		·
1		THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OA, IN AND FOR PASCO COUNTY
2		21, 11, 111, 101, 11,000 000111
3		
4	STATE OF FLORIDA,	
5	Plaintiff,	
6	vs.	Case Number 14-216CFAES
7	CURTIS REEVES,	
8	Defendant.	
9		/
10		Id Hearing  Lume V  Oruary 7, 2014  ORABLE PAT SIRACUSA Count Judge
11		oruary 7, 2014  ORABLE PAT SIRACUSA
12		oruary 7, 2014  ORABLE PAT SIRACUSA Couit Court Judge
13	Cir	
14	1	th Judicial Circuit le City, Florida
15		pert D. Sumner Judicial Center
16	<b>1</b>	053 Live Oak Avenue Ne City, FL 33525
17		inda McClain
18	Not	sistered Professional Reporter ary Public
19	Sta	te of Florida at Large
20		
21	I	ourt Administration
22	Robert D. Sum	orting Department nner Judicial Center
23	Dade C	ive Oak Avenue ity, FL 33525
24	Telephone: (352)521-	4375 Fax: (352)521-4118
25		
	į.	

1	APPEARANCES	,
2		
3	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA:	
4		
5	Manuel Garcia, Chief Assistant State Attorney Stacey Sumner, Assistant State Attorney Damien Kraebel, Assistant State Attorney	
6	William Loughery, Assistant State Attorney Office of Bernie McCabe, State Attorney	
7	Sixth Judicial Circuit, Pasco County 38053 Live Oak Avenue	
8	Dade City, Florida 33525	
9	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF	
10	THE DEFENDANT CURTIS REEVES: Richard Escobar, Esquire	
11	Dino M. Michaels, Esquire Escobar, Ramirez and Associates	
12	2917 W. Kennedy Boulevard	
13	Tampa, Florida 33609	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20	·	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

1	INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS	
2	Closing Argument by Mr. Escobar	650 687
3	Ruling	720
4		
5	Witnesses called by the State:	,
6 .	AARON SMITH	574
7 8	Direct Examination by Mr. Garcia  Voir Dire Direct Examination by Mr. Escobar.  Resumed Direct Examination by Mr. Garcia  Cross-Examination by Mr. Escobar	577 587 588
9	Redirect Examination by Mr. Garcia	599
10	Rebuttal witnesses called by the Defense	
11	NICHOLAS SACCO	609
12	Direct Examination by Mr. Escobar  Voir Dire Direct Examination by Mr. Garcia .	618
13	Resumed Direct Examination by Mr. Escobar Cross-Examination by Mr. Garcia	639 641
14	Redirect Examination by Mr. Escobar	641
15		
16		
17	INDEX TO EXHIBITS	
18	State's Exhibit 7	585
19	Defense Exhibit 4	605
20	Redacted Autopsy Report	
21	Court's Exhibit 1 Autopsy Report	605
22	Defense Exhibit 5	610
23	Hard drive	010
24	Defense Exhibit 6	640
25	Disk	

1

## PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. We're back. State is present, the Defense is present and the defendant is present in the courtroom.

State, you ready to call your next

6

7

MR. GARCIA: Yes, Your Honor, the State's ready.

8

9

THE COURT: You may proceed.

10

MR. GARCIA: Judge, the State would call

11

Aaron Smith.

witness?

12.

THE COURT: Aaron Smith. How am I going

13

to spell Aaron?

MR. GARCIA: A-A-R-O-N, Judge.

14 15

THE BAILIFF: Aaron Smith?

16

MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir.

17

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, this is one of

18

the witnesses we do not have a report for and

19

we've explained that to the prosecution. And

20 21 if we can just maybe take a look at their report. They did not provide that in discovery

22

yet.

23

THE COURT: I'll give you a break between the witness and your cross-examination to look

24

at it.

```
If you could find the report and give it
1
 2
          to him while we're doing this.
 3
     THEREUPON,
 4
                         AARON SMITH,
 5
     the witness herein, was placed under oath.
               THE COURT: You may inquire.
 6
 7
               MR. GARCIA: Thank you, Your Honor.
                                                     May
8
          it please the Court, counsel?
 9
                      DIRECT EXAMINATION
10
     BY MR. GARCIA:
               Detective Smith, good afternoon, sir.
11
12
          Α
               Good afternoon.
13
               Can you state your full legal name,
          0
14
     please?
15
          Α
               Yep. Aaron Wayne Smith.
16
               And your profession?
          Q
               I'm a detective with the Pasco County
17
          Α
18
     Sheriff's Office.
19
               And how long you been so employed?
20
               For approximately four years.
          Α
21
               What are your duties with the Pasco County
22
     Sheriff's Office?
23
               I'm currently assigned as a major crimes
          Α
24
     detective.
25
               Directing your attention to January 13th
          Q
```

1 of 2014, did you have occasion to assist Detective 2 Proctor in the investigation of a homicide which 3 occurred on that date? Yes, I did. 5 And what role did you play in this? We were -- all of our squad was called to 6 Α 7 assist at the scene. And my main role there was as 8 a crime scene detective. 9 Okay. And did you have conversations with 10 Cobb Movie Theater as far as the video surveillance? 11 Α I did. I spoke with the general manager, Tom Peck, who was in charge of the building at that 12 13 time. 14 When did you learn that Cobb Movie Theater 15 had video surveillance? 16 During our investigation that day, shortly after my arrival, I talked with Detective Bossone, 17 18 also of the sheriff's office, who had spoken with 19 the manager and said that he did have several 20 cameras throughout the building with video. 21 And through the course of your 22 investigation, were you able to obtain the original 23 footage or video surveillance from Cobb Theaters? 24 Yes. During that time frame we asked them

to stop the video recording and to download -- as

it's all digital video -- everything from 12:00 noon 1 2 that day to the incident time. And at that point 3 they contacted their IT department and started to do that. 4 And do you have a working knowledge of how 6 these video-surveillance cameras work in the movie 7 theater? 8 Α I do. There's several different cameras 9 in different areas of the building, some in the 10 Cinebistro areas, some in the hallways, most of 11 which are motion-activated digital video cameras. 12 0 Are they also infrared? 13 Ones that are in dark areas of the 14 building, such as Cinebistro, are also infrared, 15 yes. 16 Okay. And are they motion activated? 17 Yes. The ones in the Cinebistro area are 18 motion activated. 19 Did you, in fact, receive a video of the 20 theater ten, the Lone Survivor which was showing on 21 January 13th of 2014? I think the start time was 22 around 1:20 or so. 23 Yes, sir, I did. After the video had been 24 copied over on the 15th, I met with the vice 25 president of Cobb's operations and obtained copies

```
on thumb drives of all of those videos.
 1
 2
               MR. GARCIA: Judge, I'd ask the record
 3
          reflect that I'm showing what's been marked as
       State's Exhibit O, I believe, for
 4
 5
          identification purposes to Mr. Escobar.
               THE COURT: Record may so reflect.
 6
               MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, I just have some voir
 7
 8
          dire before they introduce it.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. You may proceed.
10
                VOIR DIRE DIRECT EXAMINATION
11
     BY MR. ESCOBAR:
               Good afternoon, Detective.
12
         . Q
13
          Α
               Good afternoon, sir.
14
               Detective, you were -- you were called out
15
     to the scene to assist in this investigation?
16
               Yes, sir.
          Α
17
               You were going to assist Detective
18
     Proctor?
19
               Yes, sir.
20
               And one of the roles that you assisted
21
     Detective Proctor was in gathering these particular
22
     videos?
23
          Α
               Yes, sir, that's correct.
24
               Did you examine the cameras at all there
25
    within theater ten yourself?
```

Other than visually, they're fairly high 1 Α up on a wall. I didn't write down, like, specific 2 3 make, model information that -- if that's what 4 you're asking. Okay. Do you know how it is that they Q 6 mechanically operate? Do you know the speed in 7 which they record? 8 No, I don't have that information. 9 Okay. Did you attempt to try to get that 10 information, the speed of which they record? 11 Α No, because I'm not familiar with the 12 system on that technical a level. I spoke with 13 their IT department and their network administrators 14 to get a overall view of how the system operated. 15 But did you ever ask them, tell me the 16 speed? 17 The speed to the cameras? Α 18 0 Yeah. 19 Α No, sir. 20 The speed is a pretty important issue, Q 21 correct? 22 It's -- it depends on what you're trying Α to find in the video, I suppose, but at the time for 23 24 what I was viewing it did not come up as necessary 25 information.

Well, you're aware, are you not, that if 1 2 you -- if a camera is recording at a particular 3 speed and then you're trying to play that recording at a different speed, it could be a problem as far as accuracy? 6 Sir, that's a little bit above my 7 technical knowledge, I think, sir. I'm not -- I 8 don't understand exactly what you're asking me. Well, do you know at what speed you were 10 playing the actual recorded video? 11 The -- it was played back by an embedded 12. recorder that comes from Cobb when they made the 13 copies --No, I'm not talking about that one --14 0 15 -- so that I can't tell you. -- I'm talking about your report. 16 17 you got those thumb drives and you played it, at 18 what speed are you playing those recordings? 19 It's going to be whatever speed the 20 computer that you're playing it on defaults to. Did -- what software were you using in an 21 22 effort to play that recorded --23 Α When -- initially when I viewed the video, 24 it was actually at Cobb's Theaters on their DVR 25 monitors that were there.

I'm talking about later on because what 1 we're going to be playing here is what you got from 2 3 the thumb drives; is that correct? 4 Yes, sir. What -- what I did with the 5 thumb drives is I made an exact copy of those onto 6 to portable hard drive and then copied those files 7 onto DVD. Okay. But you don't know -- your computer that you're going to be using here today, you don't 9 10 know at what speed it's playing that recorded video, 11 correct? 12 Α That's correct, sir. 13 And I believe you indicated to me earlier 14 that you're using Windows Media Player; is that 15 correct? 16 Yes, sir. Α 17 Did you try to use any other software in 18 order to play this video other than Windows Media 19 Player? The only other program I've used to view 20 21 it would be VLC Media Player. 22 VLC. 0 Yes, sir. 23 A 24 Now, just a couple of issues concerning 25 this infrared and this motion detector. Do you --

are you familiar with both of those issues? 1 2 Α Generally, sir, yes. 3 Okay. And motion activated means that a 4 camera is going to only start filming once there is some range of motion, correct? 5 6 Correct. Once it senses motion, then 7 the -- it would signal the DVR somehow to actually 8 record for a period of time after that. Do you know how much motion has to be 9 10 present in order to activate the video camera to 11 record? 12 Α That I do not -- I don't know a way to 13 quantify what the motion would be, no. 14 Did you ask anyone with Cobb Theater in 15 their technical department to give you that 16 information? No, sir. They simply told me that it was 17 18 just activated by motion. 19 And so when you're recording via motion, 20 they're going to be lapses in the continuation of 21 that film, correct? 22 There will be periods of time when the Α 23 camera does not sense motion, that it will not 24 record anything. 25 And so you're going to have events that Q

are going to be joined in presentation, but not necessarily joined in time, correct?

A Correct, sir. It plays -- when it plays back the information, it plays it in a steady -- one steady stream, obviously, instead of second by second.

Q And so the perception could be that this all happened in that time period, but in actuality it didn't.

A The -- there's an embedded timer that plays on the screen to let you know in relevance to the machine's clock what the time frame is, but correct, it doesn't -- like I said, it does play one smooth motion through. It doesn't stop at the end of each clip that was captured, if you were -- if you will.

Q And you were told that the times'tamps on those particular cameras had some problems.

A The -- we were informed by the Cobb tech, the system administrator, that the times between some of the DVRs didn't match. And the reason that that was relevant because not all of the cameras are on one single DVR, because the number of cameras that are on the building, they're split between multiple machines.

Thank you, Your Honor. 1 MR. ESCOBAR: 2 MR. MICHAELS: Judge, could we have a 3 moment? 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, may I approach? 6 THE COURT: You may. 7 Q (By Mr. Escobar) Detective, I'm going to 8 show you what's been marked as Defense Exhibit 9 Number 4 --10 Α Yes, sir. -- and ask you if you recognize that 11 12 exhibit. 13 Yes, sir. If I could open the box and 14 look at it. It appears to be the drive that your 15 office had given me to ask for copies. 16 Please, would you? 0 Yes, sir. (Perusing Defense Exhibit 4.) 17 18 It does appear to be a drive of the same 19 make and model as the one that your office had 20 dropped off here for the copies, and the ones that I 21 copied my video clips over to you. 22 Okay. And so what you're -- are you --23 what you're telling me today is that the clips that 24 you were just talking about on direct examination, 25 you used that Seagate external drive to copy that

information onto that drive. 2 A. Yes, sir. I used the external drive that 3 I copied the original thumb drive onto to then make 4 the same copy onto that drive there. Okay. In order for us to have a complete and full and accurate copy of what you had. 7 Α Of all the video I had at that time, yes, 8 sir. 9 And then you handed -- or Mr. Garcia 10 handed this to me in court; is that correct? 11 Yes, sir. Once the copy was complete, I Α 12 dropped it off at his office for him. 13 MR. ESCOBAR: No further questions, Your 14 Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. All right. 16 you can play the video if that was what you 17 were seeking to do. 18 MR. GARCIA: Judge, with the Court's 19 permission, I'd like to enter what's been 20 previously marked as State's Exhibit O for 21 identification in evidence as State's Exhibit Number 7. 22 23 THE COURT: All right. Any objection other than what was previously stated? 24 25 No objection, Your Honor. MR. ESCOBAR:

1	THE COURT: All right. It shall be
2	admitted as State's 7.
3	MR. GARCIA: And likewise, Judge, with the
4	Court's permission, I'd like to play it.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Do you know how to do
6	that?
7	MR. GARCIA: I think Mr
8	THE COURT: You need him?
9	MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir.
10	THE COURT: All right. You can step
11	down
12	THE WITNESS: Can I step down, sir?
13	THE COURT: so you can play the video.
14	THE CLERK: Manny, is that an O or a D?
15	MR. GARCIA: I can't tell.
16	THE CLERK: It's a D.
17	MR. GARCIA: Is it a D?
18	THE CLERK: Yes, sir.
19	MR. GARCIA: It is a D?
20	THE COURT: It's a D, not an O.
21	MR. GARCIA: I stand corrected, Judge. I
22	indicated to the Court it was State's Exhibit
23	O. It's State Exhibit D
24	THE COURT: Okay.
25	MR. GARCIA: for the record.

THE COURT: When you play this, it's going 1 2 to appear on that screen? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. I'm going to turn 3 4 the monitor on here and it will come up over 5 there. THE COURT: Okay. 6 Your Honor, I would not be 7 MR. ESCOBAR: 8 opposed to turning down the light. I think it 9 would -- it would give us a better view of the 10 video. We would certainly encourage that. 11 THE COURT: That's fine. Is there 12 somebody that can accomplish that task? 13 MR. ESCOBAR: Probably --14 THE COURT: You looking for those 15 backlights there? There you go. 16 There's no sound to that -- to this video; is that correct? 17 18 THE WITNESS: Correct, sir. It's video 19 only, no audio. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, may I approach a 22 little bit? 23 THE COURT: You may. Feel free to move 24 wherever you need to to get the best view. 25 (Thereupon the video, State's Exhibit 7, was played

with no accompanying audio.) 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Could we bring the 3 house lights up or is there further video? 4 THE WITNESS: What's that, sir? 5 THE COURT: Is there further video you 6 intend to play? 7 THE WITNESS: That is all --8 THE COURT: That's what's on that? 9 THE WITNESS: -- I was given, sir. THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any further 10 11 questions for this witness? 12 MR. GARCIA: Yes, Judge. 13 THE COURT: You may proceed. 14 MR. GARCIA: May it please the Court, 15 counsel? 16 RESUMED DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GARCIA: 17 18 Detective Smith, if you would, please, can you share with us, do you know the height different 19 20 between Row B and Row A? It's approximately ten inches between each 21 22 floor height. There's two steps in between each one that are about five inches each. 23 24 Okay. All right. 25 MR. GARCIA: I don't have any further

1 questions of Detective Smith, Judge. 2 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Escobar, do 3 you wish to inquire of this witness? 4 MR. ESCOBAR: I do. CROSS-EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 7 Detective, when you were given this Q . 8 assignment to go and search out this video, were you 9 told by Detective Proctor to be looking for, you 10 know, possibly a cell phone hitting Mr. Reeves aside 11 the head? 12 Α When I first received the video, we just 13 asked Cobb to give us snippets of any cameras that 14 covered that angle. I have not done anything to try 15 to enhance the video or examine any further 16 different items in it at this point. 17 Is -- is then your answer: No, Detective 0 18 Proctor never asked you to try to look at the video 19 for evidence of a phone coming across the video 20 area? He asked me to review it for evidence of 21 22 how the event occurred. He did not specifically ask 23 me to look for a phone. 24 Okay. And so I would imagine one of the 25 things that you would have found to be very helpful

would have been a program that would have allowed 1 2 you to capture, frame by frame, that event, correct? 3 No, sir. At our level we would probably 4 have a certified lab or somebody that's more 5 qualified to enhance the video, things like that 6 because --7 I'm not talking about enhancing. I'm just 8 talking about frame-by-frame playing of that video. Yes, sir. And at my job-description 10 level, I guess you would call it, I don't have 11 access to software that does that. 12 You may not have access, but my question 0 13 was: You would have liked to have done that to be 14 able to see frame-by-frame, correct? 15 No, sir. It has not come up so far in the 16 investigation. 17 0 You would not have liked to have a 18 frame-by-frame viewing of that video? 19 It's the -- we watched the video as the 20 incident occurred to see what's there. You can 21 pause it at different places and look to analyze 22 different things that you're looking at. 23 digital video, however, is not in a framed format, I 24 quess is the most correct answer. It plays straight

through. It's not like traditional film where you

have individual frames. 1 2 I understand that, but my question was 3 simply, would you have liked to have had a frame-by-frame viewing of the video so that you could see it as best as you could? A At this point of my ability to pause it on 6 7. the computer and rewind and fast forward to where I want to see, then no, sir, I don't -- I haven't seen 8 any benefit for doing it that way as opposed to just 10 watching it on the media player. 11 Now, you indicated that you could stop it --12 13 Yes, sir. Α 14 -- at certain frames, correct? 15 You can stop it at any point in time 16 during the video. Not on a frame per se, because 17 the frame doesn't exist, I guess. 18 Well, you could have stopped it at second 19 marker twenty-four. 20 Yes, sir. 21 And second marker twenty-five. Yes, sir. 22 Α 23 Q And second marker twenty-six --24 Yes, sir. Α 25 Q -- correct?

