affects every witness. How he did it.

How he didn't do it. How he collected the

evidence. How he didn't collect the evidence.

Because you'll see next week, they've got 18

witnesses that they intend to introduce here.

This is my opportunity to be able to focus on how they came about in this investigation, what they did, what they didn't do, so that you can evaluate them properly.

They want us to be in a vacuum so that you can think, well, you know, the prosecution put all those witnesses in and all this evidence in and just consider the evidence that they found on the ground, just consider the evidence that, you know, they interviewed this particular witness.

And it doesn't work that way, Your Honor.

You have to assess credibility of every witness
and every procedure that took place in this
investigation.

MR. MARTIN: Judge, therein lies the problem. What Mr. Escobar wants to do is impugn the credibility of the civilian

witnesses with what he perceives as being the deficiencies in the investigation of the Pasco Sheriff's office. And you can't make that logical leap.

So, you know, that's where we're going with it and so that's why I objected. It's just not relevant to these proceedings.

THE COURT: I'm going to overrule.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Judge.

BY MR. ESCOBAR:

- Q. Now, you remember both Mr. and
 Mrs. Hamilton discussing with you, or certainly
 Mr. Hamilton, because -- I'm not drawing them
 together. My fault there. Mr. Hamilton indicating
 to you that immediately after the shot he came over
 to Mr. Reeves and he looked at -- he grabbed the
 gun, looked down and lo and behold what did he find
 on the floor?
 - A. A cell phone, popcorn.
- Q. A cell phone. So what did you think of that cell phone being in between Mr. Reeves' legs at that moment in your evaluation of facts?

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, again, I'm going to have to object. It's a little bit different. It doesn't make any difference for

1 this hearing.

We have to -- really, I know I'm beating a dead horse, but here we're at a specific hearing, this is not a trial where he's trying to establish reasonable doubt. And that's what he's used to doing. And he can't -- he can't meet his burden by establishing in a negative. You're not going to give, quote, immunity if they can't prove it.

So that's why, you know, I object to this line of questioning about, well, what did that mean to you. It doesn't make any difference.

THE COURT: Where are you going with this?

MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, it's very simple. He

did really nothing with this particular phone.

And he's going to testify here that, you know,

he thought somehow, off the top of his head,

that maybe it was Mr. Reeves.

He did absolutely nothing to investigate this case. Not only when Corporal Hamilton showed it to him, but after Mr. Reeves had told him, hey, I think that I was -- I know I was hit in the head. I think I may have been hit in the head with a phone.

Oblivious to it, totally oblivious to it.

Didn't do anything with it. Didn't do any investigate to it. He still assumed that it was Mr. Reeves' phone that was in between his legs.

These are critical issues that this

Court's going to have to evaluate in assessing

credibility, in assessing competency of not

only this detective here but every officer that

played a role in this case.

If not, what we're doing is, let's just throw a bunch of evidence somewhere in that theater and then let's just let Mr. Reeves testify about what happened and then -- that's what he wants. Then let's have the Court determine, just based upon Mr. Reeves' testimony as to whether he acted reasonably.

There's a vital part here of the investigation. I'm not -- as you can see already of the testimony that we've elicited concerning, you know, Detective Proctor -- and I say this with total respect with reference to his performance -- but it's important. It's not like I am harping on things that shouldn't be harped on.

THE COURT: Why is it important again?

MR. ESCOBAR: It's because, Your Honor,
you're going to have to assess the --

THE COURT: Why do I have to assess how he performed in his -- why do I -- I mean, I get it in the whole grand scheme of things. But are we going to go through witness by witness by witness --

MR. ESCOBAR: No.

THE COURT: -- and evidence by evidence --

MR. ESCOBAR: No.

THE COURT: -- and I'm going to have to second-guess what he did at that time?

MR. ESCOBAR: There's two witnesses that we're going to be going thoroughly through this, which were the two main witnesses, the two main officers, that were responsible for this investigation.

And absolutely, Your Honor, this Court needs to be able to assess the credibility of both of those witnesses because they're going to be testifying their opinions as to many things involving the investigation itself.

And if I'm not able to show this Court what they didn't do and why they didn't do those things and have the Court evaluate that,

then this Court's going to sit here and it's going to say, well, Detective Proctor, you know, has 35 homicides under his belt and he did an absolute wonderful job, which is not part of my main case, but it is impossible -- it is impossible for you to judge his credibility unless you know what he did and how he did it in the investigation.

And Judge, this is -- this is my burden.

But what's going to happen here is that they're going to present their testimony and they're sandbagging me at that point in time.

And so I don't think that what I'm doing here with Detective Proctor, and I don't think that what I'm going to do with Detective Smith, is out of line at all. It is very, very relevant.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ESCOBAR: And it's necessary. I've got a person's life in my hands.

THE COURT: I've heard that before. I get that. The issue I have here is at what point -- you know, I've got a very specific job to do.

MR. ESCOBAR: Uh-huh.

