Aldape: Trial Transcript (%2) (voir dire) (v.17)





HH254

61065883-000001

VINSON & ELKINS LLP
VINSON & ELKINS LLP
SUITE 2240

FLOOR 22

HOUSTON, TX 77002-6760
RECORDS MGMT RECORDS MGMT SZ0865766023

WILLIE AASMYR-RECORDS DEPT B06155762

0865766023

HERMANIA STREET

220865766023

HERMANIA STREET

0865766023

CAUSE NO. 359,805 THE STATE OF TEXAS IN THE DISTRICT COURT VS. OF HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS RICARDO ALDAPE GUERRA 248TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

> VOLUME XVII STATEMENT OF FACTS VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION CONTINUED SEPTEMBER 29, 1982

> > ILED RAY HARDY District Clerk

JUL 1 1 1983

I N D E X

2			
3	VOLUME XVII	Page	
4	September 29, 1982		
5	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION, CONTINUED		
6	NEW JURY PANEL EXAMINED BY THE COURT	2881	
7	Stephen C. Busby		
8	Examination by the State (Moen)	2896	
9	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	2929	
10	Vincent H. Horbelt		
11	Examination by the State (Bax)	2945	
12	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	2979	
13	Examination by the State (Bax)	2987	
14	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	2994	
15	Jack D. Lee		
16	Examination by the State (Bax)	2995	
17	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3002	
18	Helen Jayroe Southern		
19	Examination by the State (Moen)	3014	
20	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3057	
21	H. R. Bridges		
22	Examination by the State (Bax)	3062	
23	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	3075	
24	Cynthia Maire Matthews		
25	Examination by the State (Moen)	3076	
i	_ ,		

... 2 92:0

1	2					Page
2	Examination []	рÀ	the	Defense	(Elizondo)	3104
3	Examination []	рÃ	the	State ((Moen)	3125
4	Examination	рĀ	the	Defense	(Elizondo)	3128
5	3					
6	.2					
7	蓪					
8	ide .					
9						
10	4.					
11	ż					
12	\$					
13						
14	£					
15	;					
16						
17	÷					
18	:					
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24	•					

INDEX

2		Page
3	VOLUME XVII	- ~ 46
4	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION, CONTINUED	·
5	H. R. Bridges	
6	Examination by the State (Bax)	3062
7	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	3075
8	Stephen C. Busby	
9	Examination by the State (Moen)	2896
10	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	2929
11	Vincent H. Horbelt	
12	Examination by the State (Bax)	2945
13	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	2979
14	Examination by the State (Bax)	2987
15	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	2994
16	Jack D. Lee	
17	Examination by the State (Bax)	2995
18	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3002
19	Cynthia Maire Matthews	
20	Examination by the State (Moen)	3076
21	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3104
22	Examination by the State (Moen)	3125
23	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3128
24	Helen Jayroe Southern	
25	Examination by the State (Moen)	3014

1	₹					Page	!
2	₃ Examinatio	n by	the	Defense	(Elizondo)	3057	
3							
4	ï						
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

.... O3

(At this time a jury panel of six was brought into the courtroom, and in their presence and hearing, the following proceedings were had.)

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is Henry Oncken. I am the judge of the 248th District Court where you now find yourselves seated, and we are here this morning to select a jury -- to continue the process of selecting a jury to try a capital murder case.

The Defendant in this case is the man seated at the end of the table, Ricardo Aldape Guerra, and seated next to him and speaking with him is Linda Hernandez. She is an interpreter, and is telling him everything in English -- or in Spanish, rather, that is said in the courtroom.

Mr. Guerra does not speak English, and it is necessary for him to have an interpreter with him.

Mr. Guerra is represented by two attorneys, Mr. Candelario Elizondo and Mr. Joe Hernandez, and Mr. Hernandez and Ms. Hernandez are not kin to each other. They just happen

to have the same name.

The Prosecution is represented by Mr. Bob Moen and Mr. Dick Bax.

The lady seated in front of you there is Cindy Layne. She is the court reporter, and she is taking down everything said in this courtroom in this case, and that is the normal procedure in every criminal case, is to have a court reporter take it down.

Now we have brought over six persons to interview in this case, and I'm sure most of you are aware, but for those of you who are not aware, a jury in a case where the State is seeking the death penalty, or a capital case, the jury is talked to individually.

Each prospective juror is brought into the courtroom and talked to individually, and when it comes your turn to do that, I ask that you simply relax and visit with us a minute.

It will take about an hour to get through the interview, but during this period of time, please bear in mind no one in this courtroom is trying to embarrass you or do anything sinister to you at all. It is just the law in a capital case you interview the jurors

In a normal criminal case, we bring over a panel of either thirty-six or forty jurors and they sit in the seats and we talk to them at one time, and it takes maybe an hour, two hours, sometimes three to complete the selection of a jury.

We have actually been in this case now, in jury selection, we have completed fifteen days of it, but it has covered about a five-week period of time to do that.

We have nine jurors, and it is just a painstaking, slow, tedious process.

We ask your indulgence and patience with us.

We are going to make this day as profitable for us, as well as you, too. We zealously guard our time as well as your time, and it takes time to do these things.

I am going to discuss with you a few general things true in all cases, and the lawyers when they visit with you will go into more detail about how this case is tried and how a capital case is tried.

First of all, after the close of the evidence in the case when both sides say they rest, I will prepare what is called legally a charge.

What that means, all the law applicable to this particular fact situation will be given to the jury in writing, and you will have that to take back into the jury room and read and study, and you will apply the facts to that law, and part of that charge is true in every criminal case, and I want to get those preliminary and general things out of the way so the lawyers don't have to talk about those.

First of all, any Defendant charged with a criminal offense is presumed under the law to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal evidence beyond a reasonable doubt.

As Mr. Guerra sits here today, he is charged with the offense of killing a police officer, but he is presumed under the law to be innocent until such time as the State brings sufficient evidence to you to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt that he did it.

If they fail to meet that burden of proof, it will be the jurors' duty to find the

Defendant not guilty.

Incidentally -- not incidentally -
I forgot to mention or tell you a brief overlay
of the facts here to see if you know anything
about this particular case. There is nothing
wrong for you to have read something or heard
something about this case; however, if you have
made up your minds as to the guilt or innocence
of this individual at this time based on what
you have read or heard, that would be wrong -wouldn't be wrong, but at least you could not
serve on the jury.

Officer James D. Harris, on July 13th, 1982, was shot and killed as he stopped at a car out on Edgewood and Walker streets. That is out in the vicinity of Dumble and Harrisburg in the east end of town, fairly close to downtown.

But he was shot and killed. Shot three times in the face, and about a minute or so later, a citizen who had two children in the car with him was also shot and killed at that same place.

About an hour after that, the Houston

Police Department was in the process of attempting
to make some arrests in the case based upon

some information they received, and another police officer was shot five times. He returned the fire of the individual who shot him and managed to kill that individual.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now with that brief rendition of the facts, is there anyone who knows anything about this case?

Okay. As I say, there is nothing wrong to know anything about it, but if you have already decided the facts, it would be improper.

Okay. Now, I mentioned when I told you that the presumption of innocence applies to this Defendant, that the State had the burden of proving his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. There will be many terms defined for you in the law that I give you, but the term beyond a reasonable doubt will not be defined for you because I can only define for a jury what the legislature defines for me and they have not defined the term reasonable doubt, so you will find nothing in the charge that tells you what that means. To me, it simply means you use your common sense. You listen to the evidence and if you are convinced, after you have heard all the evidence, if you are convinced he did do it,

If you are convinced he did not, you will find him not guilty.

To me, it is that simple. To others, it may mean something else.

The first thing that the jury will hear in the case is I will tell the State to present the indictment to the jury.

The indictment is a legal term. It is a piece of paper upon which certain words are typed, and those words bring to this courtroom, to this trial, a formal charge against this individual. It is the same thing as if you filed a lawsuit in the courthouse across the street over there, if you were not involved in an automobile accident. You would file a lawsuit stating certain things and you would have to go over there and prove those things.

That piece of paper is not evidence nor is the indictment evidence in this case.

I will tell the jury in the charge the fact that any Defendant has been arrested for, charged with, and perhaps confined for an offense is absolutely no evidence of his guilt. That evidence must come from this witness chair

that is right between you and I, and that is the only place you will get any information concerning the guilt or innocence of this individual.

The Defendant in this and every other criminal case has the right to remain silent.

He does not have to testify. His lawyers do not even have to ask questions of the witnesses who testify. That is a right given to any Defendant by the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of this state, and the laws of this state, and you are not to consider, as I will tell you in that charge, you are not to consider failure to testify as evidence of guilt. He does not have to prove his innocence. The burden is on the State to prove his guilt.

Because the State has the burden of proof, they always go first. They will talk to the jurors first. After the jury is selected, they will put on evidence first. They have the right to open and close the summation or arguments, as we call them. They get to go first because they have that burden of proof.

In any criminal case, the felony grade -- and this certainly is a felony-grade

case -- there are thirteen judges in the courtroom.

I will be the judge of the law in the case. I will give you the law, rule on objections, rule upon the admissibility of certain evidence, but I have no function in the decision concerning the facts of the case. That will be up to twelve citizens to decide after they hear the evidence.

You and I will serve on an equal basis, but we have separate functions, also. You are fact-finders under the law. Okay?

Now, in a murder case, for example, the jury --

First of all, let me back up just a minute.

A criminal case is divided into two parts. It is called a bifurcated trial. If you hear the lawyers use that term, it simply means divided into two parts.

The first stage of a criminal case is to hear facts about an event which occurred, and, obviously, someone is charged with that offense, and it is up to the jury to decide whether or not the individual charged caused that event

In a murder case, for example, the full range of punishment is by commitment in the Texas Department of Corrections for any period of years not less than five nor more than ninety-nine, or the Defendant can be sentenced to life, and in addition to any of that range of punishment, the Defendant can be assessed a fine of up to ten thousand dollars.

In this case and in all capital cases where the State is seeking the death penalty, the jury goes back and they answer two questions.

The jury in a murder case can go back there, after hearing evidence, and they can go back there and decide on any period of years within that range I have told you about.

However, in a capital case, they simply go back and answer those two questions over there on the board, and I will ask you to take just a minute to glance at those, please.

(The prospective jurors complied.)

If the jury answers one of those questions yes and one of those questions no, it becomes my duty under the law to assess his punishment at life in the penitentiary. There are only two possible punishments in a capital case if the jury finds the Defendant guilty of capital murder, and that is death or life in the penitentiary.

The jury does not go back and say, "We think he ought to get death," or "We think he ought to get life." They simply answer those questions, and the law takes care of the rest of it.

In any criminal case, a jury is not allowed to ask questions. You may sit over there and hear witnesses testify and you may

All right. I need for you to begin now, if you haven't already begun the process, to think about your feelings concerning death as a punishment for a criminal case.

When these lawyers are questioning you, please bear in mind they are not going to try to change your views about anything. They simply are entitled to know and need to know how you feel about certain issues and certainly whether or not you could participate on a jury where the State is seeking the death penalty.

If you do not approve of the death penalty, don't agree with it, that is certainly your prerogative, and I am not going to argue with your views about it.

Any other questions they ask you that you consider to be personal, please don't take them to be personal. They are here to select a jury that will be fair and impartial to both sides, and impartially decide the facts

So please understand we are not trying to be personal with you and pry into your personal affairs.

If you are chosen on this jury today, you will not be required to stay down here, obviously, until we have completed the selection of the jury. You will be allowed to go home and go about your normal duties until such time as we begin evidence.

Our target date is Monday next, the

4th. We may or may not make it. We may miss it

by a day or two. That is when we plan to start

the evidence, and certainly if you are chosen,

you will be allowed to go about your normal

activities during that period, the interim

period.

Likewise, you might be, if you are selected on the jury, at some period in the trial, which I anticipate once the evidence begins will last four, five, or six days, somewhere in that range, at some period in that time span, you may be required to stay down here one or two nights with us. We will put you in a hotel,

not lock you in a jury room. You will have a place to sleep, meals, and that sort of thing. We need you to be thinking about that.

Our normal experience has been that we can get through three jurors in the morning and three in the afternoon, so I am going to ask Ms. Matthews, Mr. Bridges, and Mr. Horbelt --

MR. ELIZONDO: May I approach the bench?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. ELIZONDO: May it please the Court, I would ask the Court to shuffle the jury panel.

THE COURT: We are going to shuffle your names around. Stand by.

All right. Do you want to come and draw them? I will let you draw them.

(Mr. Elizondo did so.)

THE COURT: Mr. Busby will be number one. Mr. Horbelt will be number two, and Mr. Lee will be number three.

Ms. Southern, Mr. Bridges, and Ms.

Matthews, I don't see any point in having you

wait down here with us, so I will excuse the

three of you now until 1:30. You can go anyplace

1

2

3

you want to go during that period. You can stay down here with us if you want to, but I will tell you that you will be seated and nothing will happen until this afternoon, because it will take the full morning to get through the other three.

Those three may be excused until 1:30.

Please report back here in this courtroom at that time, and the other three, Mr. Busby, Mr. Horbelt, and Mr. Lee, if you would, remain with us.

Mr. Busby, you will be the first one. If you would, come right around and have this chair here, and, Mr. Horbelt and Mr. Lee, if you would like, you can go down and get a cup of coffee in the basement or have a seat in the jury room. It is your choice.

Are you ready?

MR. MOEN: Sure.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

25

was called as a prospective juror and responded to

_

I need to ask you questions in the next few

EXAMINATION

questions propounded as follows:

QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:

Mr. Busby, my name is Bob Moen. I am with the District Attorney's Office. The fellow who walked out just a second ago is Mr. Dick Bax, also with the District Attorney's Office, and Mr. Bax and myself will be representing the family of J. D. Harris in the prosecution of this case that the judge has talked about.

I take it from your silence when the judge was giving a description of the facts that you don't remember having heard or read anything about the case at all?

A No.

Okay.

- There is nothing wrong with it. The only reason we ask is to see if the juror has formed an opinion or conclusion based on what they have seen or heard.

minutes or so about your feelings or opinions and explain some things you can expect to come up during the course of the trial from a legal standpoint, and what you need to do by your jury service, if we can.

If you have questions, I ask you to ask them so we can clear them up now. If you have disagreements, go ahead and state those, too.

The judge mentioned, and I second, that there are no right or wrong answers. The reason we talk to jurors like yourself is to find out how you feel.

- A Yes, sir.
 - We live in a type of country where no one has to be on a jury panel where that jury service would violate their feelings, opinions, or convictions. The only thing is that the jury tells us about them. We don't want anyone on the jury panel who is afraid to speak out and tell us how they really feel when a week from now we are standing before the jury asking them to reach a verdict based on the evidence, and they find they cannot serve on a jury concerning the death penalty or capital punishment or anything else.

Q.

We are entitled to know how you feel, and please let us know so we can make a decision as to whether or not you would be qualified to serve on this jury.

- A Okay.
- Reaping that in mind, can you tell me what your feelings are concerning capital punishment, the death penalty? Would they allow you to serve on a jury? Would they allow you to return a verdict knowing it would result in the death penalty or not?
- A I could give capital punishment.
- I take it at least your feelings concerning the death penalty would allow you to serve on a jury and return a verdict.

How long have you felt that way? Is that pretty much the way you have felt all your life, or have you ever felt differently?

A No.

I want to ask you to think about it and put yourself in that category as far as the death penalty, your feelings concerning the death penalty.

Would you say you are strongly, moderately, or reluctantly in favor of the death penalty, if you can put yourself in one of those

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

M I don't think strongly. I would say it is moderately.

- I am going to ask you to categorize yourself politically. Would you be liberally inclined, conservative, moderate, or some other description?
- A Conservative.
- Let me explain to you a little bit about the death penalty procedure in our state.

Not all murders that take place are punished as capital murders. Our legislature, back in 1974, when they enacted and passed our death penalty, current death penalty statute, they said that people that commit certain types of murders are going to stand before a jury and the jury is going to decide whether those individuals who commit those crimes should receive the life sentence or the death penalty, and they said for someone to murder during the course of a burglary, break into someone's home and kill someone; during the course of a robbery, robberymurder, rape-murder, kidnap-murder, and arsonmurder are all examples of murders that, because they take place during the commission of one of those crimes, they become capital murders.

The legislature has said there are five other instances as well in addition to those five, where if someone takes a life, they also will stand before the jury for capital murder, and that is murder for hire, such as the assassination of Judge Wood, which seems to be in the paper now, the federal judge, that is a capital case, even though he is a judge in federal court. That falls within the definition of capital murder.

Murder of a policeman or fireman during the course of their official duties, murder by a convict during the course of escaping or attempting to escape from a penal institution, and murder by a convict of anyone who is employed by us -- I say by us or the State -- in the running or involved in the running of our penal institutions for us and for the rest of society, whoever they might be: guards, librarians, medical personnel, et cetera.