1 Α Correct. 2 Did you do that? Yes, at many different times. 3 4 watched the video multiple times and paused it and 5 started again and rewound to look at different 6 sections of the video, yes. 7 Now, in addition to that video, you indicated that, I guess, you went in and examined 8 9 the area of the -- of the incident? 10 Α Yes, sir. As crime scene detective, my 11 general responsibility would be to just confer with 12 the forensic investigators that are taking 13 measurements, collecting evidence, photographing, help direct different things just to make sure, you 14 15 know, certain things are documented, and just to 16 be -- have an overall awareness of the items that 17 are in the scene. 18 And were you able to see a phone in the 19 area of the incident? 20 Yes, sir, I did. 21 Q And that phone was actually in Row A; was 22 it not? It was in the very top row of the theater. 23 24 Unfortunately, the theater does not designate row, 25 letters, numbers or seat numbers, but it would be in

1 the very top row next to the Cinebistro wall. 2 And that top row would be one that the 3 seats have a six-foot wall behind them. Correct, sir. 4 5 Q And that would have been the same seat 6 that Mr. Reeves was seated. 7 In that same row, yes, sir. And you saw the actual phone in that -- on the floor of that same seat, Mr. Reeves' seat. 9 The phone was on the floor in front of 10 Α 11 that row. At that point in time when I saw it, I 12 couldn't have told you exactly which seat Mr. Reeves 13 was in. 14 Well, what about today? At this point, since there's no numbered 15 16 seats, I can tell you where the phone was seen in our scene. I don't know which -- again, there's no 17 designation of row and seat number, so I can't tell 18 19 you, I guess, designated which seat it was, no, sir. 20 Well, it was important to you, was it not, 21 to determine whether that phone was in front of or 22 the floorboard in front of Mr. Reeves, correct? 23 Α Through the witnesses' descriptions that were there, we felt it was probably within one seat

one way or the other of the area, but I did not --

24

was not aware, at that time, of which exact seat he was in. You didn't touch the phone? No, sir. Q You made your -- sure that your group preserved the phone. Α Yes, sir. It's typical of any crime scene things were photographed and measured before they were collected, and then they were collected as evidence. And your collection methods is in an effort to preserve that phone for all sorts of evidence that may be on it? Yes, sir. Α DNA, fingerprints, what have you, correct? Q Α Anything we may attempt to gather in the future, yes, sir. And certainly if that phone was thrown by Mr. Oulson at Mr. Reeves' head, you would want to preserve anything on that phone for evidence of it striking Mr. Reeves. And, sir, at the time we collect from a Α crime scene, we preserve it because we don't know what type of evidence might be on it, so we try to

preserve everything we can for any future analysis,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

yes. 2 Now, there at the scene were you given information concerning witness descriptions of what 3 4 had taken place during the incident? Yes, sir. Α And you were told that, in fact, there was 6 7 an allegation that Mr. Reeves (sic) was throwing 8 something at -- excuse me, Mr. Oulson was throwing something at Mr. Reeves. 10 Yes, sir. The allegation I was aware of 11 at that time was that he had thrown a bag full of 12 popcorn. Well, what was the allegation concerning 13 14 the phone? 15 There was none. At the time the phone was 16 found on the floor, we did not know who the owner of 17 it was. We did not know if it belonged to 18 Mr. Reeves, Mr. Oulson or any of the other patrons 19 that might have been there. 20 And so you didn't even know that there was 21 an allegation by Mr. Reeves that Mr. Oulson had 22 struck him on the head with a phone? 23 I was made aware that he was alleged he 24 had been struck by something, and that witnesses had

said they saw a bag of popcorn thrown. And that

was --

Q Had you -- had you been told that the allegation was that specifically he had been struck by a phone?

A No, sir.

MR. GARCIA: Judge, I'm going to object to the characterization in that question. And I -- again, Judge, I would remind the Court you heard the audiotape of Mr. Reeves. He says he may have been hit with a fist; he may have been hit with a phone. He doesn't know. So to state that he was hit with a phone is a mischaracterization of his taped interview. The last thing he said was he didn't know.

THE COURT: Overruled as to those objections. I use my own recollection as to what the evidence is.

You may continue, Mr. Escobar.

Q (By Mr. Escobar) Did -- did you do anything there at the scene to determine weather that phone had a screen light where, when you touched it, it lit up?

A No, sir. That time it was just simply collected and bagged. And the power button on the top of the phone was turned off. We don't do any --

Q Why did you turn the power button on the phone off?

A That's one of our steps in preserving electronic evidence because there are many applications out there that can interfere with, say, a phone that may be locked or remotely wiped of information, things like that. So we shut it off so that things like that can't happen and to preserve any of the electronic media that may be on it.

Q When you shut that phone off and touched it, did the light go on?

A No, sir. The light -- I, just being generally familiar with that model of phone, with the iPhone, when you push the button on the top, it's not part of the screen. You'll get the -- I think -- believe the Apple logo comes on, but I'm not the one that turned it off myself. So I can't tell you for sure what it displays when it turns off.

Q Okay. And so your -- your experience with those phones is that the screen will light up when you touch the screen.

A If you touch the screen or actually -- no, sir, if the screen is not on, it will not light up if you touch the screen, only if you push the --

```
what they call the home button or the circular
1
2
     button at the bottom or the button on the top of the
 3
     phone, I believe.
               Okay. You know what model of iPhone that
 5
     was?
 6
               I do not, sir. I do -- it was an Apple
          Α
     iPhone, but I don't know which designator it was at
7
     that point.
8
9
               Do you know what the weight of that phone
         . Q
10
     was?
11
               No, sir, I don't.
          Α
12
          Q
               And do you know the size of that phone?
13
          Α
               No, sir.
14
               One -- one other question about the video
15
     that I think is somewhat important.
16
               The video appears to have some light to
     it, meaning it's not -- doesn't appear to have that
17
18
     dark theater atmosphere; is that correct?
               As far as background lighting you mean,
19
20
     sir?
                      It looks -- you know, everything
21
          Q
               Yeah.
22
     looks bright. It doesn't look like a dark theater.
     Is that because of the infrared night vision that it
23
24
     has?
25
               It's a combination of the light that's
          Α
```

available, sir, because the -- inside the theater, 1 2 the lighting is never completely off. They have the 3 can lights in the ceiling that are on, but yes, also the infrared helps brighten up the image. 4 5 Because that infrared is almost equivalent 6 to that night vision that many cameras possess, 7 correct? 8 I guess it depends on the type of camera, Α 9 sir, but it is a projected infrared light from the cameras or from other sources that the lens can 10 11 recognize that the human eye doesn't typically see. So you can't tell this Court here that 12 0 13 what you're seeing in the form of light on that 14 video is, by any stretch of the imagination, 15 accurate? It is accurate to the video, sir, not 16 17 necessarily visible to the naked human eye at the 18 time. 19 MR. ESCOBAR: No further questions. 20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. State, do you have any redirect for this 21 22 witness? 23 MR. GARCIA: Just one -- one question, 24 Judge. 25 THE COURT: Uh-huh.

1	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. GARCIA:
3	Q Detective Smith, there appears to be
4	particles floating in the air on the video. Do you
5	knew what those particles were?
6	A Yes, sir. I spoke with the Cobb
7	technicians, and also after viewing the video I feel
8	it was dust that was on top of the camera. When the
9	shot was fired, the concussion inside of the closed
10	room just caused the dust to fly in the air.
11	Q So essentially those are just dust
12	particles that you see throughout the video.
13	A Yes, sir, dust that was dislodged after
14	the shot was fired.
15	Q Okay.
16	MR. GARCIA: All right. Thank you, sir.
17	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Garcia.
18	Thank you, Detective Smith.
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
20	THE COURT: You are excused.
21	MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we'd like to
22	reserve our right to recall him on on
23	THE COURT: All right. Detective Smith,
24	don't leave the building. Okay?
25	All right. State, do you have any further

witnesses you want the Court to hear from in 1 2 this bond hearing? 3 MR. GARCIA: No, sir. 4 THE COURT: Is the victim going to make a 5 statement today --6 MR. LOUGHERY: No. 7 THE COURT: -- Mr. Grimaldi? 8 MR. GRIMALDI: No. 9 THE COURT: No statement? 10 MR. GRIMALDI: No. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Do you wish to call any rebuttal witnesses in this bond hearing? 12 13 MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, we have a couple 14 things. Number one, we want the autopsy of 15 Mr. Oulson introduced into evidence. 16 THE COURT: Do you have any objection, 17 State? 18 MR. GARCIA: I do, Judge. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a witness 20 that you're going to call for the autopsy to be introduced? 21 22 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, as the Court --23 we just got this voluminous discovery and we 24 have not -- we just spoke to our expert last 25 night concerning certain aspects of this.

This is an Arthur Hearing where hearsay is allowed. It's also a bond hearing where the rules of evidence are relaxed.

THE COURT: Absolutely, but don't I need a witness for this?

MR. ESCOBAR: I don't believe you do, Your Honor. I believe that under an Arthur Hearing, just like they had a -- a out-of-court hearsay affidavit with numerous witnesses saying numerous things in that affidavit at the initial hearing, and they used that in the Arthur hearing to show presumption of great proof evident.

We have the ability as well. This is the -- this is the government's Medical

Examiner that actually authored, you know, this particular report. It's an important report because it suggests, Your Honor, that the victim --

THE COURT: Wait, don't tell me that yet.

Let's -- let's stay with whether I'm going to

admit it before you try and tell me what's in

it.

The copy that you have, is there an affidavit of authenticity that came with it?

MR. ESCOBAR: It's actually signed, Your Honor, by the Medical Examiner in the very front. And it talks about his actual findings.

THE COURT: All right. Now, if you are going to introduce that, you're going to introduce that for me to review it without the assistance of any interpretation by any witness?

MR. ESCOBAR: That's what --

THE COURT: That's what you want.

MR. ESCOBAR: It's self-explanatory, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. State, do you have any objection to me receiving the autopsy report authored by the Medical Examiner of the sixth judicial circuit or one of the assistant

MR. GARCIA: No, I don't have an objection to that, Judge. I do have an objection to Mr. Escobar making arguments based upon the autopsy because you would need an expert in order to give these findings, Judge, and explain the findings.

THE COURT: All right. Well, it's one thing to introduce it. It's another thing

1 that -- the argument that's going to flow from 2 it. 3. As far as autopsies and autopsy reports, 4 I've seen a lot of them. So if he's going to 5 be arguing to me, I understand what's conclusion and what's the facts set out in the 6 7 autopsy. Is it your intention to tell me that I 8 9 should draw some conclusions that I'd need a 10 Medical Examiner to explain to me, or you just 11 want me to read the report and take the -- the 12 words on the page? 13 MR. ESCOBAR: Take the words on the page. 14 THE COURT: You want the words on the 15 page. 16 Is there any reason I shouldn't read the 17 words on the page, Mr. Garcia? MR. GARCIA: No, sir. No, sir. 18 19 THE COURT: All right. I'll accept it 20 into evidence as Defense -- we're on 3 for the -- 4 for the Defense, right? 21 22 MR. ESCOBAR: Five, I believe. THE COURT: Five? Five. You haven't 23 moved -- you haven't moved the C-8 in yet. 24 25 It may, Your Honor, at some MR. ESCOBAR:

1 point in time, come in. 2 THE COURT: Well, then this is 4. MR. ESCOBAR: 3 Four? THE COURT: And it's in line. It will be 5 5 if it gets in. 6 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we would 7 introduce the medical -- excuse me, let me show 8 it to them and make sure that --9 MR. GARCIA: I have it. 10 THE COURT: Okay. You're good? 11 MR. GARCIA: Yeah. 12 THE COURT: All right. Well, let me read 13 it, then. This will be now 4 in evidence. 14 Give me a moment to review it. And then -- are-15 you going to have any witnesses you're going to 16 want to call? 17 MR. ESCOBAR: I am, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. ESCOBAR: And we're going to need to 20 set up maybe three -- we've got all of our 21 equipment there. We just got to bring it 22 forward. And my witness is outside: 23 THE COURT: All right. We'll start 24 getting it set up, get your witness on deck and 25 let me read this.

State, is there any personal information that needs to be redacted here?

The victim's representative is present.

Why don't you let Mr. Grimaldi take a look at it and see if there's any personal information that he wants redacted. I'm not seeing anything that's jumping out at me immediately, but my expectation is that given the medical nature of it, there may be.

MR. MICHAELS: Just so the Court knows -THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MICHAELS: -- that gentleman helping Mr. Escobar set up is the next witness.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Thank you.

MR. GARCIA: Judge, we would ask that any personal information about Mr. Oulson be redacted from the autopsy report.

THE COURT: All right. What I'll do is

I'll -- I'll introduce two autopsy reports.

I'll put one is as Defense Exhibit 4 and that will be redacted, and then I'll put an original copy in. I'll order that to be sealed. And I'll call it Court's Exhibit 1.

If you could please highlight on yours

what you want redacted specifically, then before anybody else gets their hands on it, I'll consult with Mr. Escobar and we'll see what needs to be redacted. Perhaps y'all could agree and then -- then we'll mark one and seal the other.

MR. GARCIA: Judge, I -- I know that you are reading the autopsy report, but one of the issues that we need to address is that the State of Florida has never had an opportunity to view this video. I think just as the Defense has had opportunities to view videos, I think we should be likewise given a courtesy to view this to see what's being presented.

THE COURT: Any reason they shouldn't get to see it, also?

MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, it's their hard drive, but I -- I'm fine with that. We didn't -- we didn't take video from any other source. We took it from this hard drive that they downloaded the video. And it's actually the same left side that -- but I'll be more than glad to play it for them. If you want to do it, you know, quickly, we can do it right up there.

1 THE COURT: I'm thinking they're probably 2 going to want to see it in private before 3 it's --MR. GARCIA: Yes. 4 5 THE COURT: -- viewed by everyone. 6 MRS. SUMNER: Yeah. THE COURT: I'm thinking the only way 7 that's going to happen is if I clear this room. 8 9 So it sound like we're going to take a ten-minute recess. 10 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we can also take 11 12 the laptop --THE COURT: Yeah. 13 MR. ESCOBAR: -- and bring it to Your 14 Honor. We can do it that way as well. Doesn't 15 16 have to be --THE COURT: I don't need to see it first; 17 they want to see it first. 18 19 Whatever the Court's MR. ESCOBAR: 20 pleasure. 21 MR. LOUGHERY: We don't mind looking at it 22 off a laptop, Judge. 23 THE COURT: Is it the same on the laptop 24 as it is on the HP projector? 25 MR. ESCOBAR: Uh-huh.