1 THE COURT: And I don't really see myself 2 coming to that conclusion, oh, well Detective 3 Proctor did this, so I'm going to infer that. 4 That's not really --5 MR. ESCOBAR: It's not inferring. 6 THE COURT: -- my process. 7 MR. ESCOBAR: It's not inferring. It's 8 determining. 9 THE COURT: That's what you basically just 10 said that I'm going to do what, you know --11 MR. ESCOBAR: You're going to assess 12 credibility of every witness. 13 THE COURT: Of course I am. 14 MR. ESCOBAR: Because the minute someone 15 takes the stand and --16 THE COURT: All right. Let me just --17 let's just clarify. Okay. Credibility is 18 huge. 19 MR. ESCOBAR: Uh-huh. 20 THE COURT: I've been doing this long 21 enough to watch and listen and know what I need 22 to look for and all the things that we're --23 all the guidance we're given. 24 You can point out any deficiencies you 25 feel were done. But let's get on with it.

know, I'm not in the position -- my job, as a whole, is to make a decision in this case regarding whether Mr. Reeves acted reasonably or not, in a nutshell.

And I don't need to know exactly what Detective Proctor thought when he was interviewing someone to determine their credibility.

When -- if you want to -- I'm going to give you some leeway on this, but let's -- let's, you know -- that's not -- I don't want to get away from the crux of the issue here, as Mr. Martin has been objecting and objecting for the duration of this hearing.

Let's please, you know, get to the heart.

I will allow you some leeway to show what you
feel are deficiencies, but only to the extent
that it impacts somebody's credibility.

MR. ESCOBAR: And Judge, I -respectfully, that's what I'm trying to do.

I'm not trying to go outside of those bounds.

And I certainly understand the Court's feelings and rulings and we will abide by them.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

BY MR. ESCOBAR:

- Q. You then finished Mrs. Hamilton's interview, as well; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And the same process, five minutes off, five minutes on?
 - A. About that. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And then who did you decide to interview then?
 - A. Mr. Reeves.

- Q. And why Mr. Reeves at this point in time?

 Did you not want to go back now into the theater and try to see if, in fact, you were able to see some of the evidence that Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton had described? I mean, they're saying there's a phone, you know, there on the floor. Did you not want to go at this point in time, and at the very least, take a peek?
- A. I had -- I was aware there was a phone and popcorn there. I'm sure I had been told that by that time, not only by the Hamiltons, but there again, I was aware that there was popcorn on the floor, as well as a phone.
- Q. And so you didn't feel the need to go back in, correct?
 - A. Correct.

```
1
               Okay. So tell me where this interview
          Q.
2
     with Mr. Reeves -- that was your next interview,
 3
     correct?
 4
          Α.
               That's correct.
               MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we've got a
 5
 6
          stipulated disk of am interview with Curtis
 7
          Reeves.
8
               Let me -- can I show this? It's 141529
9
          and it's got a date of 1/24/14 on it. Can we
10
          have it just marked at this point in time just
11
          as an exhibit without introducing or do you
12
          want me to just call it by 14 --
13
               THE COURT: It doesn't get marked by her
14
          unless it comes in. You've got identification
15
16
               MR. MARTIN: Mr. Escobar, that number is
17
          the offense number.
18
               MR. ESCOBAR: I know it is. I'm trying to
19
          get the other one --
20
               MR. MARTIN: 6-AP is his number.
21
               MR. ESCOBAR: I don't see it here. I've
22
          got it.
    BY MR. ESCOBAR:
23
24
               I'm going to show you, Detective, what's
          Q.
25
     called 6-AP. It's a CD interview supposedly of
```

1 Curtis Reeves, and see if you recognize that. 2 Α. Yes, sir. I do. 3 0. Now, the front of that --4 MR. ESCOBAR: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: 5 Sure. BY MR. ESCOBAR: 6 7 The front of that bag says what? 0. CD interview of Curtis Reeves. 8 Α. 9 **Q**. Okay. 10 1643 to 1648. Α. 11 Is that your writing? Q. 12 Α. That's correct. 13 Q. Okay. 14 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we've stipulated 15 to the introduction of this particular CD. 16 It will be admitted as 34. THE COURT: 17 (Whereupon, Defense Exhibit Number 34 was admitted.) 18 MR. ESCOBAR: And then, Your Honor, we 19 have also agreed to the admission of a 20 transcript that was performed by the State 21 Attorney's office, and I'm going to mark the 22 back of this one. BY MR. ESCOBAR: 23 24 I am going to show you what's been marked Q. 25 as Defense Exhibit Number 200 and ask you if you

1 listened to the CD tape and then reviewed a 2 transcript to determine whether, in your opinion, it 3 contained everything from that CD in the form of communication. 4 Might I see that bag again, sir? 5 6 Absolutely. And we're going to show you 7 now this bag as Defendant's Exhibit Number 34. 8 MR. MARTIN: I believe that's admitted 9 Evidence 34. 10 MR. ESCOBAR: It is. 11 THE COURT: It is. 12 THE WITNESS: Can I look at my property 13 receipts? 14 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 15 0. Sure. 16 Do you have those? 17 I got this from the prosecution. Ο. 18 They were the ones that indicated that on the 19 Exhibit 200 that was something that you had reviewed 20 and had approved. 21 Α. That's correct. 22 Q. Okay. And so exhibit -- Defense Exhibit 23 Number 200 is what you reviewed. And you determined 24 that that was a correct transcript of what's

25

contained --

MR. MARTIN: Judge, let me -- if I may

just -- the transcript is within the police

report itself.

And Mr. Escobar is correct of what I did

is I took the reformatted so that it read with

line numbers and a page so that individuals could refer to the page of the police report is 76 and when we have a line number, it made it a lot easier.

We have agreed, and normally we don't do this, is to put a transcript into evidence.