People involved in the running of our penal institution and employed in that capacity, if they are killed by a convict for any reason, obviously, other than self-defense reasons, is guilty of the crime of capital murder.

come and take their seats in the jury box, and we proceed to the second phase, the punishment phase. At that portion of the trial, each side has an opportunity to offer evidence to the jury, in addition to what the jury has already heard, to help them answer the two questions that appear to your left, because depending upon the jurors' answers to those questions, the Defendant will receive either the life sentence or the death penalty.

No one is trying to hide anything from you. If both those answers are yes, you know what the results of your answers will be. The Defendant will receive the death penalty.

A no answer to either one of those, he will receive a life sentence rather than the death penalty.

For all to be yes, all twelve have to unanimously agree. To answer a question no, only ten have to be in unanimous agreement.

Slight difference. Twelve to answer yes, ten to answer no.

Now, I want to talk about these questions here for just a second, and some of

What I would like you to do is read them to yourself, if you haven't already done that, and I want to go over some of the words.

A Okay.

Okay. This first question, let me direct your attention to it. It's a question that asks you to make a determination about the conduct of the man on trial that you have found guilty -- speaking hypothetically -- that you have found guilty.

Was the conduct of that man, was that conduct deliberately done?

It's a two-part question. And was it done with a reasonable expectation that the deceased would die.

Let me give you a hypothetical case.

Imagine a situation where a man goes into a convenience store, confronts the cashier, demands the money, she is scared to death, and turns the money over to him. He gets the money and looks around the store and anticipates, or at least believes she is the only witness to the crime. He takes a pistol and fires two bullets

Unbeknownst to him, she alerts the police with an alarm, and they are waiting outside.

At that stage, the jury would decide is he guilty or not guilty of robbery-murder, which is a capital murder.

If the jury found him guilty, they would then decide: Was the conduct of this man, was it deliberately done and was it done with the reasonable expectation she would die? In other words, the pointing of the pistol, the firing of the bullets into her body, was that conduct deliberate and done with a reasonable expectation that that person would die as a result of those wounds?

Do you see how that question is basically a question of the conduct of the individual who has been found guilty of capital murder, and it is a question that directs itself to a focus?

- A Both have to be answered?
- Q Yes. It is a two-part question: Was it deliberate, and was it done with a reasonable

expectation the deceased would die.

Then the jury passes to the second question, and the second question asks you to make a determination about the type of person you find yourself in the courtroom with. Is the man on trial the type of person where there is a probability he would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society?

The second question asks you to make a decision about the person. The first question is about the conduct of the man or the individual.

You will have to -- let me go back.

You will have to use your own definitions for deliberate and use your own definitions for reasonable expectation that the deceased would die. Why is that?

The legislature that drew these up for capital murder cases didn't give us instructions. The basic law is that you and the other jurors will have to use your common sense definitions for these and the other things.

The same thing applies to Number 2, probability and criminal acts of violence and society. You will have to use your own

I want to point out some things in regards to Question 2.

First of all, you have to believe the man on trial is the type of person where there is a probability he would engage in these types of acts, and that those acts would constitute a continuing threat to society.

The first word is probability, not certainty, and I want to point out to you, and I think you realize why, if you are a juror on this case, if you are selected to serve, there is no way anyone can prove to you anything to a certainty. I think you realize why. The only person in the universe who can tell you anything to a certainty is God Almighty himself, and he will not be a witness in this case, and you are not to put yourself in the position of playing God.

You are to make the best judgment you can based on all the evidence presented to you about what kind of person is on trial to decide is there a probability he would commit these kinds of acts, criminal acts of violence.

Before you could answer the question

Again, is there a probability he is the type of person that would commit those acts which would be a continuing threat to society, and you will have to use your own definition for the word society.

out to you, I think you will realize from your own common sense, once a man is convicted of capital murder, the only society he will find himself in is the prison society, and the only thing I want to know is: Do you disagree or agree with me? Do you feel there are people in our prison system, that we ask to work in our prison system for us, who run the prison system, who deserve our protection from the convicts confined there?

A. Yes.

And do you agree or disagree there are convicts in the prison system serving out their debt to society who deserve protection from other

A. Yes.

- Now that I have had a chance to go over Questions l and 2, do you have questions about 1 and 2, the way they are worded, anything we can clear up for you right now?
- A. Comes down to the definitions. That's the only thing. I guess that would be up to me.
- Do you feel that Question 1 and 2 are the type of questions you could answer depending on what the evidence you would hear would be, yes or no, depending on the evidence?
- A Yes.
- Let me point out a certain thing: In a proper case, the law says just the facts of the crime itself can be enough evidence for you to answer both questions yes. That is for you and the other jurors to talk about.

We talk about the punishment phase of the trial. At the punishment phase of the trial, you can hear other evidence. You don't have to, but you can. Just the facts from the first stage can be enough for you to answer yes. That will be a call judgment for you and the other jurors to decide, whether based on the facts of the

29C8

case, is it enough to answer yes? Do the facts itself tell you enough about the conduct of the man and what kind of person he is to be able to answer both questions yes?

· 14

At the punishment stage, however, the law does allow other evidence, if there is any to be presented to the jury, to help them decide their answers.

For instance, crimes a man may have committed that have not been tried, too -- that is a specific question -- that type can be submitted to the jury; whatever crimes are known to authorities, any prior convictions that are known to the authorities can again be presented to the jury.

Any type of information that is known about the man on trial can be presented, good or bad, to help the jury decide what their answers to the questions can be.

But there is no requirement that type of evidence be presented to the jury before the questions can be answered yes. The opportunity is there.

Do you follow me so far, to a general extent?

Obviously, if you are selected, you will get a firsthand view of how it works, but speaking strictly in hypothetical terms, have you got a little bit of a feel of what's going on so far?

- A I guess so, yes.
- The only thing a judge will tell you, in answering those questions here, he will tell you you are not to discuss with other jurors how long a man would have to serve in the penitentiary on a sentence if that were the sentence.
- A Repeat that.
- The judge will tell you you are not to discuss among yourselves as jurors how long a man would have to serve in the penitentiary on a life sentence. The judge will not tell you that.

The judge will tell you however long he will serve is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Board of Pardons and Paroles. The reason we emphasize -- and it is so important -- if jurors were to discuss that, it would be grounds for having to do this case all over from the start, and the judge will give you that in writing, and I ask you to remember that. I want you to know how important --

1

2

THE COURT: Overruled. (By Mr. Moen) Do you have any questions about

5

4

these two questions before we pass to something

6

else?

7

A. No.

Q.

8

Okay. The judge will tell you -- I want to talk to you about other aspects of the law -- but

9

first, what would be required in your jury service,

10 11

there are six or seven things the judge will tell

12

you in his charge.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The charge is nothing more than a piece of paper. The way a jury arrives at a verdict in a murder case or capital case, they take the law in writing from the judge and they take the facts and apply it to those legal definitions given them by the judge to see if the crime actually took place. Is the man guilty or not guilty based on what the judge has told us capital murder is? And they reach their verdict and the charge consists of definitions, definitions of capital murder and admonitions the jurors must follow in reaching their decision in the case.

What the judge will tell you first off, they can go in different order than this, but first off, if the Defendant doesn't testify, you are not to consider the Defendant's failure to testify as evidence of his guilt.

In other words, jurors should arrive at their verdict based on what they have heard in the courtroom and seen inside the courtroom on the witness stand, not on the fact they have not heard from the Defendant.

That does not mean as a juror you do not desire or do not want to hear both sides of the story. That is a natural reaction, or you may have wished to have heard from the Defendant. That is, once again, a human reaction, but if the Defendant doesn't testify, you are not to consider his failure to testify as evidence of guilt.

I anticipate the Defendant will testify in this trial, but I wanted to give you that admonition in the event he does not. Okay?

Presumption of innocence, the judge will tell you -- and that will be in writing -- you are to presume the Defendant innocent. You are to reach your decision on the evidence in

the case, not on the fact the Defendant finds himself in the courtroom represented by a couple of lawyers and charged with a serious crime, but you should reach your verdict on the evidence presented from the witness stand and not find him guilty because an indictment has been returned, he has two lawyers who represent him, and he is here in the courtroom. He has the presumption of innocence.

Do you follow me on that?

Yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- The analogy I draw for prospective jurors on the indictment is kind of like a starter's pistol in a footrace. Until the starter's pistol goes off, we can't begin the race, and without the indictment, we can't begin the trial. give it any significance, that is the only significance you should give it. You will never have a chance to look at it on a case, and it is not evidence of anything. All right?
- A. Uh-huh.
- The judge will tell you that the burden of proof Q. in any trial, in any case, whether a traffic ticket or criminal case, the burden of proof always rests with the District Attorney's Office

to prove to the jurors, before they can say by their verdict that someone is guilty of any crime, and that burden is to prove beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, the burden never shifts to the Defense, but before you think that the trial is strictly a one-sided affair, it is not.

At a trial, any criminal trial, the Defense has an opportunity to call any witnesses they want at no expense to them. They can go over to the clerk and issue a subpoena arrest, forward it to the Sheriff's Department, and the individual they want to testify can be subpoenaed, and if that individual won't come voluntarily, they can be picked up and brought to the courtroom.

Either side can prove or disprove whatever they hope to prove or disprove, and only one side has the burden of doing that, and that is Mr. Bax and myself.

Follow me on that?

A Yes.

· 14

Š

If he feels the best strategy is to remain silent, not to put the Defendant on the stand and not cross-examine any witnesses Mr. Bax and

I call, they have that opportunity. They can remain silent if they like. I don't think they are going to do that, but I am just trying to give you the most hypothetical farfetched idea that I can think of to explain that burden of proof to you.

Now, that burden is to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt, not beyond all doubt, any doubt, or a shadow of a doubt, as we see often here on the lawyer shows on television, but to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, and that applies to these questions as well.

Before you could answer either one of the questions yes, you would have to believe from the evidence presented by Mr. Bax and myself that is what you believe your answers should be beyond a reasonable doubt.

We don't have the obligation to remove all doubts from your mind. You may have some doubts in your mind. The proof is beyond a reasonable doubt, not all doubt.

I think you realize why. I think you will always have doubts as to Question 2 before you answer it. I don't care how damaging the facts may be to any person on trial.

The jury may have questions, but the fact is whether that question has been proven to them beyond a reasonable doubt, not all doubt, the removal of a shadow of a doubt, or anything else.

Any questions about anything so far?

- A No.
- And finally, the judge will tell you as a juror you have the right to judge the credibility of the witnesses. That sounds almost insulting to your intelligence at first blush, but what I want to point out to you is this: The jury has a right to believe everything a witness has told them under oath or disbelieve everything, even though the witness has taken an oath to tell the truth.

I wish I could report to you, Mr.
Busby, we lived in a world where no human being,
after they had taken an oath to God to tell the
truth, would ever say anything that was not
the truth.

But I think you realize from your common sense we don't live in that type of society, so the burden falls on jurors to decide how much of a witness' testimony they are

going to believe. Does that witness' testimony make sense in logic and fact? Should I reject it or accept it, and which portions should I believe? Should I accept all of it, reject all of it?

That is a decision you will make with the other jurors, to judge the credibility of the witnesses.

The only thing the judge will tell you regarding that is when you are doing that, don't give a witness more or less belief because of a witness' job. In the eyes of the law, no witness is automatically more believable or disbelievable just because of a witness' job. A police officer, fireman, even our favorite minister at the church we attend, if we lined them up together right here in front of the jury rail, our favorite minister is going to testify, favorite doctor, favorite lawyer, dentist, et cetera, in the eyes of the law, none of those men are more believable or disbelievable than anyone else.

After they testify, it is perfectly all right for jurors to consider their occupations. I am only talking about before

Court?

A Yes.

Q That pretty much covers judging the testimony.

I told you I would include the lesser included offense of murder and capital murder. Here is how it applies.

Do you follow me on that charge of the

Okay. A person could pretty well be charged with the offense of capital murder, but you find by the evidence he is only guilty of murder.

Now, how does that come up?

Remember, we talked about for capital murder to be that offense, those circumstances have exist. In other words, the crime has to be committed during the course of committing one of those crimes we mentioned.

Imagine the hypothetical we have used to explain Question 1, where the man goes into a convenience store and confronts the teller.

Let's say there were witnesses present and change it and they thought it was a robbery-murder and he had committed capital murder, and the jury was selected, but during the course of

the trial, the jury heard evidence and found out that really it wasn't a robbery-murder.

. 14

What had happened was that he, the
Defendant who killed the cashier, had been living
with her off and on for the last couple of years,
that earlier in the day, for the last couple of
weeks, they had been having violent arguments
about her leaving him, and he had followed her
to work and the argument had continued there at
work, and finally, he lost his temper and
produced a pistol he had brought to her job and
he shot her to death.

You see, the proper verdict in that case would be not guilty of capital murder, but guilty first of murder, because it was not a robbery-murder, but yet a murder that took place.

That is how, just by way of explanation, the lesser included offense of murder can arise, even though an individual has been charged with the offense of capital murder which brings up the range of punishment for murder, which, as I mentioned earlier, is five to ninety-nine years or life, and in addition, even though a person has been found guilty of the offense of murder, a Defendant has the right to ask the jury to

Are you familiar with that term, probation? Have you heard that before at the courthouse?

A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am sure in general terms in the newspapers or whatever, maybe in discussions with your friends, but probation means release by the Court. Defendant doesn't have to go to the penitentiary. He is released by the judge under the terms and conditions set by the judge; to support his dependents; work at suitable employment; avoid places and persons of disreputable or harmful character; remain at one place in the county, and if you are going to move, tell your probation officer so that he can keep count of you; don't go out of town without a pass from your probation officer; and I think you are supposed to avoid the use of habit-forming drugs and other forms of probation, but basically, live your life like other human beings and abide by the law with a few other admonitions; report once a month so he can keep an eye on you, but he has the right to consider giving the man probation.

The jury can throw it out the window

1.4

If the jury decides it should be ten to ninety-nine years, probation doesn't apply; only the type of case where the jury is first of all in unanimous agreement that the man's punishment should be under ten years for the crime they found him guilty of, and secondly, where the jury unanimously agrees probation is proper.

You see, even though the jury assesses a term of years less than ten, they can find probation in a proper case. They could recommend it to the judge even for someone they had found guilty of the offense of murder.

Let me give you a hypothetical and try to tie in all these things we have talked about: capital murder, lesser included offenses of murder, punishment range in the very low

range for murder, and probation being granted by the jury.

Let me try to give you a hypothetical that ties those things in.

Imagine a situation where a man and woman find themselves at a hospital, and he is dying from an incurable disease, whatever it might be. His life is being sustained by life-support equipment. His prognosis is anywhere from two to six months of life left.

His wife -- and they have had the type of relationship, they are both in their seventies, have been together forty or fifty years -- they have the type of relationship where she is down almost every night spending the night.

They have a discussion, a rational discussion between the two. He has no hope of recovery whatever. The only thing that is happening, their finances and reserves are being exhausted by his stay at the hospital. The longer he stays alive, and longer he is kept alive, the poorer he will be when he passes, and the more dependent she will be on social security, et cetera.

They decide the best thing is to let

him pass, and she agrees and assists in the ending of his life. She unplugs the life-support equipment, maybe takes an IV out of his arm, and he passes during the night and dies. She commits the offense of murder. She has intentionally and knowingly taken his life. Technically, she is guilty of murder.

Let's say some of the relatives are bitter about his passing. She admits it. is not trying to lie. After he dies, she freely admits to the family and anyone who wants to listen to her how he died, and they are extremely bitter about their relative passing, and they manage to convince the jury in this hypothetical case the only reason she did that, they both owned a half-acre retirement lot that was being developed by the developer and he needed this last parcel he was going to develop to build a resort community on, and she stands to gain lots of money, but they convince the Grand Jury that this was murder for money, and because of his guilt, she will now deliberately benefit in a pecuniary fashion by his passing.

The jury hears all the facts and they think, "That is the most preposterous bunch

2923

2 3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of malarkey," but they follow their oaths as jurors and find her guilty of murder, and they retire and deliberate on what her punishment ought to be, and they decide society would not benefit by her spending any term in the penitentiary whatsoever and they return a verdict of five years' probation.

You see, by that hypothetical, it ties together all the things: capital murder, the lesser included offense of murder, and even, in fact, the range of probation, the range of punishment being probation for someone the jury has found guilty of the offense of murder.

Now, ultimately by that explanation, I wanted to ask Mr. Busby this: In a case where you were a juror and had returned a verdict and, in fact, found someone guilty of murder, could you, in a proper case, consider the question of probation even though you had returned a verdict finding someone guilty of the offense of murder?

A. Yes.

Okay. If you felt it was a proper case? is the test, really, for jurors.

A. Yes. Q If they felt like it was a proper case.

I believe the evidence in the case will show that the Defendant is, in fact, an illegal alien. He is not lawfully here in the United States.

The only reason I point that out to you in that regard is that I ask you, unless you feel you cannot put that out of your mind, do not consider that as evidence whatsoever. The Defendant should not be found guilty or not guilty merely because he is an illegal alien.

Can you abide by that?

A. Yes.

That can be evidence you want to consider for whatever weight you want to give it in answering these questions as to what type of person he is, but I am talking about guilt or innocence. He cannot be found guilty or innocent because he is illegally in this country.