1	THE COURT: All right. Just show it to
2	him on the laptop. He can come up and see it
3	up here.
4	MR. ESCOBAR: Do you need these?
5	THE COURT: How long do you anticipate
6	this witness will take?
7	MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, not long at all.
8	I'd say 20, 25 minutes.
9	THE COURT: Okay, good.
10	MR. LOUGHERY: Judge, can Mr. Grimaldi
11	come up as well?
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	(State-Defense conference.)
14	THE COURT: Everybody can hear you, just
15	so you know.
16	(Pause in proceedings.)
17	THE COURT: Okay. State, you ready to
18	proceed?
19	MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir.
20	THE COURT: All right. You know what? I
21	haven't sworn this witness in. Stand up and
22	raise your right hand, please.
23	
24	
25	

1 THEREUPON, 2 NICHOLAS SACCO, 3 the witness herein, was placed under oath. 4 THE COURT: Have a seat. 5 You may inquire. DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MR. ESCOBAR: Please state you full name for the record. 8 9 Α Nicholas Sacco. 10 And Mr. Sacco, tell us a little bit about 11 your educational background. 12 Α I was -- I went to school for general 13 business at University of South Florida, graduated in 2007. And then -- did you want --14 15 Employment? 0 16 -- employment? Α 17 0 Yes. I work for currently Trial Exhibits. 18 Α in Tampa, Florida. 19 20 What is Trial Exhibits? 21 Α It's a trial consulting company. We do 22 mainly electronic portions of trials. We'll do 23 video editing; we'll do animations; we'll do medical 24 illustrations and the like. Okay. And how long have you been doing 25 Q

that? 1 2 I've been with them for the past two 3 years, and I worked with them previously for about a 4 year before that, and then did some freelance on my own. I'm going to show you --6 0 MR. ESCOBAR: May I approach, Your Honor? 7 8 THE COURT: You may. (By Mr. Escobar) I'm going to show you Q 10 what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit -- this 11 would be, I think, now --12 THE COURT: Now it's 5. (By Mr. Escobar) -- 5, and ask you to 13 14 take a look at that exhibit and see if you recognize 15 it. Yes, I do. 16 Α 17 What is that an exhibit of? 0 18 This is the hard drive that I received 19 from your office, which had the files from the State 20 Attorney's office. 21 Okay. And can you tell me what it is that 22 you did with that particular exhibit once you 23 received it? 24 Once I received it, I opened the package 25 and I hooked it up to my computer as I would any

other hard drive. 1 2 And what was the purpose of hooking it up 3 to your computer? To get the file, the appropriate file that 4 5 would have the video that we are looking at today. Okay. And can you tell me what file you 6 7 searched and what file you found within that hard drive? 8 9 Within that hard drive I found what was called "Theater ten left side." It was within the 10 11 Cobb Theater video files underneath the subcategory "Cobb full video." 12 13 Okay. And what did you do once you -- you 14 found that particular file? 15 Once I located the file, it's an EXE file, 16 which means it's an audio executable. I opened 17 that. And what it does is within Windows, it 18 creates the -- it finds the video file that's within 19 that and it saves it to the Windows temporary 20 folder. Okay. And did you do that to save that 21 22 particular file --23 Α Yes --24 -- to a Windows temporary folder? 25 -- I did. Α

And in what computer did it save that 0 1 file? 2 3 In this one right here (indicating). Okay. And so once it was saved in that 4 5 computer, tell me what were your -- what your next 6 step was. 7 The next step from there, I took that AVI Α 8 file that was within that executable. And I 9 converted that to an mp4, which then allows me to 10 make the clips that I needed for that. 11 This process that you're doing in downloading and then converting, does that in any 12 13 way alter the video that we're about to look at here in the next few minutes? 14 15 No, it doesn't. 16 Okay. And so once you were able to do Q 17 that, tell me what your next step in the process 18 was. The next step in the process, I brought it 19 20 into my video editing program, which allowed me to 21 take the one point in time to another portion in 22 time in the video and make the appropriate clips that I needed to. 23 24 Okay. And so you were going to preserve 25 the entirety of that particular clip as well as try

```
to have individual clips of an event?
 1
 2
          Α
               Yes.
 3
                      And does that process in any way
     alter the video itself?
 4
               No, it doesn't.
 6
               Okay. You're just doing -- viewing
          Q
 7
     clip-by-clip in one of these particular segments,
     correct?
 8
 9
          Α
               Yes.
10
               Okay. What was your next step?
11
             From there I brought it into a video
     player program, which I knew allowed me to be able
12
13
     to step through the available frames as well as loop
14
     the segment that I have.
15
               Now, you -- you were under the
16
     understanding that it was being viewed by the
17
     government under just the regular Windows Media
18
     Player; is that correct?
19
          Α
               Yes.
20
               Okay. And did you try to view it in that
          Q
21
     particular player versus a player that your -- you
     just discussed?
22
23
               I did.
          Α
24
               Okay. And when you viewed it under the
25
     Windows Media Player, was it the exact same video
```

that you viewed on this other program?

A Well, in fact, when I initially opened it

through the default player, it had -- it was, like, a black and white. It looked different from the -- the one we received as the -- their video.

MR. GARCIA: Judge, if I may, I would like to have an opportunity to voir dire this witness.

THE COURT: All right. I want to let him finish trying to put in his foundation first.

And once he's finished his foundation, when he goes to proffer it, I'll allow you to voir dire.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you.

Q (By Mr. Escobar) Let's -- let's explain to the Court the differences in the viewing of that video in a Windows Media Player versus the software that you chose to use?

A My knowledge told me that it was playing it improperly. When I played it in the other -- which is actually Windows Media Player Classic, it -- it played it identical to the -- the other video I had received.

Q Okay. And so initially you played it on the Windows Media Player that was provided within

the hard drive itself. 1 2 Correct. Then you played it within the Windows 3 4 Media Player Classic, which is the same company, 5 just an upgraded version of it? It has usually different Codecs 6 Α Yeah. 7 that will play more different types of files. 8 Okay. And then you viewed that Window 0 Media Classic with the video software that you used 9 and they were identical. 10 11 Α Correct. Okay. And the only difference between the 12 13 non-classic and the software that you used was just 14 a clarity issue. 15 It was playing improperly and I could see 16 that it was now working. 17 Okay. Now, in addition to that process, 0 did you do anything else in reference to -- and I'm 18 19 going to show you --20 MR. ESCOBAR: If I can approach, Your 21 Honor. 22 THE COURT: You may. 23 (By Mr. Escobar) I'm going to show you 24 what's been marked as Defense Exhibit Number 6. 25 I'm going to show you what's been marked

```
as Defense Exhibit Number 6 and tell me if you
1
2
     recognize that composite exhibit.
 3
          Α
               Yes.
 4
               What is that composite exhibit?
          Q
 5
               These are the copies of the disk that I
    had made. After I made the clips and made the
 6
7
     files, I burnt them onto disks.
8
                      And did you get to view those as
               Okay.
     compared to the downloaded ones that you had in the
10
     computer?
11
          Α
               Yes.
               And were they one in the same?
12
13
               They, they are identical.
          Α
14
               I believe that you had an opportunity,
15
     also, to view a disk that was provided by the State
16
     Attorney's office; is that correct?
17
          Α
               Yes.
18
               Okay.
                      And did you compare that particular
19
     disk --
20
               MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we're going to
21
          mark this, but we're going to have to be very
22
          careful how we mark it, as Defense Exhibit
23
          Number 7.
24
                           Do you have a sleeve for it?
               THE COURT:
25
               MR. ESCOBAR: He have that sleeve only,
```

```
Your Honor, but if we can -- I can -- I can --
1
               THE COURT: I got extra sleeves in my
2
3
          office. Actually, we have a tech person here.
 4
          Do we have extra sleeves that we can secure?
5
               MR. ESCOBAR: I can also mark it --
 6
               THE COURT: No, let's not write on it.
7
          We'll get -- we'll get a sleeve.
8
               MR. ESCOBAR: Okay.
               THE COURT: All right? The sleeve will be
9
10
          here in a minute. So that's the one that's
11
          going to become 7?
12
               MR. ESCOBAR:
                             Seven.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. I don't think you have
          to wait for the sleeve, do you?
14
15
               MR. ESCOBAR: Okay.
16
               THE COURT: Yeah, you can --
               (By Mr. Escobar) In -- in reviewing this
17
          0
18
    particular -- which will be Number 7, Defense
19
    Exhibit Number 7, did you compare that particular
20
    disk to the other disks and the hard drive that you
21
    can download?
22
          Α
               Yes.
23
               Were they all one and the same video?
          Q
24
               Yes, for the most part. This one was --
25
     it appeared that it was screen captured which,
```

```
'again, wouldn't do anything different. It would
 1
 2
     just be a different approach to getting the video
 3
     playable in a different media player.
 4
               Okay.
          Q
               MR. ESCOBAR: I tender the witness.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay.
 6
 7
               MR. GARCIA: May it please the Court,
          Judge, counsel?
 8
 9
                 VOIR DIRE DIRECT EXAMINATION
     BY MR. GARCIA:
10
               Is it Mr. Saga? Am I pronouncing that --
11
12
               Sacco.
          Α
               -- correct? I'm sorry?
13
          0
               It's Sacco.
14
          Α
15
               Sacco? Can you spell that for me, please.
          Q
16
               S-A-C-C-O.
          Α
               Sacco. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Sacco.
17
          Q
18
               You indicated that you have a general
19
     business degree from the University of South
20
     Florida?
21
          Α
               Correct.
22
               And you said you graduated there in 2007?
          Q
23
          Α
               That's correct.
24
               Do you have any formalized training in
25
     computer forensics?
```

```
1
          Α
               No.
2
               Have you ever attended any type of
3
     computer forensic classes?
 4
          Α
               No.
 5
               Do you have a degree in computer
          0
 6
     forensics?
7
               I do not.
          Ά
8
               You have a Master's degree in computer
          0
9
     forensics?
10
          Α
               No.
11
               You have a Ph.D?
12
          Α
               No.
13
               Have you ever taught in the field of
          Q
14
     computer forensics?
15
          Α
               I haven't.
16
               Have you ever been published in the field?
17
          Α
               No.
               Have you ever been qualified in the state
18
19
     of Florida as an expert in computer forensics?
20
          Α
               No, I haven't.
21
               Have you ever been qualified in any other
          Q
22
     state other than Florida as an expert in computer
23
     forensics?
24
          Α
               No.
25
               What training and education do you feel
          Q
```

```
1
     that you have to come in here and testify as to
2
     these videos and whether or not they're playing
 3
     properly or not?
               Just that it's an identical copy from one
 4
 5
     to the other. And that all that was done was
     literally just taking out the segments and the
 6
 7
     portions that we are looking at today.
 8
               Okay. But did you not testify earlier
 9
     that "My knowledge told me that one of the videos
     was not -- was playing improperly"?
10
11
          Α
               Yes.
               What is that based on?
12
13
          Α
               That's just based on my experience in
     dealing with video and --
14
15
               Okay. But what experience do you have
16
     that would allow you to come in here and comment on
17
     these things? That --
               Just --
18
          Α
               -- that's -- I'm sorry?
19
20
          Α
               Just general experience with working
21
     video.
22
               Well, what do you mean by "general
          Q
23
     experience," though? Tell us about it.
24
               Well, video is something that I work with
25
     not on a daily basis, but, you know, it's a
```

1 secondary part of my job. 2 So you would agree with me that you're not an expert in computer forensics? 3 That's true. 4 Α 5 And you had no formalized training in 0 computer forensics? 6 7 Α No. 8 So, again, maybe I'm missing something. 9 Tell us here what, in your background, would allow 10 you to come in here and testify about these videos 11 and whether they're playing properly and improperly? 12 Α Just that -- well, one video that I had to 13 compare to was the -- this one here as well as --14 this, when it was played from its default player, 15 played it one way. And I knew that when it opened 16 in the default Windows Media Player that it looked different to me. 17 18 But just because it looks Okay. 19 different, does that mean that it's not playing properly? 20 21 Α No, that doesn't mean that. 22 So how -- how is it that you're -- you're 0 23 basing opinion -- an opinion or you're rendering an opinion to this Court that one of the videos was 24 25 playing improperly.

I want to know based upon what are you 1 2 telling Judge Siracusa --MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, I'm going to object 3 4 to his raising his voice. THE COURT: Overruled. It's just -- it's 5 okay. Keep going. 6 7 (By Mr. Garcia) -- that that video is 8 playing improperly? And I apologize. I didn't mean 9 to raise my voice at you. 10 But what is it in your background or your training that you're relying upon to tell this judge 11 12 that that video is playing improperly? Just past experience that --13 14 Q Okay. 15 -- nothing in --But you keep saying that. 16 Q -- maybe not -- well --17 Α 18 Tell me what that past experience is. Q Share with all of us what that past experience is. 19 Just playing a video and knowing that it's 20 21 not -- something looks wrong about it. When you 22 play a movie, for example --Well, I mean is there anything other that 23 24 you play a movie and it appears that it's not 25 playing properly?

1 Α No. What in your education and training are 2 you basing this opinion on? 3 Dealing with many different file types and 4 trying to open them and convert them to different 5 files. 6 7 Q. Okay. You would agree with me, would you not, that any person that opens files and tries to 8 9 transfer files could do exactly what you're doing, 10 correct? 11 Α Yes, I agree. 12 Q Right? Α Yes. 13 14 So you're not planning to be an expert in Q 15 computer forensics? 16 Α No, I'm not. MR. GARCIA: Judge, I -- I'm going to 17 object to his testimony. I don't see how he's 18 qualified to start testifying as to this video 19 20 is playing improperly. He has no formal background, no formal training. He has a 21 22 general business from the University of South 23 Florida. 24 He's not -- he doesn't have any degrees in 25 computer forensics. He doesn't have a Master's

degree, a Ph.D. He's never taught, never been 1 2 an expert. 3 I'm objecting, Judge. He's not qualified 4 to render an opinion to this Court. THE COURT: All right. Response? 5 6 MR. ESCOBAR: Yes, Your Honor. 7 He doesn't have to be a computer forensics 8 because he's not changing the video at all. 9 All he's doing is copying the video and then he 10 is -- he has taken out a segment of that video 11 and he's isolated that segment. That is all 12 he's done. 13 He hasn't changed the video itself; he 14 hasn't enhanced the video itself. It's merely a copying of that video and using different 15 16 software that allows him to segment that particular section. 17 And when the Court sees it, you will see 18 19 it's the exact same video, not altered in any 20 way, but he's able to segment a very important section of that video for the Defense. 21 22 THE COURT: All right. 23 MR. GARCIA: Judge, may I respond briefly? He indicated that he changed one of the 24

videos to an mp4. He is changing formats.

25

1 THE COURT: Yeah. 2 MR. GARCIA: He is -- they're going to 3 want this Court to rely upon this witness's 4 testimony as to these videos when clearly he's 5 not qualified to. And he's going to say, well, 6 this was playing improperly. 7 THE COURT: Well, he already said that. 8 MR. GARCIA: Judge, I'm asking this Court 9 to deny his testimony, Judge. He is nowhere --10 anywhere near being an expert in computer 11 forensics. 12 If you're going to have somebody come in 13 here and start talking about videos and whether 14 they're playing properly or not playing 15 properly and whether they were downloaded 16 properly, you need somebody that's qualified, 17 and clearly Mr. Sacco is not. 18 THE COURT: Well, if I'm hearing you 19 correctly, Mr. Escobar, you're not asking me to 20 treat him as an expert, are you? 21 MR. ESCOBAR: Absolutely not. 22 THE COURT: So you don't want me to take into consideration his opinion on the video? 23 24 MR. ESCOBAR: No. He's not going to give 25 an opinion on the video.

THE COURT: Well, he said it was playing improperly.

MR. ESCOBAR: Well, and that's why he used another software because that software gave it a clear view. And that software actually allowed him to segment a certain section that you can actually even see in the government's disk, but not as clearly because they were using an outdated media player.

In fact, his testimony was very clear, if you had used the Media Player Classic, which was an upgraded media player, you would have been able to see the same thing that he is showing in this software. That was his testimony.

THE COURT: Well, let's -- let's back it up and cut through the use of the word. When you say "improperly," you just mean that it wasn't the most sufficient way to view it?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Improperly doesn't mean that it was wrong or bad, just it wasn't optimal, right?