But it's only for the immunity hearing so that we aren't constantly trying to play and find bits and pieces on a CD to speed this up.

MR. ESCOBAR: This was a stipulation between the Defense and the Government just -- and we're going to give the Court a copy, as well.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah, we have a copy for the Court. I'll supply the format, but it's just a little bit different.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: That's how the transcript came about. I didn't transcribe it.

THE COURT: I didn't figure. I didn't

1 know that was one of your talents. 2 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we would move 3 Defense Exhibit Number 200 into evidence as Detective Proctor's --4 THE COURT: I remember view. 5 6 MR. ESCOBAR: -- transcription of the 7 interview between Detective Proctor and Curtis 8 Reeves. 9 THE COURT: That will be 35, transcript of 10 interview. 11 (Whereupon, Defense Exhibit Number 35 was admitted.) 12 MR. ESCOBAR: And Your Honor, I've got a 13 copy. We've got copies for the Court, as well. 14 MR. MARTIN: Mr. Escobar, if I could put 15 one other thing on the record about the 16 transcript. 17 You'll see it says revision 1/9/17. But 18 it also, right under that, says PSO report 19 printed 1/12/16. 20 That's important because every time you 21 print a Pasco Sheriff's report, it repaginates 22 everything. So if you have a police report 23 that was printed after that date, the pages may 24 or may not be the same. 25 So I want to make sure the record's clear

that we're trying to correlate the page report
with a printed copy of the Pasco Sheriff's
office report. And we have to refer to the
printed on 1/12/16 for the pages to correspond
Page 75, 76, that sort of thing.
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: And I know that drives us

MR. MARTIN: And I know that drives us nuts, but that's just the way it works.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Escobar.

BY MR. ESCOBAR:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Let's talk about your interview of Mr. Reeves and where that took place.

So you finished Mrs. Hamilton. And where do you go now?

- A. I exit the back of the theater with

 Detective Koening. I exit the theater with

 Detective Koenig. I drive my vehicle around back

 where I made contact with Deputy Gondak who has

 Mr. Reeves sitting in the back of his car.
 - Q. Okay. And what do you do at this point?
- A. Mr. Reeves is removed. The defendant is removed from the back of the car. I move him to my car. We move his handcuffs from his back around to his front and I sit him -- he sits in the front of

1 | my vehicle.

2

3

4

7

8

9

- Q. Okay. And all the while that you're doing this whole process, do you have a recorder?
 - A. Yes, sir. I do.
- Q. And are you turning the recording onimmediately at the time of that interview?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And why are you turning the recording on immediately at the interview of Mr. Reeves?
- 10 A. To capture what he tells me.
- Q. So you use a different process than you used for Corporal Hamilton and Mrs. Hamilton?
 - A. He's the suspect in this case.
- 14 Q. And so that makes a difference?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And so that is where the interview is conducted?
- 18 A. In the front of my vehicle. Yes, sir.
- Q. And why not in some room at the Cobb
 Theater?
- A. Convenience. It was just easier to sit him in the front of my car.
- Q. Okay. Now, how long was that interview, that first interview?
- 25 A. 1510 is when I started. It's concluded at

1540. 1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 2 Q. 1540?
- 3 Α. That's correct.
 - So about 30 minutes? 0.
 - Α. Yes, sir.
 - Okay. Now, in that particular interview are you using the same procedure of just pretty much tell me what happens and you let Mr. Reeves tell you what happens?
 - Yes, sir. It was an interview. Α.
- Okay. In that particular interview did 12 Mr. Reeves tell you that he was scared of Mr. Oulsen 13 before the shooting?
 - Α. There again, the tape sort of stands for itself, but he did mention that he was scared.
 - Did he indicate to you that he had been hit in the head and he believed that he had been hit in the head with a phone?
 - He says that he's been hit. Originally it was with possibly the fist and then the cell phone and then he just told me he didn't know what he was hit with.
- 23 Well, but the question is did he tell you Q. 24 that he thought that he was possibly hit in the head 25 with a phone?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Now, did you ask him what the lighting conditions were inside the theater?
 - A. No, sir.
- 5 Q. Why not?

4

8

9

17

22

23

- A. Well, he said that it was dark in the theater. He volunteered that.
 - Q. Did you get that same statement that it was dark for Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton?
- 10 A. I don't recall, sir. It's on the tape, if 11 I did.
- Q. Had you checked with anyone there at the Cobb Theater to determine during previews what the level of lighting was?
- 15 A. No, sir. But I've been in theaters before
 16 with the previews playing.
 - Q. And so you accepted that as being dark?
- 18 A. Well, as being -- yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Darker?
- A. Darker, than with the lights on full blast.
 - Q. Okay. And so did that play a role in your evaluation that if it was darker you may have a bit more difficulty seeing everything clearly.
- 25 A. I think -- yes, sir. Common sense would

1 | dictate that. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. Okay. And so when he told you, hey, I think that I may have been hit with Mr. Oulsen's cell phone, I'm sure that that rang a bell with reference to your statements that you had previously taken from Corporal Hamilton and Mrs. Hamilton.
 - A. I made that note. Yes, sir.
- Q. Wow, he got hit with a phone and we've got a phone in between Mr. Reeves' legs. You wanted to go find that phone; did you not?
 - A. I knew the phone was there, sir.
- Q. Well, did you want to at some point
 quickly try to focus on that phone and if, in fact,
 that was Mr. Oulsen's phone?
- A. I did want to determine whose phone it was.
- 17 O. You did what?
- A. I did want to determine whose phone that was.
- Q. When did you want to determine whose phone it was?
 - A. As quick as I could.
- Q. Did you make --
- 24 A. As soon as --
- 25 Q. Did you make a determination on

1 | January 13th, 2014 as to whose phone it was?