Do you follow me on that?

- A Yes.
- Q Tell me a little bit about your parents' occupations.

Did your mom ever work outside the home?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- A franchise owner? 23
- A. No. 24
 - Q. Has anyone at the store ever been the victim of

for a not guilty verdict.

Mr. Moen has talked to you about the punishment stage, and I will probably talk to you about the guilt-or-innocence stage, which is very important.

He went over with you the three concepts of the criminal judicial system, which is presumption of innocence, the burden of proof, and proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

- A Uh-huh.
- Q Let me go through them more specifically.

As my client sits here today indicted by a Grand Jury in Harris County, a Harris County Grand Jury, for causing the death of a police officer, charged with that crime, he is presumed to be innocent.

Do you disagree or agree in any way with this concept?

- A I agree that he is innocent until proven guilty.
- And that will be throughout the whole trial?
- A Right.
- All right. Now, you understand that the law does not place the burden upon us, the Defense, to present any evidence whatsoever or to present any witnesses to you? In other words, the burden will stay with the State throughout the whole

Will you agree with that?

- A Yes. I agree.
- Q Would you require the State to prove their case to you?
- A Uh-huh.

- Q Would you require us to prove this man's innocence to you?
- A. No.
- Okay. Now, the burden that they must meet is a burden beyond a reasonable doubt, and, of course, there is no interpretation or no definition, legal definition we may give you as to what Mr. Moen was telling you, but it is not beyond all doubt, and it is not a shadow of a doubt, and it is not some doubt. It is beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden is much, much heavier than on the civil side.

On the civil side, it is preponderance of the evidence; say, the scale of justice, whatever slight movement there is, then that side wins. Okay?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Not so in a criminal case. The burden is much heavier, much heavier where the burden is beyond

- Hard question. I believe they are human, but as far as being a police officer, I would give them some sort of credibility.
- Q Before they testify?
- A Oh, no; not before they testify. As they are testifying.
- Q So the mere fact if we have several witnesses or the State has several witnesses and we have several witnesses, you are not saying to me that before a police officer testifies that the mere fact that he is a police officer, you would give him more credibility?
- A No.

- So, let's put it this way: Would you give him more credibility than any witness simply because he is a police officer, while he is testifying?
- A While he is testifying? Not so much more, but I would give him some credibility.
- Q How is that?
- A Well, it's -- I can't say him versus some other officer of the court. I don't see why he would have more credibility. He would have more compared to, I guess, the normal citizen getting up there, to me.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

- You are talking about if he presents to you a scientific test or the fact that he noted something at an intersection or whatever, a description of an intersection?
- A Yes. I mean, he would be more -- he would be able to do that better than I would say the average citizen would.
- But you wouldn't automatically give him more benefit simply because he is a police officer, would you?
- A You mean as a human being?
- Q Prior to testifying.
- A Oh, no, no. Expert witness, I guess, is more
- Let me ask you this: Say, for example, if an illegal alien, which they will be here to

testify as to the facts, and a police officer gets up there and testifies to the facts, you are not saying you would give a police officer more credibility simply because he is a police officer, hypothetically speaking?

MR. MOEN: I object to the question. He is staking him out as to how he would place the testimony of a police officer as opposed to an illegal alien.

THE COURT: Sustained.

All right. Any class of citizens coming in or any citizen that would testify, be it a doctor, a secretary, a manager of a pizza place, a police officer, would you give that police officer more credibility than any other citizen testifying as to the same facts?

MR. MOEN: I object to the same question again, as to how he would judge a police officer's testimony versus other people and other occupations.

I think he has answered the question, that he would judge the police officer's credibility and training and what he is doing. He has also said he would not --

I object to the question along those lines, Judge.

A I didn't follow that too well.

Q Let me see if I can explain that to you.

In the first stage, if you find him guilty of intentionally and knowingly causing the death of a police officer -- those are the elements of the crime he is charged with --

A Uh-huh.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And your interpretation of deliberately is intentionally, okay?

So you find him guilty of intentionally and knowingly causing the death of a police officer, and you are asked in the second stage here, the punishment stage, to answer these two questions. The first one here is whether the conduct of the Defendant that caused the death of the deceased was committed deliberately.

Okay. Your interpretation of

- A Well, yes, for one word.
- You wouldn't automatically answer that question yes, would you, simply because you found him guilty of knowingly and intentionally causing the death of a police officer?
- A No.

All right. Let's go to the second question:

Whether there is a probability the Defendant

would commit criminal acts of violence that

would constitute a continuing threat to society.

Would you want further evidence from the State in order to make up your mind whether there is a continuing threat to society by our client, or would you automatically answer that question yes?

MR. MOEN: I object to the form of the question unless it includes, "Would he automatically answer it yes regardless of the evidence that he heard just because he had returned a verdict of guilty in the case."

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

- Q (By Mr. Hernandez) Regardless of the evidence you have heard?
- A Pardon?

Q.

25

Right. Right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Near the Astrodome between O.S.T. and Braeswood.
- Now, there will be times where, of course -- you Q. know this is the death of a police officer, and there will be times where witnesses or family members of the deceased officer might come and

Could you decipher or take away the emotions and stick with the facts and make your decision strictly on the facts of the case?

A Yes.

- Q Could you do that?
- A Uh-huh.
 - And could you place that burden continuously throughout the whole trial on the State, to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt?
- 12 A Yes.
 - Q And could you keep an open mind --
- 14 A Yes.
 - Q -- throughout the whole trial?

And could you give Mr. Guerra the presumption of innocence throughout the whole trial until they could prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt he is guilty?

- A Yes.
- All right. Let me ask you something. Say, for example, if you go in the deliberation room on the guilt-or-innocence stage and you think he might be guilty, but the State has not proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt that he is

give you a few instructions.

As I told you earlier, we anticipate that we will start the evidence in the case Monday. It may be Tuesday or Wednesday before we get to it.

In the meantime, you will be allowed to go about your normal activities.

I am going to give you an information sheet, that should an emergency arise and you need to leave town, or for whatever reason, you can contact us. If you will, let us know that so we can make appropriate arrangements in that event.

Here are the names written in. Ask for the coordinator if such an emergency arises.

We will try to let you know a day or two ahead of that time so you can arrange your schedule.

You will be more than likely to serve five or six days, as I said. You will be away from your employment during that time, and you will probably need to make arrangements for that.

Also, in the meantime, if there is any publicity, whether in the newspapers, radio, or television, please studiously avoid reading

anything, listening to anything, watching anything concerning this case, and during the course of the trial, I can guarantee you there will be publicity in probably all three of those forms of media.

I will instruct you to avoid reading, watching, or listening to anything during that time.

Your service -- or decision, rather -- must be based upon the evidence you hear in this courtroom, and not anything heard outside the courtroom. Okay?

Do you have any questions?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. We will talk to you and let you know when to come, but it will be sometime next week.

THE JUROR: If it is Monday, you will contact me?

THE COURT: I will contact you one way or the other.

THE JUROR: Thank you, sir.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was called as a prospective juror and responded to questions propounded as follows:

EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bax, you may proceed.

MR. BAX: Thank you, Your Honor.

(By Mr. Bax) Good morning, Mr. Horbelt.

As the judge mentioned earlier, I am Dick Bax with the District Attorney's Office.

There is another Assistant District Attorney by the name of Bob Moen -- or he was seated here earlier.

Together, we will be representing the State of Texas and the family of James Harris in the prosecution of Ricardo Aldape Guerra who is seated there at the end of the table.

I have noticed from your information form that you have filled out for us that you have served on a criminal jury once before.

- Yes.
- How long ago was that? Q

I am sure in that case you were brought over with a group of people and the lawyers talked to you as a group.

Was it a six-man or twelve-man jury you were on?

- A It was six, I believe.
- Q A misdemeanor case?
- A. Yes.

- And probably they were talking for thirty minutes each, I guess. Both sides selected the jury and started with the trial.
- A They did have a trial, and I forget the process we went through about that.
- I am sure it probably only took an hour or so, but this jury we are selecting now, we started selecting this jury on August 30th. We are into our fifth week. We've got ten jurors, and we've got to get two more.

The reason we do it individually, number one, the law requires it, and, number two, it allows the jury to feel more comfortable in answering some of the questions we need to talk to them about.

As you know, should this Defendant or

any Defendant be found guilty of capital murder, there is only one of two punishments available to that man, a life sentence or the death penalty.

Okay?

And the reason we bring people individually is so they are not influenced by what others say. We are not trying to conduct a debate or change your viewpoints or another person's viewpoints. At this stage of the trial, there are no right or wrong answers. What we are trying to do is find out honestly how the person feels about the death penalty and whether they themselves could participate in such a trial.

There are many people in our community who, for whatever reason, religious upbringings or whatever, tell us, "I could not, never personally, participate in a death penalty case. My religion tells me no one has the right to take the life of another person," and certainly a person is entitled to that position.

What puts a person on the jury is how they answer these questions, and if a person would be honest and tell us honestly they couldn't do it, that is fine, and if he can participate in a proper case, that is fine, also, so I guess

the question I need to ask you is: How do you feel about the death penalty? Do you feel it is a proper punishment in certain cases? Would you classify yourself as in favor of the death penalty or opposed to the death penalty?

- I would say I am in favor of it, but I would find

 -- I would find it very, very difficult to reach
 that conclusion myself. I would prefer not to
 make that decision if I could help it.
- Q Okay. There is nothing -- I don't think it would be an easy job for anybody.
- A No. It would be difficult for me to reach that conclusion, but I am in favor of it.
- Okay. I hope that no one out there in our society today believes if I find someone guilty I would automatically give him the death penalty and it would be easy. Hopefully, that is not the case.

We have had other people come through basically with the same viewpoint you have given us: "I believe in the death penalty, but I don't know that I personally could be involved in that procedure." Okay?

- A Uh-huh.
- Let me take you through the questions that would be required of you to answer if you were on a

Q. I need to ask you these questions -- first of all, let me ask you this: Let us say you listened to evidence and you found a person was guilty of capital murder. let's say, taking the life of a police officer.

After you heard that evidence, assume with me that you believe that the evidence showed the man was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Could you follow your oath and find him guilty of capital murder, knowing by finding that person guilty, you are setting him up for one of two punishments, life or death?

Would you be able to participate in a guilty verdict?

- A I think I could, but I would rather not.
- Q So you wouldn't -- you could find a person guilty?
- A I think so.

Q I am going to get it down to a little more detailed

If you find a person guilty of capital murder, the two questions here on the board are submitted to the jury. Okay?

- A Yes.
- Depending on how the jury answers these two questions, the judge will either assess life or death. If all twelve jurors answer Question No. 1 yes based on the evidence, and all twelve jurors answer Question No. 2 yes based on the evidence, then the judge must assess the death penalty. He has no choice. Two yes answers, no matter what the judge believes, he must assess the death penalty.
- A I understand.
- If either Question 1 or 2 is answered no by the jury, the judge must, by law, assess life imprisonment.

Even though you don't go back as a juror and say, "We assess the death penalty or life imprisonment," you know by these two answers what the judge will do. All right?

- A. Yes.
- Assume you have found a person guilty of capital murder and we are at the punishment stage and you

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

25

have heard evidence about the crime and heard other evidence about the man's background to help you answer these questions. You are the only one who can answer the next question I am going to phrase to you. Okay?

- A. Okay.
- If the evidence showed beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to Question No. 1 should be yes, could you answer it yes, knowing that then it would take only one more yes answer for the death penalty, or would you either refuse to answer it or answer it no so you wouldn't be a part of the death penalty?
- I think I could answer it yes or no with some explanation of what -- the definitions -- or what is meant by those two words, deliberately and reasonably.
- We will get into that in a few minutes. Q.
- It isn't clear to me what they mean.
- The reason they are underlined, you will not be given a definition.

We will go into the contents in just a minute.

You could answer Question 1 yes depending on the evidence; is that correct?

- Assume with me now that you have found a person guilty and you have answered Question No. 1 yes.
 You come to Question No. 2. Okay? And really not with regard to the content of the question at this time --
- A Yes.
- question 2
 yes knowing by answering that question yes the
 judge will assess the death penalty, or will
 you answer it no to avoid the death penalty and
 assure a life sentence?
- A Once again, if the word probability was defined,

 I think I could. The way it is written there,

 everyone, it would seem to me, would have to say

 -- agree in that question that a probability exists.
- Q That they have done something?
- A. With everybody, a probability exists they might do something.
- Q Okay.
- As it is put there. I don't know any other answer to the question, but yes, that the probability does exist.
- Q Let's go over the questions, and I will try to give you ideas of the definitions. Okay?

. 14

.

Number one, was the conduct deliberate in causing the death, and, number two, was it done with the reasonable expectation that someone would die as a result of that conduct.

Would you agree with me that Question

No. 1, first of all, asks the jury to

reevaluate the evidence they have already heard in
arriving at a guilty verdict?

- A Yes.
- Q In other words, look back on the facts for which the person's on trial.
- A Yes.
 - Deliberate to me -- I don't know what it means to you. You will have to use your everyday meaning for that term, but to me it means on purpose or willful.

How would you define deliberate?

- A That is the word I am having trouble with. If you define it as other than accidentally, as being deliberate, I would recognize what that word means.
- I think you are probably pretty close. A lot of times, people think of deliberately as a thought process.

2

3

4

6

23

24

25

The law is that a person acts

intentionally means.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

intentionally if it is his conscious objective or desire to engage in the conduct. Okay?

Let's talk more about what he was thinking about. Okay?

Let me give you an example where a person could be guilty of intentionally causing the death of someone, and perhaps not have acted deliberately or had the reasonable expectation someone would die.

- I don't understand that. Say that again.
- Let me give you an example where someone may act Q intentionally in causing the death of another person, and yet the jury may find he has not acted deliberately or did not act with the reasonable expectation someone would die. Let me give you a fact situation.

Two people get together and decide they are going to rob a bank. Okay? One man decides he is going to be the actual triggerman, go in and hold up the teller and demand the money.

The other man really is going to be the getaway driver. He is going to sit out in front in the getaway car and keep the car running while his buddy goes inside and robs the clerk.

While the man is inside robbing the

That could be an off-duty police officer or whatever, but under our law, if two people conspire together to do a robbery, if one of the two commits an offense, both people are guilty, even the man out front, even if he didn't have the intent to cause the death of someone, if he should have anticipated someone would die as a result of that conspiracy, and I think you will agree if two people go in with a loaded gun, there may be a possibility someone may get shot if something goes wrong.

- A I hear you but don't agree with you.
- Under our law, both people are guilty of capital murder. The murder inside, he does the shooting, but the person outside with the getaway car, he is just as guilty as the man inside. Okay?
- A I hear you, yes.

When you get to the punishment stage with the man who went inside and did the shooting, you may say, "Yes, he went inside and pulled the trigger and had the reasonable expectation someone would die,"

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

because anytime a man goes in with a loaded pistol, he should anticipate someone might die. All right?

When the jury is asked about the man in the getaway car, you should say there was no deliberate conduct. He was this getaway driver. He did not have the reasonable expectation someone would die.

Do you follow me?

- Yes.
- Do you see where this question could be answered yes or no, even though you found him guilty of causing the death?
- As to the fellow outside, I would have to say no.
- You could see where he could be found guilty?
- Maybe in the eyes of the law.
- Would you be able to find someone like that guilty of capital murder, the getaway driver, if it were shown he knew the man was going in with a loaded pistol?
- I don't think so. No.
- You could only find someone guilty of capital murder if they pulled the trigger and did the shooting?

Q

3

2

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If you found the person in the case, it was the person who pulled the trigger and did the shooting, all right, would you automatically answer this question yes, that he had to deliberately and acted with a reasonable expectation that someone would die?

- I would answer it yes if I felt that were the A. case, but I don't think the two things go together necessarily.
- You would have to weigh it and base it on the Q. evidence?
- I think of someone shooting in self-defense deliberately, but it may not be that you want to kill the other person. You are protecting yourself and not expecting them to die.
- You may have a situation where someone shoots Q. somebody in the leg like the robber trying to keep someone from getting the license plate number.
- Yes.
- If someone dies as a result of that act, he could have acted deliberately or intentionally without a reasonable expectation someone would die.
- A. Yes.

citizen, had raised his family, gone to school, had a steady job, took care of his family, never had problems with the law, and if you were asked whether there was a probability that that person would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society --

- A I would have to say there was a remote possibility.
- And if you were asked that question of someone you knew took a pistol to take things from people by force, what would you think about that person's probability?
- A I would say a greater probability.
- So probability in that term, I think, means something more than a possibility. Okay?

Probability, anything is possible.

Probability, to me, means chances are or more

likely than not. Okay? And, you can see, like

the first example about the person who's never

been in trouble before, raised a family, had a

good job, it is more likely than not he will not

commit criminal acts of violence.

Would you agree with me?

- A More likely than what? Than someone who has?
- Q He is more unlikely to commit criminal acts of

- A I think we may reach that conclusion, but it may not be true.
- It may not be true, but someone who carries a pistol and steals from other people, in that case, it may be more likely than not he would commit criminal acts in the future.