THE WITNESS: Well, it didn't -- it didn't -- it didn't appear to be playing the

file as it is intended. 1 2 THE COURT: As intended? All right. 3 MR. GARCIA: Judge --4 THE COURT: Could you see it more -- could 5 you see it more clearly in the other -- in the other file that you transferred it to? 6 THE WITNESS: I think "clearly" is a bad 7 I don't feel -word. 8 THE COURT: I don't know because I haven't seen it yet. Y'all have; I haven't. 10 11 MR. GARCIA: Judge, again, I reiterate, he is not qualified to render these opinions and 12 give this testimony. 13 THE COURT: I'm not concerned as much with 14 his opinion. I'm not -- I'm not going to 15 consider that. I think Mr. Escobar wants me to 16 consider the video. 17 Is there a reason I shouldn't see the 18 19 video? 20 MR. GARCIA: Yes, Judge, because he is 21 downloading and changing formats that this 22 witness is indicating it's better. Better to 23 whom is the question, Judge. Like I said, he's 24 not an expert witness, so why would the Court rely upon him testifying well, it's better in 25

this format as opposed to this format?

THE COURT: All right. Well, we've been going for an hour. So what I'm thinking I'm going to do is take a break. And I'll let you each give me a pitch as to why I should or shouldn't see it in the format that it's set versus the format that we originally watched it in, because I don't know why that format is any better than this format. And I'm going to go see if there's any -- what Professor Ehrhardt has to say about this.

So we'll -- we'll take a ten-minute recess.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: All right. Before I rule, any further argument? Anything you found while -- while I was out looking?

MR. GARCIA: Judge, the only thing that I would cite the Court to is 701 and 702 as far as testimony of experts, specifically 702.

THE COURT: All right. Let's take a look.

MR. GARCIA: Again, I would reiterate to the Court, Judge, he is not qualified to render an opinion.

THE COURT: Say that I disregard what he

has said that seems to be an opinion. Is there any reason I shouldn't look at the modification that he's done on the video if I disregard that?

MR. GARCIA: Yes, Judge, because he's -he is changing the evidence. He's putting the
evidence in a loop, so to speak. They want you
to look at evidence that has been placed in a
loop that keeps playing, like, over and over
again. He's changing or altering that
evidence, Judge.

THE COURT: Isn't that just the same evidence slowed down and put in a loop?

MR. GARCIA: Essentially, Judge, from a person whom is not qualified to do. I mean no disrespect to him, Judge, but he is no more qualified than Mr. Smith comes off the street and comes in here and says, "I have a basic knowledge of computers and how they work." Essentially, Judge, that's what it boils down to.

THE COURT: All right. Anything you want to add before I rule, Mr. Escobar?

MR. ESCOBAR: Yes, I do, Your Honor. He's not doing anything to alter the film itself.

All he is doing, at this point in time, is two things.

Number one, he's using a different media player to view. And I -- I think that even in chambers when we had discussions, one of the questions was: Well, what does this play on? What media players will this play on?

He chose a particular media player because of the fact that is he able to actually stop certain segments and view those segments in isolation.

He's testified that that doesn't change the film itself. It's no different than someone getting a photo and replicating it and saying, yep, this photo looks like this photo, which he has the ability to do. You don't need to be a forensic computer specialist in order to do that.

We've laid the proper predicate. When I look at Ehrhardt, certainly it -- we've laid the proper predicate, according to Ehrhardt. And, if anything, they can argue as to the weight of it, but I think when you see both videos, they're going to be identical.

THE COURT: Well, if they're going to be

identical, why do I need to see the second one? 1 2 MR. ESCOBAR: Because of the fact that he 3 has the ability to actually focus on a very 4 important part for the Defense; and that is 5 Mr. Oulson throwing that phone at his head. 6 And our video shows exactly that. It not only 7 shows throwing the video (sic) at his head, it shows the video (sic) bouncing off and hitting 8 9 the floor. THE COURT: It shows the video (sic) 10 11 hitting the floor -- the phone hitting the 12 floor. You actually see the light, 13 MR. ESCOBAR: 14 the light of the video (sic) coming towards his 15 head, then going down, and then all the way 16 down to the floor, absolutely. 17 MR. GARCIA: Judge, and that's my point. 18 Who is going to testify that that light or that flash of light is a phone? 19 20 THE COURT: I don't know. It's circumstantial evidence 21 MR. ESCOBAR: 22 just like -- just like their presentation of other evidence, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right. I'll tell you 24 25 I'll watch it. what.

Here's what -- here's what my ruling is going to be on why I'm going to watch it. I have a DVD player and a blu ray player at home. I don't need Stephen Hawkings and Steve Jobs to come to my house to hook up those two things, and take a disk from one and put it in the other. I get a better quality video if I look at it in the blu ray than I do in the regular video player. It's the same disk. It's just a better machine.

If he's saying that he found a better piece of software -- there's lots of software out there.

MR. GARCIA: But --

THE COURT: It's a -- it's a function of being young to know that there's lots of software out there that you can load off the internet for 60 bucks and -- and look at stuff. If it's the same form -- I'm sorry, if it's the same program and the same -- or the same file in a different program, it doesn't change it.

And I'm not a jury. I'm -- I'll -- I'll look at it. And this isn't a jury trial, this is just a bond hearing. You want proof evident presumption great, he has every chance to

confront the evidence and put it in a blu ray 1 2 player instead of a DVD player if he wants. 3 MR. GARCIA: Judge, may I question 4 Mr. Sacco on one other point, then --5 THE COURT: Sure. 6 MR. GARCIA: -- as far as voir dire goes? 7 Q (By Mr. Garcia) Mr. Sacco, you indicated 8 that the type of software you used was the most 9 updated version in order to view this. I think you said it was Media Player Classic. 10 That's the correct software, yes. 11 12 And you're saying that's the most advanced Q 13 software in 2014 that you could view this on? 14 Α No. 15 THE COURT: No. That wasn't what he was 16 saying, though. MR. GARCIA: Well, I'm -- I'm asking him 17 18 that. THE COURT: 19 Yeah. 20 Α No. I don't know that for sure. 21 (By Mr. Garcia) Okay. Do you know that Q 22 the Media Player Classic was released May 29th of 23 2003? 24 Judge, he's answered that MR. ESCOBAR: 25 question.

```
1
               It sounds correct.
 2
               MR. GARCIA: Judge -- this is a separate
 3
          question, Judge.
 4
               THE COURT: Overruled. And I don't think
 5
         he said that either.
 6
               Did you ultimately watch this on Classic
 7
          or did you put it in something else?
               THE WITNESS: Ultimately, it would be
 8
 9
          played in Classic.
10
               THE COURT: It would be played in Classic.
11
               Okay. Continue.
12
               (By Mr. Garcia) All right. So are you
          Q
13
     aware of the fact that Media Player Classic, the
14
     initial release was May 29th of 2003 --
15
               That sounds --
16
               -- eleven years ago?
          Q
17
          Α
               That sounds correct.
18
               Okay. Is that what you were watching this
19
     in?
20
          Α
               Yes.
21
               And you're saying that's the most advanced
22
     version that you could apply to this?
23
          Α
               I'm not saying that.
24
               MR. ESCOBAR: Judge, objection. He didn't
25
          say that.
```

```
THE COURT: Overruled. And Mr. Escobar,
 1
 2
          I'm listening to the question and the answer.
 3
          I promise, I'm listening to all this stuff.
          All right?
 5
               You may continue.
 6
               (By Mr. Garcia) Is there other technology
 7
     that is far more advanced than Media Player Classic
     from 2003 in order to view this?
 8
 9
               It's very possible.
10
               Well, I'm asking you. You're the one that
     knows -- has all this knowledge about computers.
11
               I'm sure there's other ones out there.
12
          Α
13
     This -- this one in particular had a few features
14
     that are -- were very helpful in playing this video
15
     the way --
16
               Okay. You couldn't find any from 2013 or
          0
17
     2014?
18
               It didn't matter to me, the year.
19
          Q
               Okay.
20
          Α
               That one I -- that one worked and was
21
    good.
22
               So if I understand you correctly, you're
          Q
23
     relying upon technology that came out eleven years
24
     ago?
25
               That's also been updated and it's --
```

1 When was it updated? Tell us. 2 Α I don't know that for sure. 3 MR. GARCIA: Judge, I -- again, I would 4 renew my objections. He's not qualified. 5 not qualified to change the videos; he's not 6 qualified to -- to tamper, whatever you want to call it, Judge, put it in a loop. He's not 7 8 qualified to do this, Judge. I think it's misleading the Court. 9 THE COURT: All right. I think --10 11 MR. LOUGHERY: Judge, if I might. 12 I understand what the Court's doing and that's -- that's fine. The problem is, that --13 14 that -- there's a lot more -- there's a lot 15 more to do in this case. 16 And it's bothersome that there's not been reciprocal discovery. We're seeing this for 17 18 the first time after the Court has said, give 19 him the tape before we even filed a charge, 20 give it to him right away. 21 They've done something to this that obviously -- I'm not saying they've done 22 23 something good, they've changed it in some 24 fashion or put it in a form for them. 25 didn't have any opportunity to look at it.

We're kind of playing catch up on this as to what it is.

It may not make a difference in the ultimate decision the Court makes, but I think as we go to the future here, we shouldn't be confronted with this kind of stuff.

THE COURT: Well, in the future all the discovery rules are going to be enforced vigorously. So I'm -- I'm --

MR. LOUGHERY: Okay.

THE COURT: -- promising that that's not going to be a problem.

All right. Here -- last --

MR. LOUGHERY: You follow -- you follow what I'm saying?

THE COURT: I do.

MR. LOUGHERY: The last 45 minutes we wouldn't had to have been spending all this time doing this if they had bothered to tell us something about it in the past, because we may differ as to what this — what they think it shows. And it may create argument the way we differ and we would have been able to resolve that perhaps, or at least be prepared for it if they had followed the rules of discovery like

1 we have. THE COURT: And I'm not finding a 2 3 discovery violation --4 MR. LOUGHERY: I understand. 5 THE COURT: -- on either side. And I think both sides thus far have been very 6 7 generous in the way that they have conducted themselves, and we're going to continue down 8 9 that road. 10 I'm going to take a look at the video now 11 if that's what you want to play. I do, Your Honor. 12 MR. ESCOBAR: 13 THE COURT: Okay. Your Honor, if we can turn 14 MR. ESCOBAR: 15 the lights down and --THE COURT: 16 Sure. The first video that I'd 17 MR. ESCOBAR: 18 like you to play is the -- the full length segment of that -- of that event at the theater 19 number ten, and then we'll take the looped 20 21 section. And I'm going to be asking you to stop it 22 at frames, starting at the second 24. 23 24 (Thereupon, the disk, was played with no 25 accompanying video.)

```
THE WITNESS:
1
                             Okay.
2
               THE COURT: Stop it at each segment.
 3
          Okay?
 4
               MR. ESCOBAR: Let it continue.
 5
               Okay. You can stop that now. And let's
 6
         go to the looped.
7
               Your Honor, may I approach the witness
          just briefly?
8
9
               THE COURT: You may.
10
                  RESUMED DIRECT EXAMINATION
11
     BY MR. ESCOBAR:
12
               Did we try to capture also this area right
13
     here, right before the light is shining?
14
               Yes.
15
               And the light that we are talking about is
16
     the light that comes here and then finally goes down
17
     lower?
18
          Α
               Yes.
19
               MR. ESCOBAR: You can stop it.
20
               Your Honor, we would move into evidence --
21
               MR. LOUGHERY: We'd like to see the other
22
          one, the third play.
23
               MR. ESCOBAR: Absolutely. Play the third
24
          one.
25
     (Thereupon, the disk was played with no accompanying
```

audio.) 1 2 MR. ESCOBAR: Okay. Your Honor, we would 3 move Defense Exhibit Composite Number 6 into 4 evidence. 5 THE COURT: All right. Over the State's 6 objection, I'll admit it. And 7, you now have 7 a sleeve for it. Have you had 7 marked? MR. ESCOBAR: I believe I did, Your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: I'll admit -- so that's 6. 10 MR. ESCOBAR: That's 6. 11 THE COURT: You had a solitary video that 12 you were going to mark as 7. 13 MR. ESCOBAR: I did. We're not going --14 THE COURT: Is that the one right there? 15 MR. ESCOBAR: That's the State's version. 16 If you'd like to put it into evidence, we can, 17 just so the Court can see that they're one and 18 the same. 19 THE COURT: That -- that doesn't matter to 20 me. 21 MR. ESCOBAR: Okay. We're not going to 22 introduce that. 23 THE COURT: Okay. It -- then it won't be 24 accepted. 25 MR. ESCOBAR: We have no further

questions, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. State, you need a 3 moment to consult? 4 MR. GARCIA: May it please the Court? 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. GARCIA: 7 Q Mr. Sacco, you would agree with me that 8 form the first loop to the third loop right before 9 the shot, there's a 14-second delay? 10 Α Yes. MR. GARCIA: Okay. I have no further 11 questions, Judge. 12 13 THE COURT: All right. Any redirect? 14 MR. ESCOBAR: Yep. 15 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. ESCOBAR: 17 Mr. Sacco, the downloaded video that you Q 18 downloaded from the hard drive --19 Yes. -- is there a 13-second delay? 20 Q 21 In the main file, no. 22 Okay. What does it show on time? Can we Q 23 play it? 24 A Yes. 25 Okay. Let's play that. That's the Q

```
1
     government's evidence, correct?
2
               Give me --
 3
               MR. GARCIA: Judge, I don't think he
          answered the question.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Is it the government's --
               THE WITNESS: I'm sorry?
 6
7
               THE COURT: Is that the evidence that was
          provided to you by the State Attorney's Office?
8
9
               THE WITNESS: I -- I can play that one.
10
          This is the exact same -- this would be the one
11
          provided by the State Attorney's Office.
12
               (By Mr. Escobar) And Nick, what he's
     talking about -- I'm talking about the hard-drive
13
     one. Is that the top one?
14
15
          Α
               Yes.
               Okay. That's the one that I want you to
16
          Q
    play. That's what was provided by the State --
17
18
          Α
               Okay.
19
               -- the hard copy, on the hard drive.
20
     There you go.
21
               And I want you to count the seconds of
22
     lapsing between the cell-phone screen light that we
23
     captured on the loop and then --
24
               MR. LOUGHERY:
                              Judge --
25
               THE COURT: Sustained. I'm not going to
```

1 consider it characterization of the cell-phone 2 screen light. I don't know what it is. There 3 was a light. MR. ESCOBAR: A light. 4 5 THE COURT: I don't know what it is. (By Mr. Escobar) I want you to count from 6 7 the light to the actual firing of the weapon that 8 you see at 3637; light being at 2425. You may have 9 to fast forward a little bit. MR. LOUGHERY: You want to fast forward to 10 the --11 12 (By Mr. Escobar) There you go. It's not playing properly. 13 THE COURT: Tell you what, just hit play 14 15 and let it run. I don't think it's running 16 THE WITNESS: is the problem. 17 18 MR. ESCOBAR: If you want to do the other, 19 the video, the actual disk that State gave you, 20 you can do that as well. 21 THE WITNESS: Okay. 22 MR. LOUGHERY: Judge, I --23 THE COURT: You took it -- you took it 24 back. 25 MR. LOUGHERY: Yeah. If I might, isn't it

1 time stamped? So Mr. Escobar asked him to 2 count out loud? THE COURT: I think he did ask him -- he 3 4 did ask him to count out loud. It is time 5 stamped. And I've watched it on my blu ray 6 player about 15 times. 7 MR. LOUGHERY: Yeah, so from the time 8 stamp of the -- of the loop -- the two loops 9 they've shown, there's a 13- or 14-second time 10 stamp between that loop and the third loop, or 11 the first appearance of the light and the 12 second appearance of light. That's -- that's 13 what we -- the question we ask. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. LOUGHERY: Are they disagreeing with 16 that? 17 THE COURT: I think he agrees with it. 18 MR. ESCOBAR: I agree with that. 19 THE COURT: Okay. So we're all on the 20 same page. We don't agree on that much where 21 everybody's --22 MR. LOUGHERY: Well, why we -- why are we 23 asking these questions? 24 MR. ESCOBAR: Well, because they were 25 insinuating that somehow there was some missing