- A. I speculated that it was Chad's phone.
- Q. You speculated?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

- Q. That certainly would be corroborating evidence for you that Mr. Reeves was hit in the head with a phone. Mr. Reeves says, I believe I was hit in the head with a phone. Lo and behold, between his legs, immediately after the shooting there's Mr. Oulsen's phone. Corroborating evidence?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And Mr. Reeves told you that in addition to being hit with the phone that Mr. Oulsen was cursing violently at him?
 - A. He said that Mr. Reeves --
- 16 Q. Mr. Oulsen.
 - A. Mr. Oulsen was cursing. Yes.
- 18 Q. Did you ask him how loud?
- A. He says that it was loud. I don't think I asked him that question.
 - Q. Did you ask him how close?
- A. He tells me that he's leaned over the chair coming at him.
- Q. Did you know at that time how tall
 Mr. Oulsen was?

- 1 A. No, sir.
- 2 Q. Did you know how much he weighed?
- 3 A. No, sir.

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 4 Q. Did you know how old he was?
 - A. No, sir. Not the direct age. No, sir.
 - Q. Did you take that opportunity in talking to Mr. Reeves to discuss with him the extent of his training as a law enforcement officer for 27 years with the Tampa Police Department?
- 10 | A. No, sir.
- 11 Q. Why not?
- 12 A. I didn't feel the need to do that.
- 13 | Q. Why not?
 - A. I did not -- just didn't feel the need to do that at that time. It was not part of -- he had just shot someone. I wanted to make sure that he told me what occurred. I did not feel the need to discuss his history there with Tampa Police Department.
 - Q. Well, did you want to determine how he carried out the threat assessment of Mr. Oulsen against his person?
- MR. MARTIN: Judge, I hate to keep standing up, but we're back to --
- THE COURT: Hang on a minute.

1 MR. MARTIN: So glad that's not me.

THE COURT: Are you objecting to no predicate?

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'm objecting to a 402 argument. And we're back to the purpose of why we have these questions for this hearing.

I know the Court says -- and I was -- and I don't mean to usurp your authority to call it quits when you want to call it quits. But for me, we're back to the -- where we are.

It doesn't make any difference what

Mr. Proctor was thinking or doing at this point
in time. We've got the statement that we got.

We have the evidence that we have. The
witnesses are what they are. They remember
what they are.

So again, it's almost like, Judge, the argument we have when we have hearsay. We've been arguing about, oh, it's hearsay. Well, if it's not offered for the truth of the matter asserted, it's relevant for what? I mean, that's where we're at now.

So if we can say, oh, we're not offering it for the truth, that's almost like the argument Mr. Escobar is making, but we're not

getting to the second part, what is it offered for. And it has to be relevant if it has a tendency to prove any material fact.

And so we have the same thing here. It doesn't make any difference what Mr. Proctor thought about what his thoughts were during the interview. We're not -- it's not a probable cause, it's not a suppress, that's not what this hearing is all about. He's already been arrested.

MR. ESCOBAR: Detective Proctor is interviewing Mr. Reeves to determine whether Mr. Reeves acted reasonably at that moment. That's what he's doing. He's asking him exactly, tell me what happened. Who was there. Was it loud. Was it not loud. How did you feel.

That's exactly what this issue is.

Because this Court's going to have to make a determination in standing in Mr. Reeves' shoes whether Mr. Reeves acted reasonably on that particular day as being either in fear of imminent death or great bodily harm.

This goes to the crux of it. He's the guy that's getting the information for us in that

1 evaluation process. 2 MR. MARTIN: I think he just made the 3 argument that I've been making. It doesn't 4 make any difference whether or not Mr. Proctor, 5 at this point in time, believes he was or was 6 not reasonable. 7 They made a decision at the scene to 8 arrest him. They made that decision. 9 doesn't make any difference to Your Honor. 10 You're making the decision now. So what 11 difference does it make for this hearing, for 12 your consideration, what they thought? 13 doesn't make any difference. 14 THE COURT: I'm going to allow it. 15 stay to the issue. Keep the --16 I'm at the interview. MR. ESCOBAR: 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 MR. ESCOBAR: I'm dealing with the 19 interview at this point, Judge. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. 21 Madam court reporter, I've MR. ESCOBAR: 22 lost my train of thought on that particular --THE COURT: You asked him about his threat 23

BY MR. ESCOBAR:

assessment.

24

Q. Now, you didn't ask him how loud, but he volunteered that, correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And he indicated to you that he had been hit, he thought, with a phone, correct?
 - A. A phone, a fist, something.
 - Q. And he indicated to you that he saw

 Mr. Oulson coming -- his body coming over his seat

 and Mr. Oulsen was facing him, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And he indicated to you that he was trying to create distance as much as he could with Mr.
- 13 | Oulsen, correct?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- 14 A. He said he sat back in the chair.
- Q. Is that a common police procedure, creating distance between the person that's attacking him?
- 18 A. Depends on the situation.
- Q. Well, is it always that you want to create distance from someone that's about to attack you?
- A. Normally you would want to do that.
- 22 | That's correct.
- Q. You certainly don't want to shorten the distance; is that correct?
- 25 A. Probably not in this situation.