I think you can see that.

- A I think we would say yes to that.
- Q Can you see where that question could be answered yes or no depending on the evidence, Question 2?
- I think it would have to be answered yes. If you answered yes to the other questions, if you found a person guilty and said yes to the first one, I think you would have to say yes to the second one.
- Q How about this question?

A seventeen-year-old says he is going to commit a robbery for whatever reason. He hasn't got any money, can't get a job, has been unable to work, and he goes into a Utotem and demands money from the teller. He is scared nervous, upset. The teller is not responding quick enough for the seventeen-year-old. He gets scared and fires a shot to the side trying to

Because we are talking about the death penalty doesn't mean my burden of proof is here. It is my same burden of proof that the State had to meet when it tried that marijuana case a few years ago.

There is no way I could prove to you beyond all doubt or beyond a shadow of a doubt this Defendant is guilty. There will be no video cameras, no video replays, and I guess the only way I could prove anything to twelve people beyond all doubt would be if the twelve jurors who were the jurors were the witnesses in the case, and if you are a witness, you are not allowed to be a juror.

Do you understand me?

A I heard you.

And if you had twelve people, you would have twelve versions, particularly if it were a confused situation.

There is no way I can prove to you beyond all doubt. You may have some doubt, but unless it is beyond a reasonable doubt, you will be required to return a verdict of guilty.

2

3

Ø.

25

You cannot say, "Judge, sentence him to death or

25

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection, Your Honor.

Q The judge will tell you if anyone alludes to or

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are killed in protecting us, we are going to make that person who kills you more accountable."

- I didn't know that was so. Is that so?
- Yes. That is why we set aside -- don't set aside a police officer, just because we say let's pick police officers -- but if someone kills police officers, you can pretty much tell what his feelings would be towards the rest of us. Probably a person who would kill a police officer would not have any trouble killing someone else if they got in the way. Would you agree with that?
- I wouldn't agree with that. I think where A. a person is confronted by a police officer with a gun and his life is threatened as opposed to a civilian who is unarmed and not protected, that would be more reason to shoot at the police officer who is protected.
- The fact that the policeman has a gun out?
- That would be different. A.
- That would tell you something different about the Q fellow?
- Yes.
- You've got a doctor and a dentist and a warehouseman as children?
- A. Yes.

A I think I could.

And at the punishment stage, could you sign the verdict answering this question yes and the second question yes if it were proved to you, knowing he would receive the death penalty?

L I could.

Q It wouldn't be easier, but you could do it if the evidence called for it? Can you make that guarantee?

A I could.

THE COURT: Before you begin, I want to make all of you aware I have an appointment at noon. We have fifteen minutes. If we are not through, we will take it up after that.

EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:

Q Mr. Horbelt, how are you today?

Q I imagine it is.

A Yes.

You work at Todd Shipyards and have been there thirty-seven years?

A Yes.

- Are you the general manager of the whole shipyard or the manager of a certain area of this particular yard?
- A For Houston.
- Q How many employees do you have under your employ?
- 12 A. It runs from 300 to 700 in total yards.
 - Q You have a Todd Shipyard in Seattle, don't you?
 - A Yes, and several places in the United States we have yards.
 - As the Prosecution told you, this is a capital murder case, and in a capital murder case, as in all cases in Texas, the State has the burden of proof. The burden of proof is to prove to you as a prospective juror this case beyond a reasonable doubt to your satisfaction. They have to prove to you that in Harris County, Texas, on a particular day, this Defendant shot a police officer in the lawful discharge of an official duty knowing at the time that he was a

police officer. They must prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

The term reasonable doubt will not be defined for you. There is no legal definition of the term reasonable doubt. The judge won't give you one. I won't give you one, and he can't give you one, but all I can do is give you a comparison and analogy.

Across the street at 301 Fannin
in the civil courthouse where they try cases over
personal injuries, workmen's compensation cases,
sometimes for millions of dollars, the burden of
proof over there is proof by a preponderance of
the evidence, the greater weight of the credible
evidence. The one that has the most credible
evidence wins.

In the civil courthouse -- I am sorry.

I am in the criminal courthouse -- where a

person's life or liberty is literally at stake
in this case, as in this case, the legislature
side before we can convict anybody, before we
can forfeit anybody's life, the State of Texas
will have a heavier burden, and that burden will
be to proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

So you can see or you understand maybe

- You don't know why it is that way?
- No, I don't. I don't understand. 10
- What do you mean by that? Q 11
- Well, it seems like that in a contract case --12 A.
 - They are fighting over money?
 - I don't agree with it. I think in a contract case you could reach a conclusion as to what was right or wrong.
- Correct. 17

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And make a definite conclusion that positively this person was right and this one was wrong. I think individually we could make that decision. It wouldn't be that this guy is forty percent and this one is sixty percent, so I am going to give him the money. I don't agree with that part of it.

Does it make sense?

6

7

8

11

12

13

. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I can assure you as actively as they are seeking the death penalty, we will be seeking the not guilty from the jury.

After the Defendant pleads not guilty,

You as a juror will be able to see, sitting right there in the jury box, you will be close to the witnesses and be able to watch their demeanor, how they testify, and their inconsistent statements, and based on that, you can believe some of, all of, or not all of their testimony. You will be the judge of the facts. The judge will be the judge of the law.

After they get through testifying, the State will then rest its case. That means, "That is all we have." At that point in time, the Defendant can, if he chooses, he can testify. He can put on evidence. He doesn't have to, but let's assume for a minute he doesn't put on any evidence whatsoever and we rest our case also.

You'd go back in the jury deliberation room --

A. Uh-huh.

qurself, "Maybe he did it. I don't know, but
I think he did it, but it hasn't been proven to
me beyond a reasonable doubt."

- I would have to find him -- if I came to the conclusion they had not proved it beyond a reasonable doubt, I would have to say not guilty.
- But you can say or you can see where you might be put in a switch where, in your own mind, you might say, "I think he did it"?
- A I imagine that's exactly the thought process that would go on, right, during the testimony, and eventually when you reach that decision --
- Q Okay.
- A -- I think that is the decision that has to be made.
- Right, but can you see where you might say to yourself, "I think he did it, but they haven't proven it to me beyond a reasonable doubt, and, therefore, I am going to find him not guilty"?
- A Yes. That is what I keep saying. I almost would lean heavily that way. I almost feel I would, because I find giving the death penalty a very difficult thing to do.
- Q It should be. Rightfully so.
- A I would be swayed tremendously the other way.

 I would have to be completely, absolutely

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

22

23

24

25

- In other words, no doubt, positive in my mind from what I heard.
- We might be getting caught in semantics here. am not sure.

The law says that the State has to

In that case, the State had to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

J

of course, in that case, the punishment the fellow was looking at was probably a fine or jail term up to six months, not talking about significant punishment. Usually those cases are handled by probation the fellow receives, usually a slap on the hand.

- A I didn't know that at the time.
- Q From what I understand, what I think you are telling us -- and correct me if I am wrong -when we are talking about capital murder, when we are talking about the death penalty --
- A Yes.
- Q -- when you used the term crystal clear --
- A Yes.
- -- absolutely positive, probably beyond the point of reasonable -- I think that is basically
- A It may be. It may be, yes. It may be.
- Basically, I think what you are telling us, before you could find someone guilty of capital murder, just to Mr. Horbelt, I would have to prove something to you beyond all doubt?

If we were talking about whether someone had a Baggie of marijuana and knew it was a Baggie of marijuana, okay? In that type of case, I wouldn't have to prove to you as much that the person were guilty simply because of the consequences of the verdict?

A. I think so. I think in the other case, the evidence appeared to me to be so overwhelmingly one way that there wasn't any doubt.

through here and see if you could fit yourself with this person: A fellow who said, "I believe in the death penalty. I can understand why we have the death penalty and the reason for it, but before I could find someone guilty of a death penalty case, you would have to prove to me beyond a shadow of a doubt," and he told us that because he said, "I would always have to live with myself and wonder what would happen if someone else came forward and admitted they did the crime."

A True.

They almost said, "I wouldn't hold the State to that inhuman proof," but he was honest enough to

tell us, "I don't think I could be a fair juror in the case because I would always have a doubt, and as long as I had a doubt, I would find a person not guilty, knowing they would face the death penalty."

- A That is what I am almost saying to you. It would have to be a tremendously strong case. I am trying to be as honest as I can.
- Whether you are talking about this case or any case, is there anyone here who feels they can't sit in judgment?
- A That is an easy out. The thought crossed my mind as to that.
- Q I don't want you to say anything but what you mean. You are going to be the one that has to live with what you tell us today. You will probably end up sitting on this jury.

If you tell us, which I think takes more courage, your telling us how you feel -- it is not a way out and you've got to live with yourself when it's all over -- and if you are telling us, "Mr. Bax, Mr. Elizondo, because of the way I feel, I cannot sit in judgment of a person requiring the death penalty. I could not sit -- beyond all doubt, I would require proof

- A I think I would be very hard to convince and more difficult than some other people would be, right.
- Q Basically because of your feelings on the death penalty?

24

sides, would you always have a reasonable doubt?

I think that that would depend a lot upon what

24

I guess my last question -- and I will get off

-- would you hold me to a higher burden of proof

than the law requires in a capital murder case

where we are seeking the death penalty?

Fine if you would, and fine if you wouldn't. We need to know how you feel.

- A I would try not to, but it would be very, very difficult.
- I don't think anyone would go back there and on purpose try to -- do you think subconsciously it might affect you in the sense that you may not be impartial in judging the facts of the case because of your feelings?
- A I would try to be impartial, but I would also feel
 I would be influenced by my thoughts.

MR. BAX: No questions.

THE COURT: I must recess at this point until 1:30, and we will come back.

(At this time a recess was taken by the court.)

THE COURT: Bring Mr. Horbelt back in, please, sir.

All right, sir. You may proceed.

EXAMINATION

-	

_

QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:

Mr. Horbelt, did you have a nice lunch at the cafeteria?

I don't have more questions to really ask you. Mr. Bax went through them pretty much in detail.

We will pass you at this time.

MR. BAX: We will excuse this juror, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Horbelt, thank you very much. I didn't realize they were that close to closing before lunch.

THE JUROR: That is all right.
Thank you very much.

was called as a prospective juror and responded to questions propounded as follows:

EXAMINATION

6

5

QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:

8

7

THE COURT: Come around, Mr. Lee, and have a chair, please, sir.

9

You may proceed.

10

Q (By Mr. Bax) Good afternoon, Mr. Lee.

11 12

It is Officer Lee, I take it?

13

A Detective. I am a Burglary and Theft detective.

14

A Have we met before at intake or anywhere?

15

A I have seen you before.

16

Q How about Bob Moen? Have you seen him before?

17

A Yes. I have seen him before.

18 19 A lot of people we have been talking to about the facts, they have no idea what particular case it

20

I am sure you probably recall the case.

21

A Oh, yes. I know.

2223

You are with the Houston Police Department?

24

A Yes, sir.

is.

25

Q Do you feel there is anything, first of all, in

sentenced to death?

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Would you have any problem applying that burden of proof in a criminal case such as this?

- No, sir. I wouldn't have.
- I think the evidence in this case may show that this Defendant is an illegal alien. Of course, the jurors should not take that into consideration, as to whether or not he would be found guilty or not guilty.

Would that fact alone, that he is an illegal alien, bias or prejudice you in any way in listening to the facts of the case?

- No, sir. It sure wouldn't.
- A person -- of course, you know that capital Q. murder means only life or death.
- Α. Yes, sir.
- If a Defendant were found guilty of a lesser included offense of murder, the punishment range is then five years to life. If the jury assesses punishment at somewhere under ten years, ten to five years, the jury could recommend probation if they felt it was proper.

Can you envision any set of facts -and I am sure you have seen in investigating

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

25

3001

may do, don't take the stand with automatic

Q How about J. R. Roberts?

23

24

25

A. J. R. Roberts, I don't know him by name, but I may know him when I see him. I work the day shift

A. Same one as Homicide, yes. 2 Q. How about J. Robinette? A. Robinette, I don't know. 4 J. K. Newman? 5 A. Newman? 6 Q. Newman. 7 A. Oh, yes. I know Newman. Newman. How long have you known Newman? 8 Oh, for years; twenty-five years. 9 A What do you know him from? Just from the police 10 Q. force? 11 Only the department. 12 A. Do you talk to him on few or many occasions? 13 The only time I talk to him is when I go -- we 14 have a few prisoners, and when we are working on 15 a case and burglary is involved, I go and speak 16 with him about it. 17 You have known him for twenty-eight years; is that Q. 18 correct? 19 About that. 20 You have known him twenty years? 21 Twenty years. 22 If he were a witness, would you give him more 23 credibility automatically? 24

No, sir.

Would you give him the same credibility as Q 1 everybody else? Everybody would be the same to me. Q. D. A. Straughan or Straughan? No. 5 Larry Trepagnier? 6 No. 7 Q. A. Palos? 8 No, sir. 9 M. E. Rodriguez? 10 A. No, sir. Mr. R. Edwards? 12 I know some Edwards, but I am not sure if that 13 is the one -- the initials --14 G. L. Bratton? 15 D. L. Bradley? 16 Bratton. 17 Bratton. No, sir. I don't know him. 18 C. A. Dealejandro? 19 A No, sir. I don't know him. 20 Q. C. D. Templeton? 21 No, sir. A. 22 A. G. Christal? Q. 23 No, sir. A. 24 M. I. Moreno? Q. 25

- No, sir. I don't know him. 1 A. Q. R. R. Ruth? 2 How do you spell that Ruth? 3 Q. R-U-T-H. No, sir. I don't know him. 5 C. J. Clark? 6 Q. 7 No, sir. J. C. Worton? 8 Worton? 9 Yes, sir. 10 No, sir. A. 11 C. W. Grant? 12 How do you spell that? 13 G-R-A-N-T. 14 No, sir. 15 B. D. Lott? 16 B. G. Lott? 17 3. D. Lott. 18 B. D. Lott. No, sir. I don't know him. 19
- $_{20}\parallel$ Q C. J. Clark?
- 21 A I think I know Clark. I am not sure if that is
 22 the same Clark I am thinking about. Is he a
 23 detective?
- Q Yes.

25 A. I think I know him by meeting him.

What is this Clark's first name, the one you were thinking of? 2 Tadon't know. I just call him Clark. 3 C. J. Clark, I believe, is a patrol officer. 4 Q. Mo. I don't know him. 5 A. Do you know Danita Smith? Q 6 What was that first name? 7 A. Q. Danita Smith. 8 No, sir. 9 C. E. Anderson? 10 No, sir. 11 Charles Anderson, the firearms expert? 12 No, sir. 13 Amy Heeter? . 14 No, sir. 15 Have you ever heard of her? 16 I don't even -- I don't even know what A. No, sir. 17 division she works in. 18 Q. L. L. Cooper? 19 Cooper, I think I know. 20 The fingerprints man? Q 21 Α. Yes. 22 How long have you known Mr. Cooper? Q. 23 Oh, about five years I believe. I ran prints 24 through there. 25

- Q Have you talked to him on few or many occasions?
- A Just a few times. Have gone to have cases run myself.
- A Based on what you know about Mr. Cooper, would you automatically give him more credibility?
- 6 A No, sir.

2

3

4

- 7 Q R. M. Jordan?
- A That sounds familiar, but I can't place him.
- 9 Q R. M. Gatewood?
- 10 A. No, sir.
- 11 Q D. R. Bostock?
- 12 A Bostock. I know him.
- 13 Q How long have you known him?
- A Ever since he's been on the police department.
- 15 Q Which is how long?
- 16 A Around twenty years.
- Would you automatically give him more credibility because of what you know about him?
- 19 A No, sir.
- 20 Q B. E. Frank?
- 21 A French?
- 22 Q. Frank.
- 23 A No, sir. I don't think I know him.
- J. Montero?
- 25 A No, sir.

```
J. M. Castillo?
    à
1
         No, sir.
2
3
    Q
         J. L. Waltman?
         Waltman?
4
         Yes, sir.
5
    A.
         No, sir.
6
         M. E. St. John?
7
         No, sir.
    A.
8
    Q.
         F. E. Ybarra?
9
         Esquibar?
    A.
10
    Ű
        Ybarra.
11
    A.
        Oh, no, sir.
12
         D. E. Roberts?
13
     A.
         Roberts?
14
        Roberts.
15
     A.
         No, sir.
16
         T. C. Bloyd?
17
         I am sorry. I can't hear the last.
18
         Bloyd.
19
         Bloyd? No, sir.
20
         J. G. Burmeister?
21
         Burmeister. I know him.
22
         How long have you known him?
23
         Ten years.
24
         Would you give him any more credibility because
     Ű
```

- A. T. Herman? Q.
- Herman, yes. I know him. 23
- How long have you known him? 24
 - Ten years.

And he is represented by two lawyers, and it might come to your knowledge he is an illegal alien.

Would you hold that against him?

- A No, sir.
- Q Would you give him a fair and impartial trial?
- A. Yes, sir.

much.

MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, we would challenge for cause because he is a Houston Police officer and acquainted with many of the witnesses in this case, and also the prosecutors, and also the prosecutors, also on that, we would have a challenge for cause.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. ELIZONDO: We will excuse him.

THE COURT: Mr. Lee, thank you very We appreciate your time.

1	HELEN JAYROE SOUTHERN,
2	was called as a prospective juror, and responded to
3	questions propounded as follows:
4	
5	EXAMINATION
6	
7	QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:
8	(The prospective juror had a very
9	brief conversation with the judge out of the
0	hearing of the court reporter.)
11	THE COURT: Have a seat.
12	Mr. Moen and Mr. Elizondo, come up,
13	please.
14	(Discussion at the bench between the
ւ5	Court and counsel out of the hearing of the court
16	reporter.)
17	Q (By Mr. Moen) Is it Southern? Is that how you
18	pronounce your last name?
19	A Yes, sir.
20	Q Just the way it looks?
21	A Yes, sir.
22	Q The judge just had a conversation with us after
23	you had a conversation with him a second ago.
24	Did one of your children get run over
25	by a police officer at some time? What happened?
	3014

How long ago was this?

- 3 A. Three years.
 - I hate to bring it up and I appreciate it.

 Obviously, you are an honest person with your feelings, and although I know it is difficult for you to mention to the judge, I appreciate that.

This case, as I think the judge told you this morning, involves a police officer.

a police officer, and I think you indicated to the judge you didn't feel like you could be fair, and I appreciate your also telling us those were your feelings. I know it was probably difficult for you to say that, and I take it, based on what happened to your son when you told the judge you couldn't be fair, I take that on face value when you indicate you couldn't be fair or impartial to the police officer based on what happened to your son.

- A I would be fair, but it would be hard.
- Q Okay. Well, that is different than saying you couldn't be fair.

What you just told me, you could be, but it would be hard to be fair?

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

Do you feel like in your mind that right now you at least have some feelings in favor of the Defendant because of the fact, just the general fact that a police officer was killed, and what happened to your son, would it be fair to say you have some leanings or some feelings in favor of the Defendant and his side of the case because of your son and the fact this man is charged with killing a police officer?

No, sir. Α.

- You are not leaning one way or the other as a prospective juror here today?
- No, sir.
- Why do you feel you can't be fair and impartial? It sounds like you could be to me.

Why do you hestiate to be on a case like this? I know you have reservations. I can see on your face you do, and, obviously, you wouldn't have stopped and talked to the judge as you did if you didn't have reservations about your own feelings about the possibility of being a juror on a case like this.

What kind of reservations do you have or what is going on in your mind right now?

Let me explain some things to you about the procedure involved in a case like this.

How do you feel about the death penalty, first of all? Do you have feelings in regards to that? Do you feel like your feelings concerning the death penalty would even allow you to be a juror on a case like this? I guess that is the first question we ought to ask, rather than go into the type of case it is.

How do you feel about the death penalty?

Do you feel like your feelings concerning the death penalty, the taking of another life, would ever allow you to be a juror on a case and return a verdict like that? Some people tell us they could and some people tell us their feelings --

- A It would be hard. It would take a lot of things.
- Or they tell us their religious beliefs wouldn't allow them to be jurors. We ask everyone that off the bat, whether their feelings would allow them to be a juror on the case.

Do you feel your feelings would allow

2 A. Yes.

- How long have you been in favor of the death penalty or believed in the death penalty? How long have you been of that frame of mind?
- A How long have I been of that frame of mird?
- 0. Uh-huh.
 - A Oh, I don't know. I really don't know.
 - Q Would it be fair to say or assume on my part that is pretty much the way you have felt all of your life?
 - A. Yes.
 - But do you feel like, given your feelings

 concerning what happened to your son and why it

 was he was killed or what resulted in his being

 killed, chased by a police officer, and him being

 on a motorcycle, do you feel like your feelings

 in that regard would ever allow you to be on a

 jury and return a verdict you know would result

 in someone receiving the death penalty for having

 killed a police officer?

Do you follow me on what I am saying?

- A No.
 - Q Okay. Do you feel like you could get over here and be a juror on a case where a man was accused

of killing a police officer and return a verdict that would result in someone receiving the death penalty for having killed the police officer?

Do you feel like you could ever do that because of what happened to your son and the facts surrounding his death?

- A If I was convinced he was guilty.
- Okay. So, what you are telling me is, even in spite of what happened to your son, you could be a juror on a capital murder case where someone was charged with having killed a police officer, and you could return a verdict that would result in that man receiving the death penalty for having killed a police officer and put your feelings aside?
- A Yes, sir.
- I just want to be clear in my mind you understand what my obligation is. My obligation is not just to be fair to the Defendant. That is not what my job is as a lawyer. I am representing the family of the police officer who was killed, and that is my job, and I am going to be asking the people over here in the jury box to be giving him a fair trial just like I would anybody else, any citizen who has been wronged by some criminal. I will ask the jurors to do the same thing, to

give my clients a fair trial as well as the Defendant. That is your obligation as a juror.

I think you can see the reservations

I have where a juror like yourself tells me what
happened to your loved one, your son, and, of
course, my obligation, as being the representative
of the family of the officer, I have some reservations
in my own mind as to whether you could be a juror
in the case, and obviously, you had reservations
in your mind as to whether or not you could be fair.
At least, I get the feeling you have reservations
in your mind, and you had to, at least to make a
comment to the judge about it, which I feel it
was right for you to do that. I am not saying it
was wrong. It would have been wrong for you not to
tell us.

See the situation I am in?

- A. Yes.
- Kind of like a situation -- imagine just a hypothetical for me just a second.

Imagine you are being tried for something, for having done some crime, and someone stands up and says, "I hate ladies who wear glasses who have brown hair who come with white flowered blouses to the courtroom, but I would try to put

Do you see where a lawyer representing you under those circumstances might turn to you and say, "I wonder if that person could be on the jury panel. I think they are giving an indication of how they really feel about you. What should we do?"

And that is what I am asking you. I can't go inside your mind. I know you've got reservations in your heart and mind.

If you feel you can't be fair on the case, don't feel like you are any less a citizen than anyone else. You have had a tragic event take place to a loved one in your life. You have a right to feel the way you do feel.

The only thing we ask of you is please reach as deep as you can inside your mind and heart and let me know exactly how you feel.

Could you be a fair and impartial juror on the case, or would you find it hard to be fair and impartial because of the event that has taken place in your life?

A I can be fair, yes.

A Yes.

I want it to be an answer you will bind yourself to for all times.

You see, what we have been doing for five weeks now is selecting jurors to be on this case, and the law does not require any juror to be a juror on a capital murder case, not yourself, Ms. Southern, or any other person who comes before us. Not Mr. Lee who was here a minute earlier or the man before him are selected as jurors on a case like this.

You know how someone winds up being a juror in a case like this? We tell them what is required of them and they tell us they can do it.

We live in a society where no one is required to be a juror unless they basically want to be. If your basic feelings, or if you have feelings of partiality or feelings toward either side in the case, which would keep you from being a juror, all we ask you to do is tell us, because we would not ask you to violate your feelings or conscience and heart, and the only way we know

that is if the juror tells us.

You see how someone winds up being a juror in the case?

A Uh-huh.

That is why I say: Give us an answer that you can keep two weeks from now, not just now.

I know you are surrounded by strangers and you think, "I will get myself in trouble."

That couldn't be further from the truth. The only way you could get yourself in trouble -
I am not talking about legal trouble -- is not to be absolutely true to yourself in the feelings that you have.

You are not any less a citizen because of the tragedy that has come into your life, and because of the feelings that have arisen in your heart and you find because of that tragedy, than any other person that comes into this courtroom whatsoever.

You are entitled to the way you feel and believe.

The only thing we need to know is exactly how you feel, and I don't want you to have any doubts in your mind. I don't want there to be a doubt in your mind and heart as to exactly how

Do you follow me on that?

A Uh-huh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q

- Now, the way that a person receives the death penalty in our state, and, of course, not all murders are punished by the death penalty -- do you know that?
- A Yes, sir.
 - There are only ten instances in which a person can be punished and actually put to death for having committed a murder: To murder while you are breaking into someone else's home; for the rapist to kill his rape victim; for the kidnapper to kill the kidnap victim; for the robber to kill his robbery victim; for an arsonist to murder; for anyone to kill a police officer or fireman in the course of their official duties; to kill for money; murder for hire; for a convict in a penal institution to kill anyone who is employed there at the prison system; or for a convict in the penal institution, while he is escaping, to take anyone else's life during the course of that escape. Those are the only cases where someone can be put to death for having committed one of

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

This man on trial is charged with having killed a police officer during the course of his official duties. The judge mentioned earlier some of the facts of the case.

Do you remember hearing anything or reading anything about the case at all?

- A. I wasn't reading anything -- I wasn't in town at that time.
- This took place on July 13th. Where were you on July 13th? What were you doing?
- A July 13th?
- Q Of this year.
- A I was probably in the state of Tennessee. I was out of state the whole month of July.
- Q Were you visiting someone July 13th?
- A My daughter.
- Your son who used to be a police officer in New Orleans, what is he doing now?
- A He has a cab company in New Orleans.
- Q How long was he a police officer before he left?
- A Eleven years.
- And I take it he left to go into private business in the cab company?
- A Yes, sir.

penalty is by answering the two questions on my left, and depending upon the jurors' answers to those questions -- no one tries to hide anything from you -- depending upon the jurors' answers to those questions, you know exactly what is going to happen to the man on trial.

By your answers and the other jurors, the man will be put to death or receive a life sentence in the Texas Department of Corrections.

If both questions are answered yes, the man will receive the death penalty.

If a no answer is given to either one of the questions, the man receives the life sentence rather than the death penalty.

Okay. All twelve jurors must unanimously agree that is what their verdict should be before a question can be answered yes, but only ten before a question can be answered no.

Do you follow me on the distinction there?

A Yes.

Q Ten to answer a question no; all twelve to answer

Now, the juror answers those questions, regardless of their personal feelings -- did you know that?

Probably you didn't.

Let me explain how that works. You could be a juror on a case where a man had committed capital murder, and after you heard all the facts of the case, you felt in your heard and mind the man shouldn't receive the death penalty, yet all the evidence indicated to you that your answers to those questions should be yes. Do you know what your obligations should be under those circumstances?

- A What?
- To answer both questions yes and put your personal feelings aside.

Do you see how that could be a very, very difficult decision for a juror to reach and to perform? Do you see how difficult that might become?

- A Yes.
- Q The law also says that jurors have to take an oath, and that will be an oath you will have to take, Ms. Southern, before you serve on this jury

panel, that you will not let your answers to these questions be affected by the punishments the man might receive.

25 İ

Some jurors say because of the type of case it is, or because of the fact the man might receive the death penalty, I would have to be really, really convinced, in fact, have all doubt removed from my mind before I could answer all these questions yes because of my feelings about the type of punishment that the man might receive, and the law says that jurors do not have to have all doubt removed from their mind or be convinced to where all doubt is removed from their mind, only believe beyond a reasonable doubt that is what their answers should be, and they are to put their personal feelings aside.

I will get back to that in just a second.

Let me ask you to look at this first question; if you haven't had an opportunity to read those, go ahead and read them. I want to talk to you about them.

This first question would ask you to make a determination about the conduct of the man on trial that has been found guilty of capital murder.

Do you follow me on that first question?

A Yes.

. 14

- Let me give you a hypothetical example of how the first question applies in a hypothetical case.

 Okay?
- A. Uh-huh.
- Imagine a man who goes into a convenience store
 to rob the person there and he goes inside with a
 loaded gun. It is early in the morning. He takes
 the cash from the lady working there. She turns
 all the money over to him and she is scared like
 any person should be, and he, not thinking there
 are other witnesses around, fires two bullets and
 kills her, shoots her once in the chest and once
 in the head, and she dies.

Unbeknownst to him, she steps on an alarm and notifies the police and they are waiting outside the store.

That man has committed robbery-murder, which under the laws of our state is capital murder. That is what we talked about earlier.

2 ||

A Yes.

The jury, after finding this man guilty of robbing her and killing her, would then have to decide, in answering this first question, as to whether the conduct on the part of the man, the firing of the bullets into her body in the portions of her body that were struck, was that deliberately done and was it done with the reasonable expectation that she would die.

Do you see where Question 1 is a twopart question?

- A Yes.
- Q Do you feel like that is the type of question you would be able to answer, depending upon the evidence that you would hear?
- A I suppose so.
- Well, when you say, "I suppose so," I don't mean to argue with you, but we need to have a definite answer now. We can't put you in the jury box supposing you can do it.

I am not trying to pick at you. All I am trying to do is plead with you; if you feel you can be a juror, tell us. Make these definite decisions in your mind now, and if you feel you

cannot tell us that, now please do not put yourself in the position of being a juror if you feel you could not do it.

- A I had rather not serve on it.
- I get those feelings, but the only way I can do anything about it or ask the judge to do anything about it as far as excusing you from jury service is for you to tell me. We have been talking a bit, and I am not trying to trick you and I know you have some reservations about being on this case and about serving as a juror.

Can you tell us what is going on in your mind and how you feel?

- A Well, like I say, if he was found guilty -- do you want me to tell you I believe in the death penalty?
 - No, ma'am. I don't want you to tell me that. If
 that is the way you feel in your heart, that is
 what I want you to tell me, but I do not want
 to put words in your mouth. I do not want to get
 you to agree with me at all, because I am not the
 one who has to be a juror on this case. You are,
 only if you feel you can be, and what I am asking
 you to do is please do not put yourself in the
 position of being a juror on this case unless you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

. 22

23

24

25

If you can't do it, if you don't feel you can be a juror, tell us you can't and tell us why you can't, but please do not agree with me. I don't want you to do that unless you really do agree with me.

But I am not trying to talk you into anything.

- Like I say, I'd rather not, under the circumstances. If it wasn't in a murder trial, yes, I could sit up here and do my job, but I don't think I really could.
- Because of the type of case it is, a capital murder case?
- A. Yes.
- And also because it involves the death of a police officer?
- That is right.
- When you say you had rather not -- and I am not Q. quarreling with you -- you understand me. not -- can you be as specific as you can be about what type of feelings you are having in your mind and heart right now?

Can you please be as specific as you can as to what is going on in your mind, what

A Yes.

1 |

2

3

4

5 i

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Can you be as specific as you can about what your feelings are concerning the death penalty? How will that affect you as being a juror on a case like this?

I know it is difficult to speak in front of people who are strange like this, but as best as you can do it, can you tell us what your feelings are about the death penalty and how that causes you difficulty being a juror on such a case?

- A Well --
- Q Just say it the best you can.
- A I would have to be positive, sure that it was deliberate and that he deserved the death penalty.
- What would it take to make you positive and be sure like you say?

Of course, that is what I would expect of every juror, to want to be positive and sure, but what would it take to be positive and sure to convince Ms. Southern?

A Well, I guess I would just have to see all the

Okay. This question over here is a question that asks you to make a determination about a man's conduct.

Do you feel you could do that, based on the evidence? After you had heard the evidence, do you feel like you could answer that question?

A Yes.

Now, this second question asks you to make a determination about what type of person is on trial. It is a little different from the first question. The second question asks you to make a determination as to whether or not there is a probability. Does a probability exist that the man on trial is the type of person who would criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society.

Before you can answer the second question yes, you have to believe there is a probability, not a certainty -- and I think you know why -- the only person I know of in this entire world that could tell us what a person will certainly do in the future is God Almighty himself, and you, as a juror, will not have to put yourself in the

You are asked, if you can, you are asked to make the best judgment decision you can about the kind of person on trial. Is he the type of person that would probably commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society?

And criminal acts means any type of criminal acts of violence: criminal mischief, assaults, burglaries, rapes, murders, et cetera, et cetera, all the criminal acts of violence.

Is he the type of person that would probably do those types of things?

Do you follow me on what the second question asks?

- A I would still have to have the evidence and stuff.
- Q I understand. I understand.

Is there anything about the way the second question is worded that would make you feel like it would be -- make it impossible to be answered?

- A No, sir.
- Do you feel like you could answer that question yes or no depending upon the evidence you would hear?

Now, the judge will tell you, and I am going to tell you, that you do not have to be convinced beyond all doubt, any doubt, or a shadow of a doubt before you can say by your verdict that a man is guilty of a crime or before you can answer these questions yes. You do not have to believe beyond all doubt, all doubt, or a shadow of a doubt.

The only burden of proof is to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you follow me on that?

- A Uh-huh.
 - The only thing I want to ask you is this: Some jurors come in and say, "Mr. Moen, I understand you have to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, but before I could answer those questions, you will have to convince me beyond all doubt. If I have any doubt at all, I will not be able to answer those questions yes knowing he would receive the death penalty," and that is fine.

People are entitled to feel that way, but they have to tell us.

Is that the way Ms. Southern feels? Is that what you would have to have? Would all doubt have to be removed from your mind? Would

٠. ا

you have to be convinced beyond all doubt before

you could answer yes, given your feelings

concerning the death penalty and given your feelings

about the type of case where a man is charged

with having killed a police officer?