1	film and there isn't. That same
2	THE COURT: I don't
3	MR. ESCOBAR: that same 13 seconds
4	appears on their's.
5	THE COURT: I don't think they were.
6	They were just they were just asking to
7	confirm that there's 13 seconds missing and
8	there is.
9	MRS. SUMNER: That's the wrong view.
10	MR. ESCOBAR: Mr. Sacco, that's fine.
11	Yeah.
12	THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, cut that. Just
13	close that.
14	All right. Any other questions you feel
15	compelled to ask?
16	MR. ESCOBAR: No, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: State, any redirect you feel
18	compelled to ask?
19	MR. GARCIA: No, sir.
20	THE COURT: Fantastic. Thank you,
21	Mr. Sacco. You're excused.
22	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
23	THE COURT: You wish to call any more
24	rebuttal witnesses?
25	MR. ESCOBAR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. State, any 1 2 rebuttal-rebuttal witnesses? 3 MR. GARCIA: No, sir. 4 THE COURT: All right. Then we're ready 5 to go into closing arguments on the bond 6 hearing. Before we do that, Mr. Grimaldi, I had a 7 8 chance to read over the autopsy. I don't know if you had a chance to look at it. I looked at 9 10 it closely for any personal information that could in any way be necessary to redact. I 11 12 didn't see anything that jumped out at me. 13 Again, I'm looking at it as a dispatchment 14 third party. 15 Is there anything that you want redacted --16 17 MR. GRIMALDI: Your Honor --THE COURT: -- specifically? 18 MR. GRIMALDI: Yes, Your Honor, just 19 20 slight. It would just -- I mean it's just his 21 age. 22 THE COURT: His age? 23 MR. GRIMALDI: Yeah. It's an identifier 24 beyond anything else. 25 THE COURT: It isn't already -- his date

1 of birth's not already public record? 2 I -- I mean I'm pretty sure it is, but if you 3 want it, I'll -- I'll have it redacted and 4 we'll make yours two copies. 5 MR. LOUGHERY: Judge, the only -- if I 6 may. The only other matter on that would be 7 his name. And I understand how, practically 8 speaking, that might be awkward, but under 9 Florida Statute 119, public record victim 10 identification information would be redacted, if you're looking for things to redact. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MR. GRIMALDI: And that's why the age as 14 well. 15 MR. LOUGHERY: We have a form here, Judge, 16 that we highlighted some of the things we 17 suggest on --18 `THE COURT: Perfect. Let's do that. 19 MR. LOUGHERY: -- if you -- show it to 20 Mr. Escobar. 21 THE COURT: Yep. It's only three pages. 22 MR. LOUGHERY: May I approach, Judge? 23 THE COURT: You may. 24 MR. LOUGHERY: As I explained to 25 Mr. Escobar, we have it in blue and

1 Mr. Grimaldi has it in red. MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, can we see the 3 other pages because we didn't get that in 4 discovery. That was the first time that I was 5 able to get these other pages. 6 THE COURT: Is there any lawful reason I 7 shouldn't let him see them? State wasn't very 8 good listening. 9 All right. You okay with the redactions, 10 Mr. Escobar? 11 MR. ESCOBAR: I am, Your Honor. If I may 12 have just a second. 13 THE COURT: All right. So this will be 14 the one that's sealed? 15 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, we would like 16 the remainder three page to make that report 17 complete. It's been redacted as well. And we 18 have no problems with the areas of redaction. 19 THE COURT: Does the remainder three pages 20 in some way --21 MR. ESCOBAR: They redacted that part. 22 guess they thought that they had given me the 23 whole report, so they went through that portion 24 as well. 25 THE COURT: Okay. All right. That's

fine, but I need a -- I need a second copy of this because I'm going to direct that be sealed, and then I'm going to direct this redacted be entered as Defense Exhibit 5.

Five, right, or four?

THE CLERK: Four.

THE COURT: Four. So this will be 4 redacted, so I need a complete copy for 4 to be put redacted -- I'm sorry, in the original form in the sealed portion of the file. That's Court's 1. So unless you want to waive sealed portion and we can just only go with redacted.

MR. ESCOBAR: I think it should only be redacted. There's no reason to seal any of them.

THE COURT: Great. We'll do that, then. We'll return that. That will be the one that goes in. And we're going to black mark over all the stuff that's highlighted. Okay?

So I'll direct you to take a black marker and go over all the stuff that's highlighted.

You want me to shred this for you or is somebody else going to take care of shredding this?

MR. LOUGHERY: That's fine, Judge. You

1 can shred it. 2 THE COURT: I'll shred it. 3 All right. State, before we go into 4 closing, how much time do you need to prepare? 5 MR. GARCIA: I'm ready. 6 THE COURT: Ten minutes? You ready now? 7 Yes, sir. MR. GARCIA: 8 THE COURT: Ten minutes or you ready now? 9 MR. ESCOBAR: We're ready. 10 THE COURT: Okay, great. Let's do it. 11 Before we go into closings, Mr. Grimaldi, 12 you talked to your client. She doesn't want to 13 make a statement prior to me making the 14 decision on bond? 15 MR. GRIMALDI: Correct, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: She going to want to make a 17 decision -- a statement after I make the 18 decision on bond? 19 MR. GRIMALDI: No, she will not. 20 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Escobar, it's 21 your motion so you're going first. Why should 22 I grant your client bond? If I should grant 23 your client bond, under what conditions would 24 you recommend to the Court? 25 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, my client has

been a life-long member of Florida the majority of his life here in the surrounding communities of Pasco County. He has led an exemplary life as a law enforcement officer. And not just a law enforcement officer, but a decorated law enforcement officer where his primary duties and exclusive duties as a law enforcement officer has been to protect the public in the state of Florida.

He's got two children, a lovely wife that he's been married to for 46 years. He's had a great career as a law enforcement officer, but also a great career as a director of security for Busch Entertainment.

As you heard there in the -- in the audiotapes of predominantly his wife, he has never had a shooting as a law enforcement officer in his entire career. However, as you learned from individuals that came before you, he was selected by the chief of the Tampa Police Department in order to start and develop and train their most selective force, and that being the tactical response team.

This is an individual of principles; this is an individual of integrity. He is a

church-going man.

There is absolutely no reason to believe that Mr. Reeves is a danger to anyone in this community or any other community. As all the witnesses have told you, they likewise don't believe that he is a danger to the community or a risk of flight.

He lives in Hernando County with his wife.

He owns his home. This is his retirement home.

This is where his daughter lives. This is

where his granddaughter lives. The ties are

incredible.

He is an individual that is on retirement.

He's an individual that depends upon that

retirement not only for him, but for his wife

and for his daughter and for his grandchild.

He is not an individual that's going to do

anything to upset that situation.

I'd like to talk a little bit, Your Honor, about what I believe to be an appropriate condition of pretrial release. As the Court knows, there is a preference for non-monetary conditions of release in our laws, in our rules of criminal procedure, as well as in 903.

And there's a reason for that.

7.

Individuals like Mr. Reeves that have absolutely no history whatsoever of criminal activity. And just the opposite, that has a history of being one of the most decorated law enforcement officers that protect the public for 27 years shouldn't need a monetary bond.

And I say that with all due respect to this Court because although the Court has to look at the charge, more importantly the Court has to look at the history and the ties that Mr. Reeves has to this community.

Do we need a monetary bond? Absolutely not. Has the family and friends decided hey, if the Court feels secure with a monetary bond, are we able to do that? Absolutely. And I think, Your Honor, this family could make a monetary bond of \$200,000, which, in essence, would be his home, his most valued possession at this point in time in retirement, the only home that his wife occupies and his daughter occupies.

Does anyone in this community, in any community think that he is going to forfeit that and flee? In some of these hearings I know the Court had some concerns well, we know

how Mr. Reeves was for the last, you know, 30 years or 30-some years, but what tells us about Mr. Reeves today?

And we brought individuals before this

Court that knew Mr. Reeves back then and that
know Mr. Reeves today. Individuals that went
to that very same Cobb Theater for 25, 30 times
and not once did they witness him being
agitated over a cell phone or anything in that
theater.

Their highlight of a -- of a day was we're going to go to Sonny's Barbecue, we're going to go to the matinee theater at the Cobb, and then we're going to go to Dairy Queen so that we can get some Dairy Queen. It tells you a little bit about who Mr. Reeves is at this point in his life.

There's other options for this Court. The Court could order him in a sort of house arrest, monitor or no monitor, public or private.

THE COURT: Have you already secured a monitor company if I order that?

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, I have -- I know that I have a monetary company that would be

more than willing to do that, but I have not been presumptuous enough to go out and select that service without this Court -- hearing this Court's order.

But there are private -- there's a -- there's Roche Bail Bonds, which I have worked with on numerous occasions, that I am certain would be more than willing to do a monitored program with Mr. Reeves.

THE COURT: Have you used the monitor in the past?

MR. ESCOBAR: I have used the monitor in the past.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ESCOBAR: And these are responsible sureties that would answer to this Court under any conditions.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ESCOBAR: The Court can place restrictions on where he can go. We've told the Court already that there are no weapons in Mr. Reeves' home. He is 71 years old. He could -- he could live in his home without going anywhere. He's 71 years old.

THE COURT: What assurances would I have

that he wouldn't have any weapons after he got out, though?

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, you could have his assurance and you could have his son's assurance, who is a Tampa police officer with no blemishes on his record, that will tell this Court that he will, himself, make sure that Mr. Reeves has no weapons in his home at any time. And if that means every day, unannounced, coming over and searching his home, that's exactly what his son would do.

His son was the first one, Your Honor -his son was the first one at the Cobb Theater
that actually held on to Mr. Oulson and applied
pressure to his chest. Mr. Reeves' son was the
first one to do that.

THE COURT: I don't know that because that wasn't something that was testified to and I'm not going to consider that. I'd like to consider, though, do you have a list of all the firearms that Mr. Reeves owns? And I'm not asking for you to read it out loud in court, but do you have a list of said firearms so that if I were to direct that the sheriff's office were to secure those firearms in their — in

their safe, evidence room or wherever else they
felt appropriate, that they would be able to
take control of those weapons prior to him

MR. ESCOBAR: Yes, Your Honor, his son does have that list.

THE COURT: Okay.

being released?

MR. ESCOBAR: I'd like to -- I'd like to talk about the facts of this case because I don't think that the proof is evident and presumption great.

The government brought some lay witnesses here before Your Honor. And those lay witnesses were all over the place as far as their testimony. Let's talk about each one of them if we can.

We had Charles Cummings that came before Your Honor. And he indicated that he was there at the Cobb Theater. And he was pretty candid that yes, I've got bad vision without my glasses. And he indicated the one thing that I think was monumental in this particular case.

And he said, "Yes, I looked over and I saw Mrs. Oulson holding Mr. Oulson back." He said, "That's when I felt maybe I need to do

something." Obviously he didn't have the opportunity. But that's a State witness that's telling this Court that he realized that that episode had gotten to the point where he, himself, felt that he needed to intercede.

Clearly Mrs. Oulson, by her own testimony on the recording, says, "I had my hand -- my hand on his chest." And that's where she was shot, while she had that hand on his chest.

There was only one shot in this case, Your Honor.

For Mrs. Oulson to recognize that hey, I better get up and I better put that hand on my husband -- remember what she said in that video? Men are hotheads.

I disagree with that. That may be her assessment at the time of her husband, but Mr. Reeves is no hothead. And there is absolutely not one scintilla of credible evidence that he was ever a hothead in that theater.

What did Mr. Reeves do when he tapped on that shoulder and he said, "Mr. Oulson, turn your cell phone off. They've put the message on the screen."

And Mr. Oulson looks at him and says,

"Fuck you." Does he take matters into his own
hands and goes into combat, or does he pull his
weapon and shoot him right then and there?

Absolutely not. What he does is he takes the
responsible course and he leaves that theater
to go advise management, the responsible thing
that we would hope that every citizen would do
in this great county.

And remember, I believe it was

Mr. Cummings that said, "Well, he was mumbling
as he was going down the aisle and he -- and he
hit the -- my back of my seat." Did you see on
the video Mr. Reeves having to hold on as he's
walking down the aisle? Even Mr. Cummings
admitted yes, tight space there.

The mumbling that he was talking about was what Mr. Turner was saying, that when Mr. Reeves returned, he said, "Excuse me, sir. I'm trying to get by."

Is that the attitude of someone that has ill will, hate, spite, which is required, required for the crime of second-degree murder "Excuse me, sir. I'm trying to get by."

Detective Proctor. They brought

Detective Proctor here to testify, but he never goes inside the theater where the event occurred. He's spoken to Mr. Reeves and Mr. Reeves says, "(Indicating) I've been hit by something. I believe that I was hit by the phone."

And where is it that we find that phone?
We find that phone in the exact location where
Mr. Reeves was. The exact location.

Does he make it a point before he arrests
Mr. Reeves, I've got to see the video now?
Nope. We're going to wait two days to do that.

Well, now we saw the video. And that video clearly depicts, clearly depicts a light, and you actually see a hand and a light coming in this general direction of Mr. Reeves. And you see it coming here (indicating), and then going down in stages. And where does it end up? Forensically where does it end up after the shooting? That phone was right there (indicating).

MR. GARCIA: Judge, I object --

MR. ESCOBAR: It's a --

MR. GARCIA: Judge, I'm going to object. That's a mischaracterization. It's arguing

facts not in evidence. There's absolutely no testimony before this Court that that was a phone. None.

THE COURT: It was testified to that a phone was found at his feet. I'll take that as my recollection, was found at the base of one of the chairs. And one of your witnesses, Corporal Hamilton, testified that there was a phone at his feet. And I've got that in my notes. I read it last night.

MR. GARCIA: I understand, Judge. I just want it made perfectly clear that there's no evidence that a phone was thrown in that video.

And I think that Mr. --

THE COURT: I'm --

MR. GARCIA: -- Escobar has alluded to that.

THE COURT: He's -- he's drawing inferences from what he saw. And he's feel -- he can feel free to draw whatever inferences he chooses; you can draw whatever inferences you choose; and I will make the ultimate conclusion as to what I think I saw, if -- if I saw anything. Okay?

MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ESCOBAR: And that inference is so strong for the following reason. We're going to go back to now Mr. Cummings, because what does Mr. Cummings say about that cell phone? Remember what he said? Well, you could see the bright light of the cell phone as Mr. Oulson was holding it. He was holding it in his hand. You could see the bright -- the bright light there of the phone, that same bright light you see flying at Mr. Reeves, coming down and landing on the floor.

But Mr. Proctor wasn't concerned about that. Mr. Proctor doesn't know the weight of an iPhone, doesn't know the size of the iPhone, but the damage that an iPhone can cause by a six-four, 200-plus gentleman flinging that phone at someone's head is incredible.

But the phone wasn't that important that night or that day, but it sure was there at the scene the minute that Mr. Hamilton came, saw Mr. Reeves, and there it was.

So this is not a throwing popcorn case only. This is throwing a deadly missile case. The speed of a phone by a six-four human being,

1 it's pretty daunting. And especially at a 2 71-year-old man, who has arthritis in both 3 hands, arthritis and a bad back and all the 4 ailments that we depicted in our motion. 5 THE COURT: If he was struck in the head 6 with a cell phone the way you're describing, 7 though, shouldn't there have been a mark on him? 8 9 MR. ESCOBAR: Maybe, maybe not, because we 10 don't know -- my phone has a rubber --11 MR. GARCIA: Judge, I'm going to object as 12 to the relevancy of his phone, Judge. Number 13 one, how is it relevant? 14 Number two, is he going to testify in this 15 case? Are -- is the Court going to place him 16 under oath as to his phone having a cover on it 17 or whatever? 18 THE COURT: I'm going --19 MR. GARCIA: He's arguing facts not in 20 evidence. 21 THE COURT: I -- he's arguing common 22 knowledge. I've got a cell phone and I've got 23 a cover on it. He's arguing just common 24 knowledge at this point. 25 It's not -- and -- and there -- there's

not a jury here. So I want -- I want to hear his arguments; I'm going to want to hear your arguments. And so tell me.

MR. ESCOBAR: And, Your Honor, phones have covers. Some covers are soft. The point here is, shouldn't Detective Proctor have been the one -- he's the lead homicide detective in this case -- to really analyze that phone and to tie it together? Not 24 days from the incident, but that day before he's put in handcuffs, before he's taken to the Pasco County jail.

And, yes, I believe that certainly if you throw this, you can have both visible injuries or not visible injuries.

But what comes even after that first light comes at Mr. Reeves' person? What happens at -- does it stop? Is his assessment that he told Mr. Proctor, "Mr. Proctor, I was scared to death. I could see this large man. I could see his facial expression. I could see his aggression. I could see" -- that was his words -- "I could see it wasn't going to stop."

Did it stop? Did it stop? It didn't stop. In fact, just the opposite. We see on their video Mr. Oulson going right up to and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

again coming at my client.

Now, let's think about aggression and the escalating pattern of someone in a theater, because that's the way we have to assess the factors. You remember decorated Deputy Chief Depolis, second in command all those years in the Tampa Police Department, was also the cofounder of the tactical squad.

And he said, "We have to take all these factors into consideration and we have to make a decision (indicating) that quickly. And he was doing what he was trained to do for 27 Mr. Garcia is not trined to do that; I'm not trained to do that; Mr. Michaels is not trained to do that. But I can tell you by the evidence in this case that Captain Reeves was very qualified in making that assessment. he was the best position to make that determination whether, at that point, three things were happening.