Q. And Mr. Reeves told you that Mr. Oulsen told him that he was going to kick his fucking ass?

- A. I don't recall that's the terminology, the exact terminology he used, but it was something to that effect. Yes, sir.
- Q. And Mr. Reeves told you he had never been so scared in his life?
 - A. He did say that. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And he appeared candid to you?
- A. He gave me a statement at the time. I thought that -- there again, he told me that. And I did not pick up on anything that he told me at that time that I could say, hey, look, you're lying. There again, I couldn't get inside of his head, but he told me that he was scared.
- Q. And, in fact, you were surprised that he was so forthcoming with everything. In fact, you told him that. You said, you know, I really thought you weren't going to be so forthcoming with me?
 - A. I don't recall making that comment.
- Q. Were you surprised that he was so forthcoming?
- A. No, sir. I mean, I think that he told me
 what occurred, and to his understanding what had
 occurred.

- Q. And that's what's important, right, is to try to determine from his point of view what he felt?
- A. It would be important for me to know what was going on there. Yes, sir.
- Q. Now, in your evaluation process you're looking for -- at this point in time since he's told you that he's been hit with a phone in the head --

MR. ESCOBAR: Madam Clerk, may I have that exhibit, the phone? Thank you.

BY MR. ESCOBAR:

- Q. He's being hit with a phone in the head, certainly that is not the common use of a phone, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And if he's being hit in the phone with the head (sic), whether it's being thrown or whether he's being hit, that phone is being used as a weapon?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And so in your investigation you're determining whether that phone was being used as a deadly weapon?
- A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And you would agree that hands can kill?

1 A. Sure.

- Q. And you would agree, likewise, that you can have serious and great bodily harm by someone throwing or hitting you with a phone in the head?
- A. You could be injured. You could be injured.
 - Q. Seriously injured.
- A. I don't quite understand how that could happen, but I guess anything is possible, sir.
- Q. Okay. Well, let's try to explore it. Did you not think that this phone could cause great bodily harm?
 - A. If it hit him maybe in the eye or something. I'm not a medical doctor. But like I said, anything is possible.
 - Q. In this case did you ever go to a professional and ask them whether this phone could cause great bodily harm?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. And you've indicated just a few seconds ago you're not a doctor.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Throughout this 30-minute period of questioning of Mr. Reeves did you ask him how loud the surroundings were when this was happening?

1 A. No, sir.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. He told you it was dark?
- 3 | A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Did you ask him at all concerning any of the disabilities or frailties that he may have been experiencing in his life at that time?
 - A. There again, the tape stands for itself, sir, but he mentions that he has arthritis.
 - Q. My question was not whether you heard that. Did you ask him, Mr. Reeves, can you tell me the laundry list that you may be experiencing in frailties at this point in time?
 - A. No, sir. I didn't ask that.
 - Q. Did you not want to know what his physical condition was at the time of this particular attack?
 - A. He was giving me the -- he gave me the information that he had arthritis, that he was in poor health.
 - Q. He also told you he had a bad back?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. That he was a physical wreck?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. But you didn't ask him specifically what that meant?
- 25 A. No, sir.

Q. But it was important to you in your assessment in this case?

- A. Everything's important, sir.
- Q. Including that?
- A. (Nods head.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. Now, Mr. Reeves also indicated to you that his head was hurting, there was something going on with his area of the eye?
- A. The eye. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Is that correct?
- 11 A. The eye. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And did you ask him how it was that that happened?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. And what did he tell you?
- 16 A. That he thought he had been hit with something.
- Q. Okay. And so at that point in time you had a possible injury, correct?
- A. I didn't see an injury. He said that he had an injury.
- Q. Did he appear to be candid with you at that time?
- A. Yes, sir. He was rubbing his eye.
- Q. That interview took 30 minutes and you

```
then went where?
 1
 2
          Α.
               I spoke to Mrs. Reeves.
 3
          0.
               Okay. And so where did that take place?
 4
          Α.
               I believe that was also in the party room.
 5
          0.
               Okay. And did you have a prerecording for
     that?
 6
 7
               I did not.
          Α.
 8
          Q.
               And why not?
 9
               She had already been interviewed.
          Α.
10
               Okay. So why were you interviewing her
          Q.
11
     then if she had already been interviewed?
12
               To get her on tape.
          Α.
13
          Q.
               She had not been on tape before?
14
          Α.
               That's my understanding.
15
               Okay. And so now you were going to get
          Q.
16
     her on tape?
17
          Α.
               That's correct.
18
               Okay. And did you do that alone or with
          Ο.
     someone else?
19
20
               Detective -- at the time Detective Matt
          Α.
21
    Myers was accompanying me.
22
          Q.
               How long was that interview, by the way?
               1625 to 16 -- or 4:25 to 4:38.
23
          Α.
24
               4:25 to 4:38, so how many minutes?
          Q.
```

25

Α.

Thirteen.