Did you follow the question, what I was asking you?

- A If there wasn't a doubt in my mind? Yes.
- Q If there was a doubt in your mind -- I didn't understand.
- A If there wasn't -- if I could be convinced myself after the facts were laid out that he was guilty, yes.
- If you had any doubts in your mind, what would you do? Would you answer the questions no if you had doubts in your mind?
- A Yes.
- You understand that the burden of proof is not proof beyond all doubt. Okay?

What I am getting back to again is this: As a lawyer who represents a family of the police officer who was killed, the judge will tell you my obligation is to prove to the jurors -- and I have a right to expect there will be twelve jurors here who will act, if I have

I understand from what you are telling me, though, before you could find someone guilty of capital murder or before you could answer those questions yes, would you have to have all doubt removed from your mind and be convinced beyond all doubt before you could answer the questions yes?

- A In my mind, I wouldn't have a doubt if the facts was out there.
- Q Okay. I am not -- let's just take the -- let's not talk in terms of hypothetical facts.

Let's just talk in terms of general concepts of law.

The burden is to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt, not to remove all doubt from your mind.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

I have said it a couple of times already. The proof is beyond a reasonable doubt.

The only thing I want to make sure of

is this: If I prove to you the answers to these questions should be yes and I prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, not all doubt or a shadow of a doubt or any doubt, but prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, would you answer the questions yes or would you answer them no because I had not proven them beyond all doubt?

- A It would be yes.
- Q Would I have to prove to Ms. Southern beyond all doubt before she would answer those questions yes?

MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, objection.

This is repetitious.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- Q (By Mr. Moen) I am sorry.
- A What was the last one?
- Q Would I have to prove to Ms. Southern beyond all doubt before she could answer those questions yes?
- A. No.
- Q Okay, then. I am a little confused.

I thought you indicated to me you had to be convinced and not have any doubt in your mind, and we talked about the burden of proof and you used the phrase a couple of times that made me kind of jump back a little bit and be scared.

You indicated you would have to be convinced, you know, beyond all doubt and have all doubt removed from your mind.

Do you understand you may have doubts about what type of man is on trial, about whether there is a probability, but there is no obligation to convince you beyond all doubt, and it can be perfectly proper for a juror to have doubts about Questions 1 and 2 and still answer the questions yes as long as the jurors believe beyond a reasonable doubt that is what their answers should be?

There is no requirement all doubt be removed from your mind, and the only thing I want to be real clear on is to be sure Ms. Southern would not hold Lawyer Bax and myself and the family of Officer Harris to be convinced beyond all doubt. Only God can do that.

Do you understand that?

- A Yes.
- You may have some lingering doubts about these questions, but it is unfair for you to expect us to prove it beyond any, all, or a shadow of a doubt, but if that is the way you feel --

Is that the way you feel, or is that

- A I would rather not have a doubt about it. I want to be sure of myself.
- Q Okay. I understand that.

I mean, I think you can see from Question No. 2, just by the way the question is written, that you may always have some type of doubt in your mind about Question No. 2 in your answer because it asks you basically to make a prediction about a person, doesn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q Based on the evidence, you know, about the man.

Do you feel like you would ever be able to answer that question yes regardless of what evidence you would hear, or never be able to answer that question yes because of what it asks you to do?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Objection, Your Honor.

It's been answered twice by her.

- Q (By Mr. Moen) Do you follow what I was getting at or did that interruption break your train of thought?
- A Well, if I convinced myself, yes.
- The only thing I was getting at is this: See, this question asks you to make a determination

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

knowingly take another life such as in the hypothetical we have talked about, the killing of the cashier at a convenience store.

What is your definition of the phrase "deliberate"? Do you have a definition for that? What does deliberate mean to you?

- To do it intentionally.
- If you had returned a verdict and found someone, in fact, guilty of intentionally taking another human being's life in the course of committing one of the crimes we have talked about or in the course of killing a police officer during the course of his official duties, would you automatically answer Question 1 yes?
- Yes.
- When it came down to answering Question No. 2, if you had, in fact, been convinced from the evidence that this man, in fact, had done what he was charged with, robbery-murder, rape-murder, or murder of a police officer or fireman, and you heard from all the evidence in your mind that he had done that act, what would your answer be to Question No. 2?
- Yes.
- And you would answer that question as well?

-14

- Okay. Would that be enough of an indicator for you, if you were convinced the man had, in fact, committed the awful type of crime he was charged with; would that be enough of an indicator to you to indicate what kind of man that man on trial was?
- A. Yes.
- You will have to use -- one of the things I wanted to point out to you, where we got these questions from, and I don't want to take credit for them.

It was the legislature who drew these questions up for you to use and jurors to use in cases like this. You will have to use your own definitions for these words. That is why I ask the definitions. You will have to use your own definitions for probability, deliberately, et cetera. Okay?

Let me talk to you about a couple of other things.

You have some obligations as a juror on a case like this. You have to presume -- one of the things the judge will have to tell you, tell you, Ms. Southern, and the rest of the jurors is that before you hear the evidence to

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

help you decide whether the man is guilty or not guilty, the judge will tell you the Defendant is entitled to a presumption of innocence, it is called.

As he sits here today, he is presumed innocent, and what the judge will ask you to do, if you can, is presume the Defendant is innocent and not feel like or think that he is guilty just because he has been indicted by a Grand Jury, that they have heard some type of evidence and returned an indictment charging him with the death of an officer. The fact he has two lawyers representing him and finds himself in this courtroom is no evidence of guilt. The Defendant is presumed to be innocent.

Do you feel you can do that, or do you feel that where there is smoke, there is fire, or if the Grand Jury indicted him, there must be some evidence he did something? The Grand Jury indicted him with this crime, and here he is in the courtroom represented by two lawyers, and there's got to be evidence about something?

What are your feelings about that?

- A. I guess he is innocent until proven quilty.
- Okay. Good. Q.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, did you know at any criminal trial the Defendant doesn't have to testify unless he wants to?

- Yes.
- Did you know the Defendant can remain silent at his own trial if he wants to, and if you are a juror on this case or any other case, you might have to decide the facts on what you hear from the witness stand and not anything from the Defendant?

How do you think that might make you feel, if you didn't hear anything from the Defendant, if he chose to remain silent, even though charged with a very, very serious crime?

Do you think that would affect you at all?

- Well, I don't know.
- You know, a lot of people who come down just like yourself don't realize the Defendant, if he doesn't want to, doesn't have to testify at his own trial, and for whatever reason, can remain silent, and the Defense doesn't have to put on witnesses if he doesn't want to.

They can, if they feel it's the best strategy, they can remain totally silent and not

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

call vitnesses if they don't want to.

Seems like it would be a crazy thing to do, but if they feel it is the best thing, they can do that.

What do you think you might do as a juror if you heard witnesses called by the State and never heard the Defendant call witnesses to prove he wasn't guilty? What type of verdict do you think you would reach under those circumstances?

- I don't know.
- It is pretty hard to do much of anything except find a person quilty if he didn't put on any type of tastimony,

How do you feel about that?

- When the lawyers give all the evidence?
- No, I am talking about a situation where they don't put on anything, remain silent, don't call witnesses on their behalf; the Defendant doesn't testify, and the only witnesses you hear from are the witnesses called by the State.
- I don't know. A.
- Okay. How do you think you might feel if you were confronted with a situation like that?
 - I don't follow you here.

Q Okay. Well, I am trying to find out what your feelings are concerning a situation that comes up more often than you suspect at these criminal trials we have, where people like yourself aren't aware of the fact, you know, the Defendant doesn't have to prove anything. We has the opportunity to call whatever witnesses he wants, if he wants to, or he doesn't have to call any witnesses.

He can get on the witness stand and testify if he wants to, or he doesn't have to, and I am trying to see what your feelings would be.

What do you think you might do if the only witnesses you heard from were called by the State, called by Mr. Bax or myself, and you never heard a single witness called on the part of the Defendant, or the Defendant never even testified?

How do you think you might feel? Do you think you might hold that against the Defendant or --

A Yes.

- Q For not having explained his side of it or offered any type of defense?
- A Yes.
- A Do you feel like in your heart and mind at

A Yes.

- 14

That is a pretty natural reaction. I don't quarrel with your feeling that way. That is a fairly normal reaction.

I know you are a mother and raised your children, and I am sure you resolved your feelings with the children the way most mothers did and listened to both sides of the story and made a decision?

- A Yes.
- The judge will charge you now about the credibility of witnesses. He will talk to you about --

What he will tell you in that regard is as a juror, you have a right to believe or disbelieve everything a witness says even though the witness is under oath, and that sounds crazy, doesn't it, to think you would find yourself as a juror listening to someone who raised their right hand saying, "So help me God, I will tell the truth," and then disbelieve what they might

say, even though they had taken an oath to tell the truth?

to do so.

But as a juror, you have the right to do that because I think you realize, Ms. Southern, that we live in an unperfect world, that there are many people in the world who will not tell the truth, even though they have taken an oath

I think it would be great if we lived in a world where the opposite situation existed, where everyone was a truth-teller, so jurors should decide.

The only thing the judge will tell you is in deciding whether you believe or disbelieve things, you shouldn't give anyone more belief because of his or her job, police officers as well.

Do you feel you could put aside any feelings you have towards the police because of what happened to your son?

- A Sure.
- Q And judge them as you would any other person?
- A Sure.
- That applies to the Defendant, too. If the Defendant decides he wants to testify, you judge

him like any other witness. Does he make sense or not make sense? Should I believe him or not?

You might, as well, find yourself in that type of situation, where four or five witnesses are pointing the finger and saying, "I saw this man do this," and he gets on the stand and says, "I didn't do it. He did it. Someone else did it. It wasn't me."

Those are the type of things jurors decide every day.

- A Uh-huh.
- I saw you tentatively shake your head. I take it you could do that?
- A. Yes.
- Now, let me talk to you about one final thing, and that is in regards to the range of punishment for the offense of murder.

The reason I talk about it is because murder is a lesser included offense of capital murder.

What that means is basically this:

You could be a juror on a capital murder case
where someone was charged with capital murder,
and you could actually find the person guilty of
the offense of murder.

How would that come about? I need to give you an example.

Let's take the hypothetical situation where a man was charged with robbery-murder where he killed the cashier. Let's say he was indicted for capital murder and then you hear for the first time that what really happened there at the store was that the man had been dating that woman for a couple of years, and she was getting ready to break up with him and was running around with another man, and he was terrifically upset and angry about it, that he had followed her to the store, argued with her earlier that day, followed her to the convenience store with a pistol, got angry again, and shot and killed her.

Do you see where that could not be a capital murder because that is not robbery-murder, but it would be murder?

- A Uh-huh.
- Q But the jurors' verdict in that case should be murder, but not capital murder.

Now, the range of punishment for murder is different from capital murder.

The range of punishment for murder is five to ninety-nine years or life, and the jury

Do you follow me on that?

A Uh-huh.

17 |

Can you imagine any set of circumstances in your mind, imagine the most sympathetic murder case you can, where someone else intentionally and knowingly has taken another person's life, and imagine the most sympathetic case you can, and can you imagine you, as a juror, if you had found someone guilty of murder, being able to consider, if you felt it were a proper case, being able to recommend probation?

Can you imagine any murder case where you would be able to do that as a juror?

A Put them on probation?

No.

I am not trying to change your mind. You are entitled to feel that way, but I want you to think of the most sympathetic case where a man or woman has taken another's life, a battered wife case or facts that amount to a mercy killing.

Are you telling ma that in the most sympathetic case you can think of, probation is

Is that the way you feel?

A Yes.

I hope for the period of time we have talked, you understand that I have not been trying -- at least, I hope you don't think I have -- I have not been trying to change your mind at all. I have been trying to dig at you. I don't want to use the phrase pick at you, but I have been trying to pick at you to answer out how you feel.

There are not any circumstances you can think of where you feel probation is proper?

- A No.
- Q Is that a fair statement?

MR. MOEN: Judge, I think that is all I have, and based on the responses of the juror, we would challenge.

THE COURT: Mr. Elizondo?

MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, I would like to know under what theory he is challenging. The last response or --

THE COURT: That would be my assumption, based upon the fact she could not consider probation.

--

MR. ELIZONDO: Judge, in --

MR. MOEN: In light of all her

responses, particularly responses to answers 1 and 2 as well as her feelings regarding the possibility of the Defendant not testifying, not testifying as well as 35.13, which I think is the section that says we are entitled to rely on any aspect of the law; we are entitled to rely on it for punishment.

EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:

- Ms. Southern, how are you doing?
- A Okay.
- Q It's been a long day, hasn't it?
- A Uh-huh.
- I need to talk to you a little bit about what

 Mr. Moen is talking about. It's a little -- I

 hate to go straight into it, but murder carries

 a wide range of punishment, and it is almost unfair

 to even give the question, can you give probation

 in a murder case, without giving hypotheticals,

 you know, because there are many ways murder is

 committed in our state.

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me give a couple of hypotheticals.

Let's assume a husband and wife have been married for fifty years. The husband gets real sick. He is being supported only by lifesupport systems, and being fed through the veins. He has been in the hospital, let's say, for nine or ten months. This is costing the family a lot of money, using up retirement and is going to leave the poor wife destitute.

So the man talks to the wife and says to her, "Look, I have had a long life. Go ahead and pull the plug in the life-support system. This way, you can at least have some money left over so you can live on it, " and the wife pulls the plug and he dies.

Under our law, she has committed murder. She has intentionally and knowingly taken a life of somebody.

- Uh-huh. A,
- Let's assume in that hypothetical it goes to a jury and that they consider probation.

In that hypothetical, could you consider probation in that hypothetical, or any kind of murder case?

MR. MOEN: Excuse me. I object to him

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

example. A husband and wife have been married.

The wife is working all the time, and the husband

doesn't work. His favorite occupation is to come in drunk every night and beat his wife up, beat the children and abuse everybody there. That is all he does. He drinks, wastes all his moneyy on drinks, and comes home and beats his wife up every day.

One day he comes home again, and the wife says, "I am not taking any more of this. I'm not taking any more," and she kills him. And then she is prosecuted for murder.

You can see in that case how a jury might consider probation.

Let me give you another case. A husband comes home and sees his two children beaten up and killed and his wife has been sexually molested, and right before she dies, she tells her husband, "Joe Blow down the street did it."

He goes to Joe Blow's house, knocks on the door, and Joe Blow opens the door and he says, "Did you do this to my wife and children," and he says, "Yes, I did, and I enjoyed it." The husband shoots and kills him and that, too, is murder. And hypothetically, let's say the jury considers probation.

I am not trying to limit you to these

facts and hypotheticals I have given you, but use your imagination and see if you can think of a proper case in your own mind where you can consider probation, not give it, but consider probation.

- A On murder charges?
- Q Uh-huh.
- A Nope.
- Q You couldn't in the hypotheticals I have given you?
- A. No.

MR. MOEN: I think her answer is very definite, Judge, with the hypothetical confronted her by the Defense attorney, and for that reason, we renew our challenge.

MR. ELIZONDO: Let me go to the other challenge and come to this one.

THE COURT: We have a challenge.

MR. MOEN: Regardless of the other challenge, Bowen versus State is extremely clear as to what action the State can take where the juror has given a response like she has in regard to the answers she has given.

THE COURT: Ms. Southern, just so it is clear in my mind, there are no circumstances

1	where you would consider probation in a murder
2	case?
3	THE JUROR: No, sir.
4	THE COURT: I will sustain the State's
5	challenge.
6	Ms. Southern, you will be excused from
7	jury service.
8	Thank you.
9	THE JUROR: Thank you.
10	MR. MOEN: Thank you, Ms. Southern.
11	
12	
13	
14	H. R. BRIDGES,
	was called as a prospective juror and responded to
15	and responded to
15	questions propounded as follows:
16	
16	questions propounded as follows:
16 17 18	questions propounded as follows:
16 17 18 19	questions propounded as follows: EXAMINATION
16 17 18 19 20	questions propounded as follows: EXAMINATION QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:
16 17 18 19 20 21	questions propounded as follows: EXAMINATION QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX: THE COURT: Relax, and hopefully, you
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX: THE COURT: Relax, and hopefully, you won't be here too long.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX: THE COURT: Relax, and hopefully, you won't be here too long. Q (By Mr. Bax) Good afternoon, Dr. Bridges.

Yes.

1	Ų Ų	old you testify in that case?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q	And were you a fact witness or a character
4		witness?
5	A.	Fact witness.
6	õ	I am not trying to pick at you, but I am trying
7		to know a little about you, and both sides want
8		to know.
9		Were you a witness for the Defense
10		or for the State?
11	A.	I was called by the State.
12	Q	What was the Defendant's name?
13	A.	Freddie Thompson.
14	Q	Freddie Thompson?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q	Do you recall what court that was in?
17	A.	No, I do not.
18	Ŏ.	Do you recall either the prosecutor's name
19	A.	No, I do not.
20	ð	When you say a fact witness, were you a fact
21		witness as to the guilt or innocence of Freddie
22		Thompson?
23	A.	It involved more of his medical condition, his
24		medical circumstances and physical abilities.
25	A.	As to whether he would be capable, in his condition

murder, they can receive one of two punishments, either life imprisonment or the death penalty; nothing less than that.

we talk to people individually so we can get to know them and let them feel as free as they can and be honest with their answers.