Number one, he was going to be seriously injured.

Number two, a forcible felony was going to be committed against him. And we're going to talk about forcible felony and the state of the

law with that.

2

about any felony being number three.

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Isn't there a knowledge

Three, any felony. We're going to talk

And let's take that right now where we get the opportunity. I outlined for the Court the law concerning the use in self-defense of justifiable deadly force. And let me read to the Court 782.02, which is found in the homicide section of our statutes.

And it says, "The use of deadly force is justifiable when a person is resisting any attempt to murder such person or" -- this is the big one -- "to commit any felony upon him."

Now, it's not part of the Stand Your Ground options and there would be a duty to retreat under 782.02, but it doesn't say "forcible felony." It says, "Any felony."

We know that Mr. Reeves is 71 years old. And this great state of Florida protects the elderly. If someone commits a misdemeanor battery against Mr. Reeves, it automatically becomes a felony. So under these circumstances Mr. Reeves did not even have to wait for him to be severely damaged under 782.002.

element to battery on an elderly person?
Wouldn't he had have had to know that he was
over 65?

MR. ESCOBAR: Well, Your Honor, unfortunately the answer is no.

THE COURT: There isn't?

MR. ESCOBAR: No. Your Honor, that's a very gray area in the law and has been heavily litigated in the past. But what we have to remember is: How close was Mr. Oulson from Mr. Reeves? Does he look like he's a day or two younger than 65?

Let's assume that the Court were to rule in that fashion. That's what's happening.

That's what's happening. He is under the impression at that point in time that he is, at the very least, going to be battered. His own testimony was: It was beyond a misdemeanor battery, that he was going to be seriously injured by this gentleman. Why? He had no means of protecting himself. He couldn't use his hands against a —-year-old six-foot-four, 200-pound individual.

What did Vivian say? She was so scared she turned away. His wife right next to him,

ς

elderly, health problems. Was he just assessing his situation? Was he assessing his situation and his wife's? Of course he was. Forty-six years married to this woman and loves her dearly.

776.012, which is the Stand Your Ground. And it deals with the issue of same thing, serious bodily injury, or a forcible felony. And I will tell you that the District Court's of Appeal of this state have had some real problems with the definition of what is a forcible felony.

And we have two Supreme Court cases that I believe got cited. Actually, they cited one, but there was an earlier one that came about where the Supreme Court tried to define what forcible felony was. And there was a -- two long opinions dealing with well, how do we do that? Do we do that strictly by an elements approach, or do we do that by the actual physical act that was taking place?

I would suggest to the Court that for a self-defense situation like we have here, it should be the actual act, because it's Mr. Reeves that's using that defense based upon

his perceptions.

The Court was clear in those opinions to say, "You know what? If a battery's committed

They were applying that forcible felony rule in those two cases dealing with the Prison Release Reoffender Act, where individuals get punished harsher if they qualify under certain offenses, and the career -- no, I think it was the Violent Criminal Act which, again, they get punished a bit more severe.

So the context of those Supreme Court cases were such that they were not being necessarily applied to a self-defense issue with the exception of the earlier case. And I'll have to pull that for the Court. I've got it. It dealt with whether a trafficking in narcotics was a forcible felony.

And the court said, "Not all traffickings are forcible. Some could be forcible."

But, you know, we've got to go to this element approach because I am sure that the court felt, how are we going to re-litigate, you know, these particular cases and deal with the issue of whether it was forcible or whether it was not forcible?

and it's committed with any degree of force, yes, it could be a forcible felony on a battery of LEO. It could be a forcible felony on someone that's 65 years of age or older.

But we're not willing to go there. We're going to define forcible felony by an elements approach and that is it. I suspect there's going to be a great deal of litigation dealing with this issue in the future.

Self-defense. His testimony that he gave immediately after this incident, recorded, after someone read him his rights and said, "Mr. Reeves, anything you say can be used against you in the future" is uncontroverted by any credible evidence.

In fact, his testimony is corroborated by that type of evidence that we probably want to rely on more than anything. That's physical evidence. It's that physical evidence that doesn't have the ability to be persuaded by things in life that shouldn't really entertain someone's opinions and desires.

I know that there was individuals in that -- in that theater that were heartbroken over what had happened. I know that

Mr. Cummings, Mr. Friedhoff, Mr. -Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Turner, they were -- they
witnessed this. They tried their best to help
Mr. Oulson. And so there is a sense of wanting
to help Mr. Oulson not only then, but
thereafter as well. This was a dark theater.

If we remember Mr. Friedhoff's testimony,

and let's -- let's think about this because this one is very, very important.

Mr. Friedhoff was about three rows up. And he was having to look over his right shoulder between his girlfriend, who was to his right.

And he indicated, you know, I was looking back and, you know, I was able to see Mr. Oulson's cell phone on his lap.

Now, think about it. These are high seats. And he's able to see Mr. Oulson's cell phone on his lap?

Well, what about Mr. Turner? Mr. Turner said, you know, when Mr. Reeves left,
Mr. Oulson stood up and he was -- he was standing up the whole time with his phone.

Remember, I asked? I said, "What about Vivian behind him?" Oh, you know, it was the previews so, you know, he was just standing up

with his phone and he happened to see his light -- and he's the scanner. He's the guy that scans wherever he goes because that's his background, and that's what he was saying.

Was Mr. Oulson standing up like that? Was he waiting for Mr. Reeves to come back in order to attack him like he did?

But one thing that Mr. Friedhoff said that was so important. Remember the -- "You know, I heard some crumbling of popcorn, but then I heard a thump." But then I heard a thump.

Consistent? Of course it is.

I listed in my memo many second-degree -excuse me, Second DCA cases and a Fourth DCA,

Dorsey --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ESCOBAR: -- that cited many Second DCA cases dealing with the issue of the overreaction of one that was claiming self-defense. Not one of those cases was addressed by the prosecution, and there's a clear answer to that. They couldn't. Those cases are rock solid.

Those cases tell Your Honor that under these circumstances at best, at best what they

could do is maybe charge, maybe charge manslaughter. Not that they'd get a conviction, but that the factual basis in order to make that decision at best, if that's their theory, supports a charge of manslaughter.

They have proven not one scintilla of ill will, spite, hatred. And all those cases talked about you can't develop those in a short period of time.

I know Your Honor read those Second

District cases. I know Your Honor read the

Dorsey case.

THE COURT: I did.

MR. ESCOBAR: They were extremely on point. They were right on point. And the only cases that they actually cited were cases -- cases that were not dealing with self-defense. The only case that dealt with self-defense was a 1934 case that actually we adopt as our position.

I'm sure the Court remembers the 1934 case of -- I think it was Ramsey. Ramsey. That was the one dealing with the -- the father and the daughter and the gentleman that was disrespecting, sexually, his daughter.

THE COURT:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes.

MR. ESCOBAR: And the Court, in Ramsey, talked about three different types of malice. And they said, you know, it may be some other crime, but it's not second-degree murder because there was no evidence here of hatred, malice, the necessary elements that you need for second-degree murder. This could have been a response to an emotion that he had because of the disrespecting of the daughter.

That was a case they cited and it supports our position. The only case they cited that has any relevance whatsoever to the issue of self-defense.

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to be asking them about their cases on self-defense and their cases on second-degree murder in a minute.

But one of the things I'm interested in for my decision, when I decide on proof evident presumption great, when I decide on that, do I take into consideration the affirmative defenses or do I merely take into consideration whether the State can, in fact, prove their case absent the affirmative defenses, because

7 · 

the affirmative defense of self-defense has to be established by the Defense.

I would never put any proof requirement on you for the proof of guilt, but if you wish to establish an affirmative defense, that's on you.

So when I analyze the State's case and ask myself, have they met this high standard, should I be asking myself have they met this high standard, and then has the Defense rebutted it, or should I simply be asking, have they met this high standard and at trial then I will hear whether the Defense has provided the affirmative defense?

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, I can answer that question. And with all due respect to the Court, I disagree.

THE COURT: That I should even ask the question?

MR. ESCOBAR: No, no. No. I disagree that -- that the Defense has the burden of proving self-defense. We have the burden to go forward with self-defense. They have to prove, beyond and to the exclusion of a reasonable doubt at trial, that it was not self-defense.

THE COURT: I probably phrased it poorly.

What I mean is, you have to establish

self-defense and then they have to knock it

down. I -- I recognize that. It's more just a

should I be looking at self-defense now or

should I be waiting to look at self-defense at

trial for purposes of JOA and for purposes of

instructing the jury?

MR. ESCOBAR: You have to be looking, Your Honor -- and I say this with all due respect to the Court -- you have to be looking at self-defense now. If not, those individuals that exercised their absolute legal right to self-defense would be kept out of the loop or forget about it. If you -- if you assert self-defense, no one can consider it until we get to trial.

That's not the intent of any law that I'm aware of in this great state. I think --

THE COURT: Is there any case that tells me that?

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, I -- I'm not sure that there is. I -- I can tell the Court I have not read that, but let's look at practicalities.

THE COURT: Well, I was looking for the cases before I was looking for practicalities.

I go to practicalities when I don't have cases if the --

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, I'd be -- I'd love to be able to get you that case law if you'd like me to. I am sure that there's got to be some case out there that stands for the proposition that no, you've got to look at all the evidence. And if there's evidence brought forth by the defendant that says, you know what? This is self-defense, and it is supported in any way, they've got to prove it, not only beyond -- to the exclusion of a reasonable doubt, but the case law is clear their burden -- their burden is beyond, beyond to the exclusion of a reasonable doubt.

THE COURT: I know. I read that. I'm just --

MR. ESCOBAR: It --

THE COURT: -- trying to -- I'm just trying to figure out if, in my analysis, I have to apply this self-defense now.

MR. ESCOBAR: Absolutely. I think you do,
Your Honor. And I -- you know, with 30 years

of experience, I think that I am on solid ground there, because it would make no practical sense for the law to say you know what? Here at this stage we're going to just leave you in jail. And the only time that the Court or anyone can consider the issue of self-defense is when you go before a body of your peers in a jury.

That would make no sense and I seriously doubt that any court would rule in such a fashion. It's their burden from day one. When they charge someone, it's their burden throughout the entire period, and it's their burden at trial.

THE COURT: Well, affirmative defenses, though, suggest they're affirmative defenses and they have to be raised by the Defense.

MR. ESCOBAR: I would agree with you if this was the case. If we had to prove beyond a reasonable doubt self-defense, I'd say, you know, maybe there's an argument here. But that's not what the law says. The law says all we have to do is introduce some evidence of self-defense. And in a trial, it shifts right back to them and now they have that ultimate

Τ Ο

burden of proof beyond and to the exclusion of a reasonable doubt.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ESCOBAR: And here it's even beyond that.

THE COURT: Well, that's why we're talking it through. I like to -- I like to get both sides' input and I'm going to get Mr. Garcia's input on that.

How about this: Is the Stand Your

Ground -- is the Stand Your Ground statute that

place that you could go requesting the immunity

of the Court prior to going to a jury? Is

that -- is that a mechanism that the

legislature's now built in as your outlet prior

to trial?

MR. ESCOBAR: It has, Your Honor. And the beauty of both 782.02, which is not the Stand Your Ground, and 776.012 is that the law doesn't say that the only time that you can use deadly force is if someone actually pulls out a gun. And so if they pull out a gun, you can pull out a gun, or if they pull out a knife, you can pull out a knife.

That's not what the law says. The law

23

24

25

doesn't even mention what that person has to do in order to create that fear. The only thing and the most important thing that the law does create is it says, you know what? If you're going to judge this gentleman on the issues of self-defense, you're going to be stepping in his shoes. And that reasonable person has got to say, okay, I'm a reasonable person, but I'm a reasonable person of 71 years old. And, you know, I'm a reasonable person, but I'm a reasonable person that has arthritis in both hands. And, you know, I'm a reasonable person, but I'm a reasonable person that has arthritis and a bad back. And you know what, I'm a reasonable person, but I am sitting in a theater, that it is dark, and this gentleman is coming over the back of -- of the chair.

That's what we have to do with the law of self-defense. It is not playing Monday morning quarterback. And the reason we don't play Monday morning quarterback under those circumstances is, when you're looking at that Monday morning play, you have a better advantage. You may be looking at it from the cameras that are high up on the field. And so

you're able to see what Tom Brady can't.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ESCOBAR: That's not the law of self-defense. The law of self-defense here is we don't go to those cameras, we go to him. And we have to take him as an experienced 27-year veteran that has been highly trained to look at the dangerous factors that could result in his serious bodily injury, death or, under 782, any felony.

THE COURT: Well, here's what it says in the transcript -- it's not the transcript.

Here's what it says as I sat and quietly -- and tried to write as quickly what he was saying when he was being talked to by Detective Proctor.

He said, "I couldn't take that ass whipping."

MR. ESCOBAR: Exactly, but he also said,
"I thought I was going to be seriously
injured." And I would beg the judge -- I would
beg, Judge, listen to that audio again because
it's right there. It is right there. He says,
"I was concerned that I was going to have some
serious injury."

THE COURT: I heard him say that, too, but I also heard him, in a reflective moment, say that it was going to be an ass whipping. And ass whipping means a lot of different things to a lot of different people, I suppose, but an ass whipping to me just means get beaten up.

MR. ESCOBAR: Well --

THE COURT: Should I take it a different way?

MR. ESCOBAR: -- an ass whipping to you would -- may just be a "beating up." To me it just may be beaten up. To a 71-year-old man with these kind of ailments, it could be his life.

And that's why the Florida legislature has said, you know what? You know what? We've got to protect the elderly. They're far more frail than the 20-year-old or the 30-year old or the 40-year-old. These individuals get a punch to the head and they die. These individuals get a punch and they fall and they break their hip and they die.

Fifty percent of the elderly people in this country that get a broken hip, they die. Fifty percent; it's that high.

1 THE COURT: Fifty percent of 2 people that --3 Fifty percent of the MR. ESCOBAR: 4 individuals. The elderly individuals, not 5 the -- the young. The elderly individuals, 6 they die. . 7 THE COURT: Well, eventually we all die, 8 but you're saying approximately from a broken 9 hip they die? Well, it's -- it's all the 10 MR. ESCOBAR: 11 complications that come with that, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MR. ESCOBAR: It's being in bed; it's the 14 congestive heart failure that results in not 15 being mobile, absolutely. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. ESCOBAR: And so the legislature has 18 seen this. I didn't draft this law. 19 Florida legislature has said, you know what? 20 We've got to protect the elderly. 21 And so, yes, Your Honor, an ass whipping 22 for a 71 year old could be his life. If we 23 were here and he had not pulled that gun and he 24 had been hit and he had died, we'd all, in this 25 room, be saying: Mr. Reeves, 27 years on the

force, commander of the tactical squad, you had a weapon in your -- in your pocket and you didn't realize that your life was in danger?

That's what we would be saying today.

That's what we've said for many fallen officers in Hillsborough County. That Officer Roberts who approached that homeless man, the homeless man with the cart that nobody thought was dangerous.

MR. LOUGHERY: Your Honor, this is -- this is objectionable. Okay? You can't -- that's apples and oranges and it does disrespect Officer Roberts.

MR. ESCOBAR: No, it's --

THE COURT: All right. Look, move on from it.

MR. ESCOBAR: I will.

THE COURT: I get what you're saying. People are unpredictable.

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, I -- I certainly think that with the family support that
Mr. Reeves has in this community, with his history of being nothing but an incredible public servant, that he is not a danger to the community, he is not a risk of flight. He is

.1

17.

going to have his day in court, but he needs to have this time outside of the Pasco County jail so that he can assist his lawyers with this defense.

The evidence that we've brought before

Your Honor creates incredible reasonable doubt.

Incredible reasonable doubt. Not one of the

State's witnesses really coincide with the other.

And then if you listen to Ms. Oulson's statement, she says, "My husband didn't curse. My husband didn't hit anybody. My husband didn't do any of that." Please, listen to her — listen to her tape again. She says her husband didn't hit anybody, didn't strike anybody. The only thing he says, "Hey, dude, what's up with you" or "What's wrong with you?" And what do we see on the video? Just the opposite.

Not one single witness that they presented before this Court is credible. And not credible because they're bad people, Your Honor. They're not credible because they witnessed an event that was very traumatizing. And I think that certainly in their heart they

want to do everything that they can for Chad Oulson. But fortunately, the facts of this case, the cell phone spells out the video, the light corroborates the statements of Curtis Reeves.