Q. Thirteen minutes. And who did you interview next? You still haven't gone into the theater, right?

A. That's correct.

4

7

8

9

11

16

17

18

- Q. Did you have a second interview with Mr. Reeves?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. So you still haven't gone into the theater?
- 10 A. That's correct, sir.
 - Q. So where do you go after Mrs. Reeves?
- 12 A. I go back and I speak to Curtis again,
 13 Mr. Reeves, the defendant.
- Q. Well, did you go anywhere between the time of Mrs. Reeves and going back to speak to Curtis?
 - A. I believe that's where I met with the command staff and we had a -- we had a meeting as to what the investigation had revealed.
 - O. That lasted about five minutes?
- 20 A. I don't recall, sir.
- Q. Well, check your next interview with

 Mr. Reeves and see how much time lapsed between the

 end of Mrs. Reeves and the beginning of the second

 Mr. Reeves interview.
- 25 A. That's correct. Five minutes.

1 So five minutes with your command staff Q. 2 and now you're back talking to Mr. Reeves and 3 telling him you're going to charge him with 4 second-degree murder? 5 That's correct. 6 0. That was your investigation in this case? 7 Α. That's correct, sir. 8 Despite the fact that you believed that Q. 9 Mr. Reeves was very forthcoming with everything that 10 you had asked? 11 He gave me a story as to what had 12 occurred. 13 Q. He was forthcoming with everything that 14 you had asked; is that correct? 15 He gave me what he had -- his take on what Α. 16 had occurred there. 17 Page 165 --Ο. 18 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor --19 MR. ESCOBAR: -- Line --20 MR. MARTIN: -- I appreciate that. 21 if those words are in there, I mean, if we're 22 really nitpicking about what's going -- was he 23 forthcoming. He said everything. I mean, is 24 that really impeachment? No.

So, you know, I hate to keep standing up.

1 THE COURT: Is he substantially 2 inconsistent? 3 MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, he said he was 4 very -- he was forthcoming with everything that I asked with his statement. Yes, sir. 5 6 MR. MARTIN: So how is that substantially 7 different? 8 MR. ESCOBAR: Because he's avoiding the 9 word forthcoming. That's what he's avoiding. 10 I've asked him twice. 11 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 12 Forthcoming, correct, Detective? Q. 13 MR. MARTIN: Wait a minute. We're 14 still -- I still have my objection. 15 THE COURT: I heard him say candid. 16 MR. MARTIN: Right. 17 MR. ESCOBAR: And forthcoming, meaning, 18 giving as much as Mr. Reeves had. 19 THE COURT: Go ahead. I'll overrule. 20 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 21 Correct, Detective? 0. 22 Α. Is that what I said in my deposition? 23 That's what you said in your deposition. Q. 24 I understand, sir, that he gave me a Α. 25 statement at that time that I believed, in his -- to

1 | him he thought was true and correct.

- Q. Now, what do you do now? Because now you've gotten his statement, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. You believed his statement was straightforward and honest?
- A. In his mind he thought -- he had sat in the back of a patrol car for a period of time and now he's telling me this story. Yes, sir.
 - Q. He appeared straightforward and honest.
- A. He told me what had occurred. There again, I cannot get inside of his head. He's telling me that statement.
 - Q. Page 165. Question: and one of the things that you're trying to assess -- well, in this person, is he candid with me. He appeared to be honest and straightforward. Was he. Your answer: He did appear to be straightforward. Question: And honest. Answer: And honest.
 - A. All right, sir.
- 21 Q. Were you being truthful back then?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. Is that a truthful answer?
- MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, I'm going to

 object. That depo calls for speculation. It'

1 calling for speculation now.

Just like Mr. Proctor said, he can't get into his head. So just because it was asked at the depo doesn't mean it's going to be admitted into court. That's not a proper question. It calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Yeah, I kind of thought so.

But it's -- we've already had this discussion

for impeachment purposes. I'll allow it. But

now you want to object as to it calls for

speculation, the question? Yeah, we've already

gone past that. But let's just move on.

BY MR. ESCOBAR:

- Q. What was your next step in this investigation? Now you've informed Mr. Reeves that he is going to be arrested.
 - A. I go into the theater.
- Q. Okay. At what time did you first go into the theater? So you would have gone into the theater after you told Mr. Reeves that he was going to be arrested?
 - A. That's correct. I go in at 5:32.
- Q. At 5:32?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. And that's approximately how many hours

1 | after this incident?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

- A. Four hours.
- Q. Now, what's your purpose now in going into the theater?
- A. To visualize the theater. I wanted to see the area.
 - Q. Why didn't you do that before you decided to charge Mr. Reeves with second-degree murder?
 - A. I had -- I was being apprised of everything that was going on inside the theater.
 - Q. Who was apprising you of that?
- 12 A. Sergeant Harris -- our acting Sergeant
 13 Harris, and other deputies who were in contact with
 14 Detective Smith.
 - Q. Well, then -- and you're talking about the interviews that were taking place?
 - A. No, sir. The crime scene.
- 18 | O. Just the crime scene?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. So you weren't being given any information about the interviews that were taking place by the various detectives there with the Pasco County Sheriff's office?
- A. No, sir. I was being apprised of that also.