You see, the only way a person becomes a juror in this case is frankly by the way they answer their questions and whether they themselves believe they can participate in that type of trial.

You see, we have many different types of people that come before us. Some people say, "I believe in the death penalty, and if I believe someone guilty, I would calmly assess the death penalty.

That one is too strong to be a juror.

Other people come in and say, "I could never assess the death penalty. There is no way I could do that. My religious background, the way I was taught, would not allow me to participate in a trial." That person is not qualified to be a juror either.

What we are looking for is twelve people who can listen to the evidence and return

the death penalty without doing violence to their beliefs.

You see, I guess a lot of people could come in and say, "I disagree with the death penalty, but I can still sit on the jury."

That would be in violation of their beliefs, where the law said, "I can believe in the death penalty," but their personal beliefs said, "I can't."

So, with that introduction, tell us how you believe about the death penalty, whether being a doctor, spending a lifetime in saving people, whether you could participate in a procedure which may ultimately go directly in contrast to the life of a person saving the life of an individual.

- It would be a direct contrast, not just my training, my beliefs, my professional oath which starts out my training, and after you have spent all your energies and efforts in preserving lives, there is no way that I could go with the death penalty.
- My father is a surgeon. I have talked to him.

 This is about the sixth death penalty case I have sat on, and I have talked with him about it on occasion, and he is of the same frame of mind

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Okay.

been in that vein.

3069

But as long as I can remember, my convictions have

But we are not here to debate the pros and cons of capital punishment, and I thank you for being as honest as you have been with me in telling us how deep-rooted these feelings are, going through your profession, but even as a child growing up, these were instilled by your parents and what not.

Can you envision any situation where Dr. Bridges could participate in a death penalty verdict?

A No, I can't.

We can sit here, and I can go through some pretty gory fact situations, and I am sure you, as most people, have probably seen some situations that would make people sick.

Is there any fact situation, no matter how gory I can make it, thirty children being killed, that would change your position on the death penalty?

- A. No.
- Q I have to take you through some fundamental steps

- A. My feelings about the death penalty are still the same.
- Q I am sorry?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. My feelings about the death penalty are still the same.
- Would those strong feelings you have prevent you from even finding a person guilty of capital murder?

Some people say it would; some people say it wouldn't. They say the problems come in when we get to the punishment.

- A It would influence me, because that is still at the end of the tunnel.
- Let me ask it this way: We always hear terms like bias and prejudice and partiality and impartiality, and usually when we hear those terms, we think of them as bad terms, but I think you will agree we

.

all have biases and prejudices, and there are areas where we can be impartial and areas where we cannot be impartial.

Do you feel that perhaps your feelings toward the death penalty and the opposition to it would affect your decision to be impartial in listening to the facts of the case -- and I don't expect, Doctor, for you to say, "I would consciously disregard my oath as a juror," but can you see where subconsciously, because of your feelings as a juror, it may affect the way you listen to the evidence, the way you evaluate all the evidence?

- A I find that question still difficult to answer.
- It is a very difficult question to answer.

I think what you are telling me is, in a proper case, if you believed beyond a reasonable doubt, you could find a person guilty of capital murder, which would just, if you do that, that is either life or death.

- A That probably exists.
- Let's assume, just to make-believe now, that you have found someone guilty of capital murder, you and eleven other jurors. You have heard the evidence, and though perhaps reluctantly, you

participated in the guilty verdict with the eleven other jurors. Okay?

At the punishment stage, as the judge explained to you earlier, these two questions would be submitted to the jury. The jury doesn't go back there and say, "Judge, we assess the punishment at death," or, "Judge, we assess the punishment at life," but by the way these two questions are handled by the jury, the judge must, by law, sentence the Defendant to life or death.

First of all, I take it if this

procedure were such you had to say life or death

in your verdict, you could never say death, no

matter what the facts were?

- A That is true.
- Can you ever envision yourself answering both these questions yes, no matter what the evidence was, knowing two yes answers would require the judge to sentence the man to death?
- A I can't see answering both of them yes.
- For the record again, so someone else one day will understand, if the evidence showed Question I should be yes, could you answer it yes knowing one more yes answer would result in the death penalty?

A I would probably fail to answer.

Assume with me that you had answered Question 1
yes. Okay? And you get down to Question No. 2,
and you know in your mind if you answer that one
yes, with a guilty verdict behind you, and with the
answer to No. 1 yes, if the answer to No. 2 is
yes, he is going to receive the death penalty,
and, of course, as a juror, you have to assume
that punishment will be carried out someday.

Could you ever answer Qustion 2 yes in that regard?

- A I couldn't be a party to it.
- Okay, so no matter what the facts were, even if
 the evidence showed the answers should be yes,
 you would either fail to answer it or answer it
 no because your personal beliefs would never allow
 you to answer these questions yes; is that
 correct?
- A That is correct.
- Now, Mr. Elizondo or Mr. Hernandez in a few seconds may have a few questions of you. I am not going to go into gory situations or tell you a guy may have been to the penitentiary twenty

ļ	
1	Thank you very much.
2	MR. BAX: Thank you, Doctor.
3	
4	
5	
6	CYNTHIA MAIRE MATTHEWS,
7	was called as a prospective juror and responded to
8	questions propounded as follows:
9	
0	EXAMINATION
1	
2	QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:
3	THE COURT: Are you ready?
4	MR. MOEN: Yes, sir.
.5	THE COURT: Ms. Matthews, if you would,
6	just relax. We will be through shortly.
7	You may proceed.
.8	Q (By Mr. Moen) Ms. Matthews, my name is Bob Moen.
9	I am with the District Attorney's Office here in
0.	town, and seated behind me is a fellow by the name
21	of Dick Bax, also with the District Attorney's
22	Office, and together, we will be representing the
23	family of a man named J. D. Harris.
4	It is alleged that back on July 13th
25	of this year, he was killed by Ricardo Aldape

The judge asked if you had read or heard anything about the case, and I take it from your silence you had not read or heard anything about the case at all?

A Just what I read in the paper and knew.

There is nothing wrong with having heard about a case, read about it, seeing something on television or having read something in the paper, et cetera.

The only reason we ask in the first place is to see if jurors have formed an opinion that would interfere with their being a juror.

There is nothing wrong with their having read or heard something.

What I want to do is find out what your feelings are, find out how you feel about some of the aspects of the law that will come up during a trial like this, see how you feel.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to ask me. If you have disagreements, anything at all we can clear up for you, please ask me. The last thing we want to do, if we can

avoid it, is have jurors have questions when they have passed into the box, have questions they can't discuss that they can ask us now.

as well. There are no right or wrong answers at this time. It is informal and it should be an informal proceeding. I know it is difficult at times to think of this as being an informal proceeding. You are here in a room with six or seven different strangers, almost feel you have done something, because you are here in a room trying to answer questions, but it is informal, and there are no right or wrong answers, only the way you feel.

I want to ask you in a second your feelings concerning the death penalty, whether or not your feelings concerning the death penalty would allow you to be a juror on a capital murder case and return a verdict you know would result in someone receiving the death penalty, whether you could do that or not because of your feelings on the death penalty.

But before I do that, let me explain something to you about capital murder cases.

Not all murders that take place in our

capital murders are only murders that take place during the commission of one of five crimes: First of all, a murder in a burglary; a rapist to kill his rape victim; kidnapping; robbery; arson-murder; a policeman or a fireman killed; a convict to kill in a penal institution, people we employ to work in a penal institution; or for a convict to kill anyone while escaping; or murder for hire.

Those are the only murders that fall within the definition of capital murder, and, of course, the way a person receives punishment for that crime is by people answering questions that appear to my left.

With that in mind, can you tell me what your feelings are concerning the death penalty? Would they allow you to be a juror in a case like that?

- A I believe in the death penalty.
- Q Is that the way you have felt most of your adult life?
- A That is the way I have felt.
- Q You've got, obviously, still the majority of your

to whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty, and you will reach your verdict based on the evidence at that time and you will go with the other jurors and decide what your verdict should be.

If, in fact, you vote guilty, you will come out and take your seat in the jury box and we will proceed to the second phase of the trial, and the second phase is devoted to what the jurors' answers to these two questions ought to be.

At the second phase or punishment
phase, the law allows Mr. Bax and myself the
opportunity to present additional evidence. The
jury can hear about crimes which the man has
committed for which he has not yet been convicted,
but anything within the confines of the United
States, or the Constitution, anything deemed
admissible by the Court for the jury to hear to
decide what their answers to these questions
should be. That is the last thing the jury does.
They take all the evidence they have heard from
both parts of the trial and go to the jury room
and decide what their answers will be.

Two yes answers and the man will receive

the death penalty. A no answer to either question and the man will receive a life sentence rather than the death penalty.

Have you had a chance to read these questions to yourself earlier?

- A Yes, sir.
- Let's talk about the first question to start off with. The first question would ask you, as a juror, to make a determination about the conduct of the man on trial. It asks was his conduct that caused the death of the deceased deliberate and was that conduct done with the reasonable expectation that the deceased or another would die.

It's actually a two-part question, and it asks you to make a determination about the conduct of the man that the jury has found guilty of capital murder. Was that conduct done with the reasonable expectation the deceased would die?

Let me give you a hypothetical example and show you how that question applies. It is a question the jury answers based on the facts they have heard that have indicated to them they should find the man guilty of capital murder.

Let me give you an example. Imagine

a man who goes into a convenience store in the early morning hours and confronts a cashier and she is afraid as anyone would be. He points the pistol at her and demands the money and she turns the money over to him. It appears to him at that time she is the only witness. Rather than be identified at a lineup later, he decides to shoot her and kill her. He shoots her once in the head and chest, and she dies.

Unbeknownst to him, she steps on an alarm and the police are waiting outside and he is arrested. He has committed capital murder, robbery-murder.

The question would be the same as in every type of capital murder case; what type of conduct was there on that man's part?

When you take a loaded pistol, point it at another human being and fire bullets into their body, is it reasonable to expect a human being will die when shot in the portions of his or her body, when shot with a loaded gun?

It is pretty much a common sense, straightforward question answered based on the facts of the crime itself.

Now, the answer to the question,

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

however, is not automatically yes just because the jurors have found the man guilty of capital murder.

Let me give you another example of how the answer could be no, even though a person was convicted by a jury of capital murder. Okay?

Imagine the same circumstance, same hypothetical, but inject something different.

Let's say the person who is inside and kills the cashier is a thirty-five-year-old excon who has managed to talk a seventeen-year-old into going with him, and the seventeen-year-old goes with eyes open, knows they are going to rob, and let's say the thirty-five-year-old even provides the weapon for the seventeen-year-old, says stand outside and any cars that come by, let me know. I am going in and get the money. Nothing will happen. We will split it up.

He's got no records or convictions, the seventeen-year-old doesn't. He hears a shot, has no idea of what is going on inside the store, throws his gun down and flees.

Under our law of parties, however, people who act together to commit a crime can't

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

come to the courthouse later, can't say, I was really surprised. A surprise defense can't cut People who commit a crime together are equally responsible for the crime committed, but I think you can see, when the jury was deciding under the seventeen-year-old if he were convicted under our law of parties of capital murder, I think you can see where your answers would be different. There would be no conduct that caused her death. Sure, there was conduct that caused the commission of the robbery, but the part that caused her death, was it deliberate? I think you can see how the jury could arrive at different conclusions to No. 1, even though they had found the Defendant guilty of the offense of capital murder.

That is why I mentioned earlier, even though a man is found guilty, or woman is found guilty of capital murder, it doesn't mean that either one of the questions is automatically answered yes, but it is a determination the jury makes based on the evidence. They decide what part did that person play in the man or woman's death and was that part that they played deliberate conduct done with the reasonable

Now, the second question is different from the first. It asks you to make a determination about the type of person on trial. What type of person do we find ourselves in the courtroom with? Is the man on trial for capital murder the type of person where there exists a probability this person would commit these types of criminal acts of violence, and would those acts constitute a continuing threat to society?

The legislature drew these questions up and did not give us a definition for these words, and you will have to use your own definitions for those words, probability and society.

The only thing I wanted to point out to you is the word probability is not certainty, and I think you realize the only person in the entire world who could predict to a certainty is the Almighty himself, and he will not be a witness in this case, and you are not required as jurors to put yourselves in the position of playing God.

fou are asked, however, to make the best judgment decision you can about the man on trial based on all the evidence you hear as to

Now, the phrase "criminal acts of violence" is all-inclusive. It includes any type of criminal act of violence, from the most minor assault to the most serious type of violence we can talk of. It involves crimes against property, burglary, breaking and entering motor vehicles, et cetera, any of those types of acts. Is there a probability those were the type of acts he would engage in? Would they constitute a continuing threat to society?

I think you realize from your common sense, like all the other jurors do, once a man is found guilty of capital murder, the place he winds up spending the rest of his life in until the sentence is carried out is the penitentiary. The only thing I wanted you to be aware of is that -- and if you agree or disagree with me, that is fine -- there are people in the penitentiary, people we ask to work in the penitentiary to keep our prison system working for us, and we ask those people, and I think they have a right to expect

Would you agree or disagree that convicts who are serving their debt to society have a right to be free from fear of being harmed by being confined with other convicts who have committed crimes and find themselves in the penitentiary as well?

A Yes.

As to those Questions 1 and 2, you will have to use your own definitions for the words that appear in the questions.

Do you have any questions of me about 1 and 2 now that we have had a chance to go over them?

- A Not really.
- Do you feel those are the type of questions you could answer? Whether you answer yes or no, that is your business, but do you feel those are the type of questions you could answer depending upon the evidence you might hear?
- A I could answer them.
- Q Okay. Let me talk to you about some of the things required of you by your jury service.

The judge will give you five or six

things in writing. After all of the evidence is presented at the first phase, the guilt-or-innocence phase of the trial, the judge will type you up on a legal-size piece of paper the law that applies to a capital murder case, and the way the jury reaches a verdict, they take all the evidence and read the law and see if the facts fall within the law the judge has given them.

The judge will put in five or six things that directly affect the jury. He will tell you first of all the Grand Jury indictment is no evidence of the Defendant's guilt. The jury is not to consider that as any evidence of the Defendant's guilt.

The analogy I draw for jurors like yourself is the Grand Jury indictment is kind of like the starting pistol in a race. Before the pistol goes off, the race can't begin, and it's not evidence that anything took place.

You decide what took place on July 13th if you are a juror, based on what you hear from the witness stand. All right?

- A Okay.
- Me will tell you about the presumption of innocence and he will tell you that the Defendant

is presumed to be innocent, and as a prospective juror, you are to give that presumption.

what does the presumption of innocence mean? Not to insult your intelligence, I think you realize in a hypothetical case the man who kills in the convenience store or runs outside, one who commits the offense, is just as guilty on the day he committed the crime as the day he comes to the courthouse to answer to twelve jurors, but jurors who don't know anything about the case are to presume the man innocent and base their verdict on what the witness is telling them from the witness stand in the courtroom.

Do you see how that presumption of innocence works?

- A Yes.
- The judge will also tell you the burden of proof in a criminal case always rests with Mr. Bax and myself. We have the burden of proving to you beyond a reasonable doubt. That is the burden in the criminal courthouse. That burden never shifts to the Defense. I don't want you to think the trial is not a wide-open proceeding. It is.

Either side can call witnesses if they want to. If a Defendant wants someone to come

a subpoena to the clerk and she will give it to the Sheriff's Office who will, in fact, serve that person individually and bring that person to the courthouse, even if they're not wanting to come. They will still come. They can do this without expense to themselves or the lawyers. They can get whatever witnesses they want to prove whatever they want. The trial is a wide-open proceeding.

. 14

The only difference is they don't have the burden of proving, the burden of doing that. If they want to, they can. If they feel it would be the best strategy for them not to say anything and remain silent, well, we might disagree with them with that as being the right thing to do, but they can still do that if they choose to for some reason, because the only ones who have to prove to you what took place on July 13th is Mr. Bax and myself, and we have to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, not all doubt or a shadow of a doubt.

Those are the phrases often heard on television. It has to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. That applies to these questions

_

Before you can answer either question yes, you would have to believe beyond a reasonable doubt that from the evidence Mr. Bax and I present, that is what your answers should be.

Please don't hesitate in telling Mr.

Bax and I that we didn't, if we don't prove it.

If we don't prove it, it is our problem. We

don't expect jurors to violate their oaths in

any aspect of the case, but to reach a fair

verdict to both sides based on the evidence that

is presented to them. Okay?

- A Yes.
- The judge will tell you -- this is another thing
 -- he will charge you on -- I am trying to get
 my thoughts straight -- he will tell you when you
 judge the credibility of the witnesses, a juror
 should not give a witness any more or less
 belief because of a witness' job. You see, in the
 eyes of the law, a person, just because of his
 or her job, is not entitled to any more or less
 belief just because of their job.