I'd ask the Court to consider pretrial release. Mr. Reeves is willing to abide by any conditions this Court deems to be reasonable and prudent. And I would respectfully ask the Court to consider those and allow Mr. Reeves some form of pretrial release, monetary or not, until we're able to go to trial and prove his innocence.

THE COURT: All right. You want a break?

Manny's going to get pretty animated. I'll

give you a break.

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I'm going to give my courtroom staff a break. It's not fair that I go right into it. We've been going for quite some time.

So we're going to take a -- you want ten or fifteen?

THE COURT REPORTER: Fifteen.

THE COURT: We're going to take a fifteen-minute recess. We'll be back at 3:45

1 to continue. 2 (Recess.) 3 THE COURT: All right. You can be seated. 4 All right. Mr. Garcia, you ready to begin your presentation? 5 6 MR. GARCIA: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. Tell me what you 8 got to tell me. 9 MR. GARCIA: May it please the Court, 1.0 counsel? Judge, what has brought us here Wednesday 11 12 and Friday of this week? I would submit to you 13 the last words of Chad Oulson, "I can't believe 14 he shot me." 15 The law is clear in this case, Judge. 16 have the burden of proof not only by beyond a 17 reasonable doubt, but by all doubt in this 18 And we have to prove to you that the case. 19 proof is evident and the presumption is great 20 that this defendant, Curtis Reeves, committed 21 second-degree murder on January 13th of 2014. 22 I would submit to this Court contrary to 23 what Mr. Escobar has argued, that the State's 24 witnesses are not credible, they're all over

the place, so on and so forth. But two things

25

that are consistent with all four of those main
witnesses, Judge, are that they never saw
Chad Oulson strike, touch, hit or even throw a

cell phone at Mr. Oulson.

You heard Mr. Cummings. And Mr. Cummings told you from the very beginning that Mr. Reeves was agitated, he was angry. As he walked out of the theater, he kicked the back of his chair. What's also consistent with all four of those witnesses, they all say it was popcorn and nothing more but popcorn.

What evidence does the State have to corroborate the testimony of those witnesses, Judge? And I would submit to you that we have photographs, which obviously you have seen and I would invite the Court to look at again, of Mr. Reeves on January 13th of 2014. And it shows that he absolutely has no injuries upon his face. None.

Mr. Escobar would want you to believe or the Court to believe that he may or may not have injuries had a cell phone been thrown at him. I would beg to differ with him, Judge.

If a cell phone had been thrown in Mr. Reeves' face, there would be injuries depicted in these

Я

photographs. And there's absolutely not even one scintilla of evidence that he was struck in the face.

Let's look at the statements that were made by Mr. Reeves in this case when he was interviewed by Detective Allen Proctor as far as ill will, depraved mind, hatred. "It was crazy, it really was. It was completely uncalled for. Good heaven, I didn't mean to do that. That was just -- I had to say that I've counseled cops for."

Out of his own mouth, Judge. "Good heaven, I didn't mean to do that." Not "I acted in self-defense. I just got hit with the cell phone on the side of my face. He threw the cell phone and hit me," but "Good heaven, I didn't mean to do that."

What else do we know, Judge? You know that Mr. Reeves, in talking to his wife, she indicates to him there's no justification for what happened in there.

What's more interesting and more telling,
Judge, is that when Mr. Escobar kept saying
look at the State's witnesses and determine
their credibility and you will find that

they're not credible, so on and so forth. I

know you've heard the audio, but I would

implore the Court to go through your notes.

know that you took copious notes, Judge.

And Mr. Reeves says on the interview, "You know, I don't know if I was saying 'no, no, no' or 'whoa, whoa, whoa,' so he's coming over on me. I've got to -- I'm pushing him off with my left hands and I had a hold of something. I'm assuming it was probably his chest. I don't know."

Where in that video is that depicted,

Judge? Where in that video do you see

Mr. Reeves holding Chad Oulson back like he's

describing? "I either was touching his arm,

his chest or shoulder."

It's not in there, Judge. And the reason being is, after he found out that he had shot and killed Chad Oulson, not knowing that there was video surveillance in this case, he had to come up with a self-defense argument.

So what does he do? He starts making these statements. He knew that he shot that man in cold blood that day, Judge, for no justification.

Another one of his statements, "Oh, shit, this is stupid." Judge, and more telling is that when Corporal Alex Smith (sic) is on the witness stand and he hears conversations between Mr. Reeves and his wife, that his wife, after he makes a statement to her, he — she turns to him and says, "There was no reason to do what you did."

THE COURT: You mean Corporal Hamilton.

MR. GARCIA: Corporal Hamilton. What did
I say, Judge?

THE COURT: Alex Smith.

MR. GARCIA: I -- I'm sorry, Judge. I apologize.

He then turns to his wife and what does he say? He points at her and says, "Shut your fucking mouth and don't say another word."

Why? Because he knew what he had done was wrong, Judge. He didn't want his wife saying the truth.

And what's the truth in this case? What statements do we have from Vivian Reeves?

Detective Proctor asked Mrs. Reeves, "Did you see him get hit in the face?"

"No."

"Did you hear a hit?" And he -- he even demonstrated on the audio, Judge. If you recall, he (indicating) smacks his hand and said, "Did you hear a hit?"

"No."

"Did you see any injuries upon your husband, Mr. Reeves' body?"

"No."

"Any indications that he had been hit?
Was there anything, Mrs. Reeves, on your
husband's body that would lead you to believe
your husband was struck or hit?"

"No."

"Did Mr. Oulson ever threaten your husband?"

"No."

And more telling, this defense that a cell phone was thrown, Mrs. Reeves was right next to him, sitting right there. Did you ever hear her say to Detective Proctor Mr. Oulson threw his cell phone; I see a cell phone come flying by? No. Why? Because it didn't happen, Judge. That's why. She specifically said that she had not heard Mr. Oulson make any threats to her husband, Mr. Reeves.

Detective Proctor goes back and questions him further. And he says to him, "You keep saying he hit you, but what does he hit you with?"

Mr. Reeves: "It's dark. I don't know."

Originally he had said, "I thought it was
a fist. I thought he may have thrown a cell
phone or hit me with a cell phone." Bottom
line, Judge, is it didn't happen.

For the sake of argument and should this Court believe Mr. Escobar that the shiny light on the video was, in fact, a Smartphone, obviously we're not saying that it was, we're not admitting that it was, Judge.

First of all, why would somebody throw a 5- or \$600 cell phone at someone? And then why would Mr. Reeves wait 13 seconds after that shiny light before firing his gun? Is that reasonable?

I would submit to you that based upon the video in this case -- and the only one that's aggressive in here is Mr. Reeves. From the minute that he gets in that theater -- and take it, Judge, you can see the theater -- the theater's empty. There's hardly anyone there

to see the showing.

R

Why does he go and sit directly behind Chad Oulson? Because Mr. Reeves has appointed himself as the texting police. He's going to tell him, because as Mr. Escobar said, he has 27 years of law enforcement, all this tactical training, all this experience, and by God, he's going to go in there and he's going to sit behind Chad Oulson.

And you saw on the video within seconds —
he sits down and within seconds he's tapping
him on the shoulder, hey, you need to turn that
off. And he sits back. And a second or two
goes by and what does he do? He reaches over
again and tells him, you need to turn your cell
phone off.

Anywhere in that video do you ever see
Mr. Oulson, during those encounters, turn
around and speak to him or say anything to him?
Obviously you don't see him in the video.

Then the third occasion. He's sitting there and he moves forward again. Another conversation, okay, you're not going to turn the cell phone off, I'm going to see the management. He leaves and goes to see the

management.

He shortly comes back there afterwards.

Now he sees -- it's corroborated through the testimony in the taped interview of Ms. Oulson that her husband had put the cell phone away -- so instead of just going back to his seat and not saying anything, he has to engage him again and say, "Oh, so now that you've -- that I've gone to management, now you put your cell phone away."

And then what transpires, Judge? I would submit to you what transpires is, is that Chad Oulson stands up. He is extremely angry at this point after Mr. Reeves has confronted him at least on three, if not four, occasions about the cell phone and he's had enough.

There's various versions of what he said.

Some people say, "I was texting my fucking daughter if it's -- it was any of your business." "I had just gotten a phone message. I was checking on my daughter," so on and so forth.

What you see in that video is you see
Chad Oulson reaching over, grabbing the popcorn
out of Mr. Reeves' hands and throwing it at his

chest.

And I would submit to you, Judge, as far as testimony about the gun being drawn and so on and so forth, if you look at that video,
Judge, there is absolutely no way -- I don't care how many times he's drawn that gun from his pocket in the fluid motion that Mr. Turner talked about, I would submit to you Mr. Reeves was ready and waiting for Oulson; he was ready and waiting for a confrontation.

It's almost instantaneously. The popcorn is thrown. The popcorn is still in the air, hasn't even hit him when the gun is pulled out in front of him because he said, according to his testimony, it was in an upward trajectory. If you look at that video, his arm is straight out, Judge.

The other important and interesting point that was brought out through Detective Aaron Smith is that you heard that the difference in height between Row B and Row A is ten inches, Judge.

THE COURT: I did hear that.

MR. GARCIA: So six-foot-four Chad Oulson would not be six-foot-four standing in front of

Curtis Reeves. You would have to take ten 1 2 inches off of his height which would put him 3 basically directly in front of the defendant. 4 THE COURT: Was that true if he was 5 sitting, though, which he clearly was sitting. 6 So now -- now he's just a five-foot-four guy 7 standing in front of him, right? MR. GARCIA: 8 Right. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. GARCIA: Correct. 11 Tell me what -- tell me --THE COURT: 12 highlight, spotlight what you've told me so 13 far, though, that gets you past the many cases 14 the Defense has cited as it relates to 15 second-degree murder. 16 MR. GARCIA: Absolutely, Judge. 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 MR. GARCIA: I can point you directly to 19 it --20 THE COURT: Point --21 MR. GARCIA: -- and that's the 22 statement --23 Point me to it. THE COURT: MR. GARCIA: That is the statement from 24 25 Derek Friedhoff. If you recall, the statement

from him was "I'll teach you to throw popcorn at me," and he fires the gun at Chad Oulson.

That is a person with a depraved mind; that is a person with ill will; that is a person with hatred.

I can cite to you, the Court -- Judge, our case law is clear in this case, Judge, the cases that I've cited.

THE COURT: Tell me those cases again.

You're saying the ones that are in your -- in your memo.

MR. GARCIA: Yes, Judge, the ones that are in the memo starting off with *Keltner*.

THE COURT: Which page of the memo was it again?

MR. GARCIA: I'm -- I'm sorry, Judge?

THE COURT: Which page of the memo was it again? Keltner; there it is. It's on Page 2 at the top.

MR. GARCIA: Yes, Judge. But citing the Court to Keltner, Judge, under Headnote 1 -- and it's, for the record, Keltner is Keltner vs. State of Florida. And it was decided February 17th, 1995. It was a Second DCA case.

"Keltner contends that the evidence was

insufficient to warrant the jury's finding that he evinced a depraved mind in shooting the victim. From our view of the evidence in this case, we find that the act of pointing a loaded firearm in someone's direction and then firing it is imminently dangerous to another and evinces a depraved mind."

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GARCIA: And then it cites to the other cases of *Brown* and *Edwards*. And I think in one of those cases the defendant fired at an individual and struck him in the leg. And the court likewise says that constitutes ill will, hatred and a depraved mind, Judge, when you point a gun at someone and you fire it.

THE COURT: Does that mean that every gun death has to be second-degree murder? It can't be manslaughter?

MR. GARCIA: No, I'm not saying that, Judge. It depends upon the facts and the circumstances in this case.

In this case, Judge, our contention is they have not established self-defense in this case. And through his actions, pointing the gun, firing the gun and his statements,

**T** J

constitutes second-degree murder.

2

THE COURT: Keltner seems to be a little light on facts. It's a one-page decision.

4

3

case. I would cite the Court to Edwards vs.

5

MR. GARCIA: Well, Judge, here's another

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

State of Florida which can be found at 302 So.2d 479, a Third DCA case which was decided November 3rd of 1974. Under Headnotes 3, 4 and 5, "As defined in 782.04 Florida Statute, murder in the first degree requires premeditated design," as this Court is well aware of, "and murder in the second degree requires an imminently dangerous

act evincing a depraved mind regardless of human life. It is well established the state of mind may be inferred from one's actions, and a murderous intent may be established by the facts and circumstances of the case, such as a

weapon being directed at some vital spot on the

assaultee's body."

I would submit to you that Mr. Reeves, in pointing that firearm directly at Chad Oulson's chest, what other intent did he have, Judge, but to kill him? It's not like he shot him in the leg or shot him in the arm, he shot him in

the dead center of his chest.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: What am I to make, though, of all the Defense's cases that talk about an overreaction to a sudden provocation in fight? Is manslaughter not -- not -- for instance, he said, "I thought I was going to get my ass whipped."

Say that -- say that self-defense isn't appropriate and say that everything that you prove is correct. How is simply shooting him as an overreaction not the manslaughter that half a dozen of the Defense's cases point me to? And some of them are Second DCA cases fairly recent.

MR. GARCIA: Judge, because I think in this case you have the ill will that's necessary for the second-degree murder by his very own statements, "I'll teach you to throw popcorn at me," and fires.

That is a time to reflect. As the Court is well aware of, Judge, the time to reflect is only the time necessary for reflection. You see a dollar bill on the ground, you stop. I pick it up? That's establishing premeditated murder, Judge.

12<sup>-</sup>

In this case I would submit to you his reflection, it wasn't like the popcorn was thrown and he was hit and automatically he fires. But you heard the testimony from the witnesses, especially Mr. Friedhoff. He testified, "I'll show you to throw popcorn in my face," and then fires center mass. What other intent does he have but to kill Chad Oulson?

Furthermore, Judge, does a reasonable citizen carry a loaded firearm in a theater in violation of a posted sign that clearly says no firearms? If he had left the firearm in his car, we wouldn't be here today. This would have never have happened.

Clearly his actions on January 13th of 2014, Judge -- and I would submit to you that the State of Florida has not only proven this by proof evident presumption great, we have not only proven it beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt, but of all doubt, Judge.

There was no reason for him to shoot

Chad Oulson with a firearm and kill him, even assuming that he had been struck, assuming

arguendo that he had been struck with the cell phone.

You know, Mr. Escobar kept talking about

self-defense, the Stand Your Ground, a forcible felony. Well, Judge, in our memorandum, in our response to their motion to set a reasonable

bond, I think the case law is very clear,

Judge.

2.3

In Nelson vs. State, "The issue for resolution is whether the trial court erred in classifying Nelson as a prison re-releasee reoffender on the two convictions of battery of a person sixty-five years of age or older pursuant to Section 784.08(2)(c) of the Florida Statutes."

In State vs. Hearns, which is found at 961 So.2d 211, a Florida Supreme Court case of 2007, the Florida Supreme Court looked at the elements of the offense charged, battery on a law enforcement officer, and determined that since a battery could include a mere touching, it would not necessarily be a forcible felony under the PRR statute.

"We conclude that *Hearns* applies to the instant charges and that *Nelson* is not subject

to sentencing as a PRR for the two battery offenses. Battery of a person sixty-five years old or older is neither an enumerated felony nor does it contain the necessary element of 'the use of threat of physical force or violence against an individual.' See 784.08(c) of the Florida statutes, 2004."

In Hearns, 961 So.2d 216, the court reiterated that "The only relevant consideration when determining whether an offense constitutes a forcible felony is the statutory elements of the offense. If 'the use or threat of physical force or violence against an individual' is not a necessary element of the crime, 'then the crime is not a forcible felony within the meaning of the final clause of Section 776.08.'"

THE COURT: All right. Let's go one step further looking logically at the construction of the statute when -- for instance, when the State brings a case and they calculate the criminal punishment code for purposes of scoring out a sentence.

If you bring me a charge out of Georgia where it's a misdemeanor, but in Florida it

2.4

would be a felony, should I look to the elements of the offense committed or should I look to the elements that are delineated within the Georgia statute to determine whether it's a felony or misdemeanor for purposes of scoring?

MR. GARCIA: Well, you should look for the elements for purposes of scoring, Judge.

THE COURT: And then factually, in this case, should I look to simply the idea that battery on a person sixty-five years of age or older could be a touching against the will or it could be, as charged in (B), causing injury which is what they're alleging. They're alleging that it was by causing injury from the striking with the phone, not simply an unwanted touching.

MR. GARCIA: I understand that, Judge. However, it's not a forcible felony to where you can pull out a gun and shoot and kill someone.

THE COURT: Oh, I'm not saying that. I'm just asking -- I'm asking can it be classified if they're asserting this defense.