- Q. Well, how were you being apprised of that?
- A. We -- those detectives were reporting to Sergeant Sessa and Detective Harris, who was the acting sergeant.
- Q. Well, how many -- how many summaries of their interviews did they give you before you decided to charge Mr. Reeves?
 - A. We stood there. We talked about it.
- Q. That's a five-minute session that you had there?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. So I would suspect that no one during that five-minute session told you about Joanna Turner?
 - A. They did not mention people by name.
- Q. Well, during that five-minute session certainly they didn't tell you about the young lady who indicated that she saw Mr. Oulsen with a dark object in her (sic) hand that she believed -- in his hand, that she believed was either a dark cup, a black cup or a thermos, making a throwing motion to the back area?
 - MR. MARTIN: I object, Judge. And you saw her actions and that's not what she did and he knows it.
 - MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, you can be the judge

1 of it, whether it was this or whether it was 2 this. 3 MR. MARTIN: No. No. MR. ESCOBAR: It's a throwing motion. 4 5 MR. MARTIN: No. No. That's exactly 6 So I object to the whole line of 7 questioning. 8 Again, we're going right back -- it doesn't make any difference what took place in 9 10 that five minutes for you to make your 11 decision. And this whole line of questioning 12 is not relevant to these proceedings. 13 THE COURT: Where are you going with this? 14 MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, just the area of the 15 decision-making process and the communication 16 is very important. 17 MR. MARTIN: It doesn't make any --18 It's not going to take me a MR. ESCOBAR: 19 whole lot of time. I'm going to be off of this 20 in a few seconds. 21 THE COURT: Go on. 22 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 23 So that information was not given to you, Q. 24 correct, Detective? 25 Α. Not about the lady who was -- observed

throwing an object. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

- A. It wasn't furnished to me at that time.
- Q. Well, at the very least, did you inquire of any -- of either Harris or Sessa or any other detective? Hey, listen, Reeves told me that he got hit in the head with a phone. We need to find out how that phone got in between his legs. Whose phone is it. You knew it wasn't Mr. Reeves' phone, right, is what you're telling me?
- A. In that meeting that we stood there, we talked about the fact that no one had saw him get hit --
 - Q. Did the --
- A. -- with anything.
 - Q. Was that odd to you in a darkened theater, people watching previews in a loud theater with previews, was that odd that people would not have clear vision of everything that went on around them?
- A. You know, his wife is sitting right next to him.
 - Q. Right.
- A. She doesn't see that. She doesn't see him qet hit.
 - Q. And she tells you that she was terrified

when Mr. Oulsen was coming over onto their seat,
correct?

A. I don't know if she uses the terminology
terrified, but her tape stands for itself also.

O. She was scared.

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, again, this is getting argumentative. He wants to say, you should have done this, this and this. This means this to him when, in fact, they took a different approach.

They made the arrest. They made the determination that the immunity wasn't going to apply at that initial investigation. And now it's up to you to decide on the facts in this case and this is not relevant to these proceedings.

MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, we cannot present our case in isolation. If that was the case, then the only one that we would present is Mr. Reeves to come in here and say, this is what I remember happening.

We weren't there. Remember, when law enforcement goes there to investigate a crime, the Defense is not there. And so it's their production. It is their investigation.

These items of evidence that you're going to see next week from the Government are going to be from individuals like this detective, and you're going to have to assess the credibility of that particular evidence and the relevancy of that particular evidence based upon his investigation.

I know what Mr. Martin wants. He doesn't want the people that actually --

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Escobar doesn't know what I want. I'm getting tired of him trying to explain to people what I think.

THE COURT: All right. All right. All right. It's been a long week. Listen, I do not know exactly what's coming. So in an abundance of caution, I'm going to allow this so we don't have to call everybody back.

Because I anticipate I'm going to hear that argument, if you would have let me delve into this area, this is exactly what I was telling you was going to come.

So I'm going to allow it. Just please -MR. ESCOBAR: I'm trying to move along as
quickly as I can.

THE COURT: And I'm not worried about

1 quick, just redundant or irrelevant. Just, you 2 know, kind of keep focused. 3 MR. ESCOBAR: I am. THE COURT: Thank you. 4 5 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 6 So now you go into that scene without 7 having the benefit of Joanna Turner, correct? 8 Α. That's correct, sir. 9 Why not group all the detectives that had 10 done some interviews, and at the very least gather 11 them up, and for yourself, figure out what they learned? 12 13 Α. We did that. 14 Q. In that five-minute period? 15 Α. No, sir. Afterwards. 16 After you went into the scene? Q. 17 Α. Right. 18 Okay. So we're going to get to that in Q. 19 just a second. So now you go into the scene and lo 20 and behold you see the phone? 21 I can't remember if the phone was there or Α. 22 if they already collected it at that time. 23 Why would they be collecting it without Q. 24 you having the opportunity to see it in the location

of which it was found? You've got the information

1 | now about that phone.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. It's been photographed. It's been videoed and it's been collected.
- Q. By that time did you know that there was a video surveillance system in that theater?
- A. I was told there were cameras up. I did not believe that it would capture the actual event.
- Q. And how did you make determination of that? Because you hadn't been inside the theater yet.
- 11 A. Oh, are you talking about -- afterwards is 12 when --
 - Q. No. no. Before.
 - A. I misunderstood your question, Counselor.
- 15 Q. No. no. Before.
- 16 A. I'm already inside the scene.
 - Q. Let's take it right before, and then we'll see what the evaluation process is.
 - A. Okay. Go ahead.
 - Q. Did you know even know that there was a surveillance system before you go -- four hours later, before you go into the crime scene, did you even know that there was a video surveillance system at the Cobb Theater inside Theater 10?
 - A. I don't recall if they told me that or

not. I don't believe that I was aware of it. There again, I don't recall anybody telling me that there was a video back in the back.