And you're -- you're saying Stand Your Ground as though they've actually asserted

I don't think --1 that. 2 MR. GARCIA: I -- I -- I'm not --3 THE COURT: -- they've actually asserted 4 that. 5 MR. GARCIA: No, I'm not saying that, 6 Judge. I'm just saying in looking --7 THE COURT: I actually want to get that clarified because -- and I -- I hate to use 8 9 those words because it makes everybody run in 10 different directions and say things that aren't 11 necessary to be said, and it's certainly a 12 phrase that when you touch upon it, everybody 13 goes wild, but I can't avoid it anymore. 14 Are you asserting Stand Your Ground here? 15 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, at this point 16 it's too early in -- in this case to assert any 17 of that. What I did, if -- if the Court 18 reflects on -- on -- it's on Page 5 of my 19 memorandum, you will see that I cite not only 20 776.012, which is what's contained in -- in --21 in Stand Your Ground, but more importantly, 22 782.02 doesn't even talk about a forcible 23 felony. 24 THE COURT: I --25 It says "any felony." MR. ESCOBAR:

THE COURT: I know and that's why -- and that's why I'm going through it. But I want to -- I want to make sure that everybody has it correct what's going on here.

Are you, at this point, asserting Stand
Your Ground --

MR. ESCOBAR: No.

THE COURT: -- or any variation of Stand
Your Ground within the statute?

MR. ESCOBAR: No. Your Honor, the only thing that we've done is that we've made the laws available to the Court for the Court's consideration on both sides. And that's why we went through great lengths to show that, you know, the six-foot wall was right behind Mr. Reeves, and it wouldn't be reasonable for him to be able to flee Mr. Oulson because, again, he was over the -- the backrest of Mr. Oulson. So that was the whole purpose of doing this.

So if he has a duty to retreat, guess what? He wasn't going anywhere.

THE COURT: I -- I heard your frequent and -- frequent and vivid references to the six-foot wall many times and I understood that.

But I also just want to make sure that we're clear.

You're not asserting Stand Your Ground at this time.

MR. ESCOBAR: I -- I --

THE COURT: I'm not foreclosing you from doing it, but I want to make sure that it's clear, that's not something you're asking me to consider right now in any way.

MR. ESCOBAR: Not to consider at this time, Your Honor, but I would consider along with the statute, you've got to consider all the physical evidence, including the autopsy that clearly shows --

THE COURT: I'm going to look at all the evidence --

MR. ESCOBAR: Okay.

THE COURT: -- before I rule. Don't worry. I'm going to take it all back to my chambers and I'm going to take ten to fifteen minutes to go through it all again. I looked at it this morning as soon as I walked in here. I'm going to look at it all again, especially the new stuff.

So I just wanted to make sure that we're

clear, you're not asserting Stand Your Ground.

I'm not keeping you from doing it later, but
that's not what we're doing today. Okay?

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, in a bond motion like this, you don't assert Stand Your Ground.

THE COURT: Right, it's an immunity.

MR. ESCOBAR: It's a consideration of the law that you have to consider, but we're not asserting it now because we're not at a Stand Your Ground posture.

THE COURT: Right. I just -- just making sure. Okay. Great.

You may continue, Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: Judge, did I answer the Court's question? Or I think we may have cleared up the issue as to the Stand Your Ground defense.

THE COURT: That was what I wanted -- I wanted to get that out of the way before we went any farther. I'm still -- I'm still listening for anything additionally you want to tell me on why this is second-degree murder and not manslaughter if you prove it beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. And I don't believe that there's self-defense.

Why is it that it's second-degree murder and not manslaughter?

MR. GARCIA: I -- Judge, and I think -- not to be repetitive. I think I set it out in the State's response as to the cases that we cited as to the gun.

And mindful, Judge, the -- the uncontroverted testimony from this witness stand was Mr. Reeves shot an unarmed man.

There wasn't self-defense. They all indicated they never saw a hit, they never saw a strike, they never saw a cell phone. They saw popcorn being thrown.

Does popcorn justify him pulling out his firearm and shooting Chad Oulson in the chest?

No. I would submit it does not, Judge.

THE COURT: How about this: On that video there is a light. I don't know what that light is. I know what Mr. Escobar wants me to believe that light is, but I don't know what that light is, not yet. I could infer what that light might be.

What do you think that light is based on everything that we've got going on here in the way of the testimony and evidence that we've

heard from the bond hearing? What should I believe that light is?

MR. GARCIA: I don't know, Judge, to be quite candid with the Court. And I don't think the case -- the Court, I'm sorry, can assume what it is or have conjecture as to what it is.

Mr. Escobar doesn't know that that's a cell phone. He can't stand up here before this Court and say it's a cell phone.

THE COURT: Well, he did.

MR. GARCIA: I know he did, Judge, but it's pure speculation and conjecture on his part. It's an assumption.

We don't know if that's a glitch in the camera, the light that you see. We don't know if that's Mr. Reeves' cell phone that has fallen or Mrs. Reeves' cell phone that has fallen.

Why is he asking about his cell phone?

Ask yourself -- you know, he's thinking that he lost his cell phone. We don't know what that is, Judge.

THE COURT: Say I believe it is the cell phone. How does that affect the ruling that I should give at this time?

MR. GARCIA: How does it affect the ruling? Tremendously, Judge, because if you, in fact, believe that that cell phone was thrown at Mr. Reeves, 13 seconds goes by before he shoots him. That's ill will. That's hatred. That's having a deprayed mind. That is second-degree murder.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else you want to tell me as to why I should find proof evident presumption great because while I have not yet made my decision, when I do make my decision, if I decide you've not found -- met your standard, I want to hear your input as to what you believe I should do if I decide to give a bond, whether it should be a monetary bond. And if it's a monetary bond, I'm going to ask you what you think the amount should be. And then I'm also going to ask what other restrictions you think I should put on Mr. Reeves in the event that I give him bond.

MR. GARCIA: Judge, in -- in all candor with the Court, the State's position is that we would obviously ask the Court for no bond.

However, if you find that we have not met our burden by proof evident presumption great

and you are inclined to set a bond, I would ask
this Court to set a bond in the amount of
two-million dollars.

I would ask the Court for him to surrender his passport. I would ask the Court to impose the fact that he cannot go to the movies or attend any of the movie theaters.

THE COURT: That's a given. I'm going to do that.

MR. GARCIA: Well -- Judge, because quite frankly, Judge, you know, the citizens of Pasco County have a right to be protected from people as Mr. Reeves in this case, Judge. He was a ticking time bomb that day, Judge --

THE COURT: All right. I --

MR. GARCIA: -- and he exploded.

THE COURT: I understand that, but I'm looking also at the bond schedule. If I decide you've not met your burden, the bond schedule suggests that for a life felony, including homicides, low bond is \$100,000, high bond is none.

In the state of Florida here in Pasco

County, because we have the numbers and they're

always given to the judges, I've had a chance

3.

to take a look at the numbers.

Do you know how many second-degree murders we have pending in Pasco County right now?

Thirteen of them. Five of them have bonds in the amount between 100,000 and 500,000; eight of them have no bond.

What bond should I set for him? Nobody's got -- well, actually, I think one had 750,000.

MR. GARCIA: It's almost --

THE COURT: No -- nobody's got one more than a million. And the ones that have high -- the higher bonds have other situations going on. This gentleman has no prior record for his -- the entirety of his life.

And why would I set a two-million dollar bond for somebody with no prior record?

MR. GARCIA: Judge, that's because the

State of Florida feels that strongly about this

case and the safety of the citizens of Pasco

County. Judge, we firmly believe that

second-degree murder has, in fact, been proven

here.

I understand the Court may or may not have a finding and disagree with us, Judge. If you feel that \$2,000,000.00 is excessive and -- and

in conjunction with bond schedules you're saying it could be from \$100,000 to no bond at all, then I would submit to the Court, Judge, that we would ask for a \$200,000 bond should the Court decide to set one, that he — that all the firearms in the possession of his son be relinquished to the Pasco County Sheriff's Office.

THE COURT: All the firearms that he owns.

MR. GARCIA: That he owns that are in the

possession --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GARCIA: -- of his son. We would ask that his passport be surrendered to this Court.

In addition, again, I think to reiterate, we've already considered that as part of the bond conditions, should you set it, is that he is not to attend any theaters. And I would say, Judge, either in Pasco County or any other county in the state of Florida.

THE COURT: Just -- just so that nobody has to worry about this, in the event that I grant bond --

MR. GARCIA: He's not going --

THE COURT: -- I've not made -- I've not

made a decision yet, but in the event that I

grant bond, I'm going to order that he remain

at his house. He can go to church and he can

go to the grocery store, but that's it. Unless

he has some other special function that he

wants to attend, then he's going to ask the

8 that.

Mr. Escobar's already volunteered that he's basically willing to be on house arrest if I -- if I let him out. I'd let him go to church and I'd let him go to the grocery store, if -- if he thought that was necessary. Of course, I'd probably counsel him that's a bad idea, also, but --

Court's permission in advance if I decide to do

MR. GARCIA: Judge, I would also ask this Court to consider putting an ankle monitor on him.

THE COURT: And I'm going to do that, also, if I -- if I grant bond. Again, I'm still -- I'm still trying to figure out what to do here. And I'm going to review all my notes and I'm going to review the evidence and then I'm going to give you the answer.

But anything else that -- that you haven't

2

3 4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

covered with me yet that you want to cover?

MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir. Judge, as far as presentation, Judge, the only thing that I've asked, as I indicated to the Court and I would reiterate one more time, the State of Florida feels strongly that this has been proven by proof evident presumption great that we have not only met our burden by proving it beyond a reasonable doubt, but all doubt that the defendant committed second-degree murder on January 13th of 2014.

And we would respectfully request that his -- his bond remain at zero.

> THE COURT: All right.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Garcia.

Mr. Escobar, I'm not in the habit of doing it, but I -- if there's anything that he's addressed specifically that -- specifically that you need to -- you feel that I should have readdressed to me in a very limited fashion, I will let you do it because I need to make sure I've made the right decision here, and I want to hear from everybody as much as I can.

> Your Honor, I -- one of the MR. ESCOBAR:

things that he mentioned is, why would Mr. Oulson throw his phone?

I think that's very reasonable that Mr. Oulson would have thrown his phone because the phone is what actually caused Mr. Oulson's anxiety over this whole situation.

He was texting; he was using his phone. And that's what precipitated this whole issue. I could see very easily him getting so frustrated over the situation and getting so

We know he got out of control. No one can dispute that Mr. Oulson was totally out of control. Whether he threw a phone like this

MR. LOUGHERY: Judge --

-- or whether he --

MR. LOUGHERY: -- Judge, objection. is not another argument. I think you wanted something specific.

THE COURT: Yeah, I -- I -- I was -- I was hoping -- I mean is there -- is there anything specific? I get -- I get what your inference that you're drawing and I get what his inference that he's drawing. I understand that

. 9

and you two will never agree on that. And when you say nobody can disagree, I bet you I could find a couple people in the audience that would disagree with just about anything that gets said today.

I'm just talking. Is there anything within the law that you disagree with that Mr. Garcia asserted that you haven't already told me about, because that's what I'm looking for. I have to apply the law to the facts and come up with this decision. I don't -- I don't need any more of the emotional argument. I just need the law to the facts.

Is there anything left that I haven't considered, asked you about, asked him about?

I've asked you both some tough questions because I wanted to hear your answers. And you both have answered me and you've given me a lot to think about.

Is there anything else that you thought of while Mr. Garcia was talking that you thought Judge, you should have asked him this, or Judge, you should have asked him that.

MR. ESCOBAR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR. ESCOBAR: I think I've laid the law in 2 my memo. 3 THE COURT: All right, great. Then we're 4 going to take 15 minutes so I can go and look 5 at everything and I'll come back and tell you 6 what's going to happen. 7 (Recess.) 8 THE COURT: All right. State, before we 9 got started today, I asked you if March 12th at 11:00 a.m. would work as a pretrial for you. 10 11 Does March 12th at 11:00 a.m. work? 12 MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir, Judge, that's fine. 13 THE COURT: Defense, I ask the same of 14 you. March 12th at 11:00 a.m.; does that work? 15 MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, it does. 16 long as Mr. Michaels -- I've got a hearing in 17 Seminole County -- if he could cover for me --18 THE COURT: Of course. 19 MR. ESCOBAR: -- at this hearing, we'll be 20 fine. 21 THE COURT: Of course. Okay. 22 Second, civility. I've been doing this 23 long enough to know that no matter what I say 24 in the next five minutes, there's going to be a 25 lot of people that are going to be unhappy.

One side or the other, both sides feel very passionate. And it's when you're initially unhappy you're tempted to say or do something that you wouldn't normally do. There's probably not a better illustration of that than what's going on, what brings us here today.

So to that end, think right now how you would feel if the decision went against you. Think right now how you would feel if the decision went for you.

If the decision went for you, while you may be happy, you would know that if the decision went against the side that you want or against that side, you would not want to see the others celebrate in your face or do anything to attempt to provoke you and vice versa. You would want to be treated with respect and you would want to treat others with respect.

So to that end, take a few moments before you react. And when you react, if you choose to, please react outside of the courtroom.

I've watched too many of these things escalate a bad situation into a worse situation. We don't need that here.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

As I sit here and you wait for me to rule, I can tell you that I have been in this position before. I've felt this position before. It feels like this is a verdict, but this is not a verdict. I am not finding anybody guilty or innocent of anything today, and it's not to be interpreted as such.

No matter what my ruling is on this motion, Mr. Reeves, nothing changes about the fact that you are presumed innocent of this Nothing changes. I'm not endorsing charge. your self-defense position nor am I saying that your self-defense position is wrong by my ruling in this matter.

It is a pretrial ruling for the purposes of determining detention. It's not a finding of quilt or a finding of innocence and it needs to be clearly understood in that way.

To that end, the decision of the Court, after listening to all of the evidence, after reviewing the very well-prepared brief -briefs that were provided, after reviewing the evidence and specifically listening to the tapes, after listening to the argument of counsel for both sides, the Court is going to

find that the State did, in fact, meet their standard.

And I am going to detain Mr. Reeves pretrial. He will remain in custody, remanded to the Sheriff of Pasco County.

Mr. Reeves, you have appellate rights on this. You can appeal this and the appellate courts will have a chance to review everything that I've done. If they decide that I've made a mistake, it comes back and I would give you a bond.

And because -- because I know it is a possibility that I will be appealed, a probability that I will be appealed, and because I know that they may send it back, I want to put on the record what I would have done if I did not find that the standard was met, so that if they send it back and say Judge Siracusa, you are wrong, they know what I would have done.

What I would have done was, I would have given you a \$150,000 bond which would have been consistent with my observation of people with no prior record charged with second-degree murder. I would have -- and that's from

looking at the entirety of the sixth judicial circuit.

I would have ordered that you would have remained on a monitor at your house. I would have ordered that you would have had contact only at your church and at the grocery store, if you wanted to go grocery shopping.

I would have ordered that not only you be dispossessed of all your firearms that you currently own and placed in the custody of the sheriff's office, but I would have ordered that no firearms would be brought into your presence by anybody that was a friend or associate of yours. In other words, your son, who is a law enforcement officer and who is allowed to carry a firearm, if he was coming to visit you at your home, he would not be able to bring that firearm into the home.

So that would have been my ruling had I not found the standard met. Having found the standard met, though, I have to detain you pretrial.

And we'll be in recess, then, on this case until March 12th of this year.

MR. ESCOBAR: Your Honor, I have one

matter that I'd like to --1 2 THE COURT: Sure. 3 MR. ESCOBAR: -- clear up with the Court. 4 Since the videos have been presented, I think 5 it's only fair to, at this point in time, for 6 me to agree that the videos that were 7 introduced into evidence be released to the 8 media. I think it's only fair for them to be 9 able to view it on their own software, on their 10 own computers so that they can see for 11 themselves --12 THE COURT: Let me ask the State if they 13 have any objection. State, do you have any 14 objection? 15 MR. LOUGHERY: 16 MR. GARCIA: No, sir. 17 THE COURT: Okay. If you're agreeing, 18 then I'll allow it to be released in its raw 19 form through the discovery request. 20 And, State, you've -- you've gotten the 21 agreement of the victim; is that correct? 22 MRS. SUMNER: Yes, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Grimaldi, you're okay with 24 that? 25 That's fine, Your Honor. MR. GRIMALDI:

```
THE COURT: Okay, great. Then we'll be in
 1
 2
          recess until March 12th.
 3
     (Proceedings concluded.)
 4
 5
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

STATE OF FLORIDA )
COUNTY OF PASCO )

I, Melinda McClain, Registered Professional Reporter, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true record.

DATED this 20th day of March, 2014.

Melinda McClain, RPR