- Q. You would agree that that's -- if there is a video surveillance, that's a pretty good piece of evidence?
 - A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. And one of the reasons that you go into the scene from the very beginning is that you want to get the layout and see if, in fact, there's anything that could aid you in your investigation?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. If that phone had hit Mr. Reeves, you realize that there's a possibility that there would be DNA on that phone, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. So you don't want that phone touched.

 There's DNA on that phone. You summons the forensic people right then and there. They can do that DNA right there on that floor. We don't do that?
 - A. (Shakes head.) No, sir.
 - Q. And why not?
- A. It needs to be in a controlled environment.
- 25 Q. In a controlled environment?

1 A. That's correct.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Okay. But you have forensic people to do that.
 - A. In a controlled environment.
 - Q. And you also have cyber crimes there, correct?
 - A. I believe they were there. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And so you can group up both cyber crimes and forensics to take care of just about anything with that phone?
 - A. That's not protocol for us to process DNA on the scene involving a phone like that.
 - Q. Do you realize that when people touch a phone that they can damage DNA, remove DNA?
 - A. There again, they're trained in how to handle DNA touch evidence.
 - Q. And so you didn't ever, days later, instruct Detective Smith to go into evidence and turn on that phone again to see whose phone it was?
 - A. I did not instruct him. He was instructed to go.
 - Q. He was instructed to do it?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- Q. Did you know that he was instructed to go and touch that phone again before DNA even had a

1 chance to touch it? 2 I don't recall, sir, when I became aware 3 of that. Now, the fact of a 43-year-old man 4 0. 5 attacking a 71-year-old man was of concern to you, 6 correct? 7 Yes, sir. Α. 8 0. And the reason it was of concern to you is 9 because you realized that people, as they age, 10 become frail, fragile. They're more easily hurt, 11 correct? 12 In some cases, that's correct. Α. 13 Q. Mr. Reeves was an elderly man? 14 Α. Seventy-one. 15 And he had already told you that he had Q. 16 some physical problems? 17 Α. That's correct. 18 And Mr. Reeves told you that he believed 19 that Mr. Oulsen was going to, quote, pardon my 20 language, beat the shit out of him? 21 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, asked and 22 answered about 40 minutes ago. 23 THE COURT: Sustained. Please move on. 24 BY MR. ESCOBAR:

Mr. Reeves had told you that Mr. Oulsen

25

Q.

1 | was very explosive at that time?

A. I don't recall if he uses the terminology explosive.

Q. 234 --

4

5

6

7

8

9

22

23

- A. The tape stands for itself, sir.
- Q. You don't remember explosive?
- A. There again, I'm not for sure if that's his exact terminology or not in this. There again, the tape stands for itself. If that's what the --
- Q. Have you ever heard of the phrase, escalating patterns of violence?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And where have you heard that?
- 14 A. I don't remember, sir.
- 15 Q. In your training as a law enforcement?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And why is that assessment important for you, an escalating pattern of violence?
- A. That's -- it's important to law
 enforcement to know how to -- when and what to do in
 certain situations.
 - Q. And if you don't correctly assess that situation, it could mean your life?
 - A. It could. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. So when you went into the theater to do

your first assessment four hours later, there was no evidence there?

- A. There again, I believe the popcorn might have still been on the floor and things like that.

 I believe that they were in the process of possibly numbering the seats at that time.
- Q. Now, in your interview with Mrs. Reeves you indicated that you recorded her; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.

Q. And you remember her telling you in that interview that immediately after the shooting Mr. Reeves had told her, Mr. Oulsen hit me in the face?

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, I'm going to object. Calls for hearsay. And if it's not being offered for the truth, then we're going to have to have some type of relevancy in this particular proceeding. We can't just go through everybody's statement and get it on the record.

So I object to the hearsay and there's no relevancy for -- other than for the truth.

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, I'm going to -I'm not going to ask that question. I'm going

1 to --2 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 3 Q. So you would agree that if she made that 4 statement --THE COURT: Withdrawn. 5 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 6 -- it would be on the recording? 0. 8 Α. That's correct. To me, if she had made that statement, it would have been on the 9 10 statement -- it would have been on the recording. 11 And if she made that statement to 12 Detective Smith, it would have been in his notes? 13 Because you certainly read his notes. 14 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, that calls for 15 speculation about what's in someone else's 16 notes. 17 THE COURT: Yeah, rephrase. 18 MR. ESCOBAR: I will. 19 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 20 Did you talk to Detective Smith about 21 whether or not Mrs. Reeves told him that? 22 Α. I do not recall, sir, if I did or not. 23 But that would have been important for Q. 24 information for you in assessing this case, correct, 25 whether Mr. Reeves immediately informed someone that

```
1
     he had been hit in the face, because that statement
 2
     has the indicia of reliability. It's excited
 3
     utterance.
               MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, I'm going to
 4
          object to the form of the question. Again, now
 5
 6
          he's put it in the form of legal terms. And so
 7
          I object to the form of the question of what
 8
          he's asking.
 9
               MR. ESCOBAR: I won't call it an excited
10
          utterance.
11
     BY MR. ESCOBAR:
12
               That would have been a reliable statement,
          Q.
13
     correct --
14
               MR. MARTIN: That calls for speculation,
15
          Judge.
16
     BY MR. ESCOBAR:
17
          O. -- at the time.
18
               MR. MARTIN: That calls for speculation.
19
               THE COURT: All right. All right.
20
          Sustained.
21
               Let's rephrase or move on.
22
     (CONTINUED IN VOLUME X.)
23
24
25
```