After a person gets on the stand and testifies, then it is perfectly permissible for the jurors to consider that person's job in

For example, a doctor testifying about medical injuries, a police officer with a number of years experience testifying about his investigation and what it indicated to them, then it's perfectly permissible, after witnesses testify, for a juror to consider that witness! job.

Vitness gets on the stand. I don't care if it's the favorite minister of our church, if it's the police officer we have known all our lives, a lawyer, doctor, candlestick maker, baker, however that goes, regardless of a person's job, he is not entitled to any more or less belief because of a person's job.

Do you follow me on that charge from the Court?

A Yes.

Okay. Let me talk to you about a couple of other aspects of the law, and I want to ask you some personal questions.

We have talked about -- and I think you mentioned earlier the range of punishment for murder being five to ninety-nine years or

6

7

8

9

10

--

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

life, and the reason I talked about that in
the first place was because of this. Someone
could be charged with the offense of capital
murder and could find a person guilty of not
capital murder but the offense of murder instead,
and here is how that matter arises, and let me
give you an example of what we are talking about.

Imagine a situation or the example I gave you earlier about the man who went in the store and killed the cashier. Let's say there were witnesses in the store, and let's add a couple of things to the hypothetical. thought the cashier was robbed during a robbery. Why else would he shoot her except to take money from her, and they felt it was a robbery-murder, and he was indicted by the Grand Jury for robbery-murder, but the jury heard what really happened is that the man -- I am speaking hypothetically -- what really happened is the man knew this woman and had dated her off and on for a number of years. She was getting ready to leave him for someone else, and he was extremely jealous and upset about it and she had had an argument earlier that day, very violent argument. He confronted her about the same

_

argument at the store, had a pistol with him, got extremely angry, produced his gun and killed her, and that jury hears those facts and they found out that was not what took place. It was not a robbery-murder.

You see, he is not guilty of capital murder, but guilty of murder, because the case (sic) did not take place during a robbery as first suspected.

Then the jury would decide what the punishment would be; the range of punishment is from five years to a maximum of ninety-nine years or life, and the jury can, if they feel it is a proper case, even though the jury has found a man guilty of murder, they can recommend probation to the judge.

Have you ever heard that phrase probation before?

- A Yes, sir.
 - I think you are probably familiar with how it works, but let me, just out of an abundance of caution, explain it to you anyway.

The only way a man or woman can receive probation for a felony offense when a jury has found them guilty of murder, is if the jury,

first of all, unanimously agrees among themselves that the person should receive no more than ten years in the penitentiary. The jury has to be in unanimous agreement that the punishment should be ten years or less.

If the jury agrees on that, then the jury can then discuss among themselves, and either accept or reject whether or not they are going to recommend probation for this person they have found guilty of whatever crime it is, whether they are going to recommend probation to the judge.

If they recommend probation, it is a binding recommendation. The judge must follow the jurors' recommendation, and the jury can either accept or reject the idea of probation.

Do you follow me on how probation works?

- A Yes.
- And see, anyone who has even been convicted of murder can ask for probation. It doesn't make any difference. It can be the worst crime in the world.

I guess it goes back to the phrase, "It doesn't hurt to ask." The jury might decide

a man should spend nine or ten years in the penitentiary for robbery or a rape case, and they don't consider probation.

Probation only arises where the jury has heard all the facts and decides that the punishment should be ten years or less, and also are in unanimous agreement that it is the type of case where the man is deserving of probation.

The only reason I take so much time to explain that to you, I want to ask you: If you were a juror on a case where someone had been found guilty of an offense, even the offense of murder, if you felt the facts indicated to you it was a proper case for ten years or less on the punishment scale, and also the facts indicated to you it was a case for probation, would you be able to consider probation on such a case, even though you had initially found the person guilty of murder?

- A Yes, I could.
- Well, I take it you can at least conceive of some fact situation in your mind, even though a person has committed the offense of murder, where probation might be a proper punishment?
- A Yes, sir.

•		bo you have any questions of me so far?
2	A.	No.
3	Ø	Okay. It seems like there was something else I
4		wanted to talk to you about, but it has been
5		easy to talk to you, because you've got some
6		knowledge of the proceedings and the law involved.
7		Even a little bit helps. It makes
8		it easier.
9		What is your mother's occupation, if
10		she has worked outside the home?
11	A.	She is a teacher.
12	Q	Where does she teach at?
13	A.	Aldine High School.
14	Q	What is your daddy's occupation?
15	A.	He works for the City of Houston. He is a
16		surveyor.
17	Q	Do you have brothers and sisters?
18	A.	Yes, I do. I have a brother and a sister.
19	σ	Are they older or younger than yourself?
20	A.	Both of them are younger.
21	Ď	Are both in school?
22	A.	One is attending Texas Tech University, and the
23		other is in high school in Aldine.
24	Q	He doesn't have your mom for a teacher, does he?
25	A.	No.

Yes.

The only thing I would ask you to do
is put the guilt or innocence thing out of your
mind and decide whether he is guilty or not
guilty on the facts, what they tell you he did
or did not do.

Do you feel you could do that?

A Yes, sir.

- The fact he is an illegal alien can tell you about the kind of person he is when answering Question 2, for instance, based on the facts and what the witnesses tell you from the witness stand, but don't consider the fact that he is an illegal alien when deciding his guilt or innocence.

 Okay?
- A Okay.
- Q Did I talk about the Defendant's failure to testify? I don't think we did.

I want to tell you in any criminal case, as the judge mentioned earlier, any Defendant, regardless of the crime they are accused of, has the right to get on the stand and tell his or her version of what happened, or the Defendant can, in fact, not say anything, can remain silent. It doesn't mean the jurors

can't wonder why or what a person might want to
say or even wish to hear both sides of the story.
Those are all pretty natural reactions.

All of us, before we make a decision, like to hear, get as much input as we can and hear both sides of the story, but in a criminal case at the courthouse, sometimes jurors have to decide without hearing from the Defendant, and if the Defendant does not testify, although I anticipate he will, but if the Defendant does not testify, the judge will tell you you are to base your decision on what you hear from the witness stand and not base your decision on what you have heard or not heard from him. You decide.

If he testifies, you judge him like any other person, whether he is telling the truth by his demeanor, et cetera.

Do you understand that?

- A Yes.
- Let me talk with Mr. Bax and see if he has other questions, and if not, we will pass you to the Defense.

(Consultation between attorneys.)

(By Mr. Moen) Mr. Bax reminded me of something
I didn't talk to you about, and we have been

When answering these questions, the judge will give you within the charge that in addition to the fact it takes twelve jurors to answer yes, he will tell you you must not discuss and must not let the other jurors discuss how long the Defendant would have to serve in the Texas Department of Corrections if he were to receive a life sentence. He will tell you that is within the jurisdiction of the Board of Pardons and Paroles.

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection, Your Honor. The prosecutor is stressing the law of parole.

(By Mr. Moen) He will tell you that is within the discretion of the Board of Pardons and Paroles to decide how long the Defendant would have to serve. Jurors will not discuss that among themselves. They will look at what the judge told them, and if they persist in talking about it, give us a rap on the door and let us know what is happening because if someone does that, we have to go to trial all over again. It is the type of conduct that would make us start the proceedings all over again. Okay? Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I believe you are number eighty-three or eighty-four -- eighty-six. I am sorry.

We have ten people selected so far, and we need another two people.

This part of the trial is what is known as voir dire examination.

Voir dire, they tell me, means to speak the truth. The reason you are up there is to ask you a few questions and see how you feel about different things. That is why we need to talk to you at length. I don't mean to embarrass you or in any way humiliate you by these questions, but we need to know your answers to these questions, There are no right or wrong answers, and all we want to know is how you feel.

- This case is a capital murder case, capital murder of a police officer.
- A. Uh-huh.

This kind of case, as in any kind of case in Texas, the State must prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that this man committed the offense. They must prove to you that on a particular day here in Harris County, Texas, this Defendant shot and killed a police officer in the lawful discharge of an official duty knowing at the time he was a police officer. They must prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

The term reasonable doubt will not be defined for you. The judge won't give you any definition. The judge won't and I won't. I don't have a legal definition. There is none, but all I can tell you is that across the street where they try lawsuits over there for contract disputes, disputes over personal injuries, over medical malpractice, over workmen's compensation, sometimes for lots of money, sometimes for millions of dollars, the burden of proof over there is by a preponderance of the evidence, the greater weight of the credible evidence.

Over here on this side, the legislature said before you can forfeit somebody's life or liberty, literally in this case, the legislature said the State will have a higher burden, the burden of proving their case to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

How do you feel about that?

- Well, it depends on the evidence given, whether you can prove somebody guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Yes, you could, depending on what the facts are, and what they have to show you and prove to you, you can, I feel.
- What do you feel about the heavy burden they have? Do you think that is right or wrong? Just how do you feel?
- A Sometimes it is wrong because of the things that are happening and people are getting away with things, and because you have to prove it to such an extent, it seems like they are getting away with things.
- And like I say, all I want to know is just how you feel about this.

Do you think the State should have that heavy burden?

A Sometimes, no. I don't feel like they should.

Let's assume -- to quote an example or give an example that Mr. Bax gave -- sometimes is not a definite answer -- you have a mallet in your hand, and I say, "Ms. Matthews, if I put my hand in front of you, are you going to bang it with that mallet?"

I am a little leery of putting my hand there.

Do you think the State should have the burden of proving this case beyond a reasonable doubt, or do you think it's too much of a burden and they ought to prove it by a preponderance of the evidence, the greater weight of the credible evidence?

I would say no; I don't think they should have to prove it beyond a -- but then again, yes. It depends on the circumstances.

THE COURT: Is that a definite maybe?

MR. ELIZONDO: That is a definite

maybe.

THE JUROR: I guess.

- Q (By Mr. Elizondo) What do you mean "circumstances"?
- A Depending on what the crime was and what was

Let me go further and see how you feel about certain things.

Let's assume -- you know, you will ask yourself if you are on this jury panel, you will see how the State goes about proving their case beyond a reasonable doubt. They go ahead and call witnesses and they sit in the witness stand, and you are sitting in the jury box close to the witnesses, and you can watch their demeanor, and by watching their demeanor, any inconsistency they might have, you can more or less give them credibility or not give them credibility, and it is your decision. You can believe some of, all of or none of what a witness testifies to. You will be the judge of the facts. Judge Oncken will be the judge of the law.

So you will hear these people and they will come up there and take the stand, and they will put on more people, and after a while, they will rest their case. That means, "That is all we have."

Let's assume for a minute that we rest our case, and we don't put on any evidence whatsoever, and you go back in the jury room and

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What would your verdict be? Let's say you are back there and you are saying, "I think he did it. Maybe he did. Maybe he killed a police officer, but I haven't been convinced beyond a reasonable doubt."

In that situation, what would your verdict be?

- I don't think I could give you an honest one, because that is somebody else's life. That is
- What do you mean by that? Ç
 - I mean that is somebody's life that you are

What if he didn't testify at all? Would you wonder about what he might have said or done?

Yes. I would wonder. I would wonder.

Would you hold it against him?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I know we are brought up to hear -we are always going to hear two sides, always want to make up our minds and decisions on two sides. It's only human, I guess, and proper, but the law says this man does not have to testify, and let's say he doesn't testify and you are

And so you would want him to testify?

by the Grand Jury?

Let's assume for a minute that you have found him guilty of intentionally and knowingly killing a police officer. This trial, as in all trials in Texas, is divided into two parts.

The first part is the guilt-or-innocence stage, a separate and distinct part.

If he is found innocent, we go to the second part, and if he is found not guilty, that is all they wrote.

while we are talking about that, let me talk about your boyfriend and people you know that are law enforcement officers.

If I were across the street at 301

Fannin and I was representing a doctor,

representing him in a malpractice case and I were

talking to people who were doctors, I would be

leery of putting them on a jury panel for fear

they would say, "Well, this doctor is being sued

by a lawyer, and I might be sued at some time,

and I will be sympathetic toward the doctor,"

so I would be leery of putting them on the jury

panel.

- I see you have had thirty-two hours at becoming a police officer, a peace officer.
- A Yes.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Would you be more sympathetic toward the State's case or anything, or the family of J. D. Harris?

You know, I suspect that the widow will testify, and that will be pretty emotional, I would assume.

- A I would probably be a little sympathetic. I probably would. Yes.
- Well, as a result of your being sympathetic, would you hold it against the State -- I mean, against my man, or would you benefit the State by virtue of your sympathy?
- A I wouldn't hold it against him, because I don't know whether he is guilty or innocent.
- But based upon your sympathy, would you make the State's case a little easier?

Again, you know, only you can tell us that.

MR. MOEN: Objection, Your Honor, to the form of the question, "make the State's case a little easier." I don't see how she can

Unconsciously, as a result of the way you feel about the family of J. D. Harris -and I expect the widow will testify -- would you have a bias against this man for or against him or for or against the State?

subconsciously or some way or another.

- Well, I don't think I could be prejudiced or biased towards him because I don't know if he is guilty or innocent. Now, I would feel sorry for the family and everyone involved, yes. Yes, I would feel sorry for the family and probably be a little biased or prejudiced towards him.
- Let's assume you find him guilty and we go to the punishment phase. The punishment phase is determined, of course, by the way you answer those two questions. If two questions are answered yes, it means automatically that he dies.
- Α. Dies.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And two noes or one no means a life sentence.

If you have found him guilty of

result of death?

4

3

1

2

5

A.

No.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. You know, the first question asks if the Q. conduct of the Defendant that caused the death of the deceased was committed deliberately.

The word deliberately is underlined, and, again, there is no definition of the word deliberately. The judge can't give one. No one can give one.

I was reading in Webster's, and Webster's said to premeditate.

MR. MOEN: He sure did not say that. For four weeks he said that is what someone told him.

MR. ELIZONDO: Daniel Webster.

THE COURT: Get back to the law.

(By Mr. Elizondo) Anyway, they tell me, reading it or whatever, they say it means to ponder or think about with a measure of consideration. For instance, you will go in the jury deliberation room and ponder or think about whether this man is guilty or not.

A. It means intentionally.

Okay. Let me go to the first phase. In the first phase, in the guilt-or-innocence phase, you have found him guilty of intentionally and knowingly killing a police officer. Then we will go to the punishment phase.

In the punishment phase, you've got to answer Questions 1 and 2 yes or no. Would you automatically answer Question No. 1 yes solely because you have found him guilty in the first phase of intentionally and knowingly killing a police officer?

- A If he did it intentionally and knowingly, yes, I would answer it yes.
- Okay, and, of course, there are many ways to look at a case.

To give you an example, the one Mr.

Moen gave you, the one about the thirty-fiveyear-old ex-con that goes into the Seven-Eleven,
and I don't recall if he talked about the seveteenyear-old, if he talked about the seventeen-yearold as in the seventeen-year-old example, but the
seventeen-year-old is a lookout. The thirty-five-

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

year-old goes in there and takes the money and kills the cashier and runs out.

You can see where the seventeen-year-old's conduct didn't really cause the death because it wasn't committed by him, really, but theoretically and legally, he could be convicted for capital murder.

Would you answer that yes also?

- A. No. No.
- That is what I am trying to get at.

The No. 2 question is more or less asking you to foretell or forecast the future. It is asking you to determine whether there is a probability that he will commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society.

Do you believe that anything is probable?

- Anything is probable, possible, yes. A.
- So, what do you think the word probability means?
- That it is possible that he could do this again A. or do something similar to this again.
- Well, then, since you believe that it's probable, Q or anything is probable, right?
- A. Right.
- Would you automatically answer yes to Question No.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes, they can.

Anything is probable? Q

2 without regard to any evidence, solely because you believe that anything is probable?

- No, I wouldn't. It depends on his background. Maybe if he's been charged with anything else before, his record.
- Q. Of course, you realize that the State would have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that there is a probability that he would commit criminal acts, more than one act of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society.
- Yes, sir.
- And if they don't prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt, you would answer the question no?
- Right.
- Do you think that a person can change his mode of behavior, his mode of conduct, his mode of operations?
- Sometimes, yes, and sometimes, no. It depends on maybe their age, how bad their record was before, what they had done, and what they had been convicted of this time as to whether they could be reformed or not.

A That is a safe answer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

25

Let's assume you are back there and you were on this jury panel and you go back there and you do some deliberations and you are sitting back there again and saying to yourself, "You know, there is a probability he committed the offense. I think he did, but I haven't been convinced beyond a reasonable doubt, so I am going to find him not guilty."

Could you do that?

- A If I wasn't convinced? Yes, I could.
- And you could go back and talk with Terry Lee and tell him you did that?
- A Yes, I could do that if I felt within myself he wasn't guilty. I wouldn't want to convict him.
- And you would talk to David Rose (sic) and tell him, "I found a person who it was accused of killing a police officer, found him not guilty"?
- 19 A Yes, sir.
- 20 Q You could do that?
 - A I could do that.
- 22 And you could tell your boyfriend?
- $_{23}$ A Yes, I could.
- $_{24}\parallel$ μ He is a fireman, right?
 - A Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this.

- Seeing as how you are studying to be a peace officer and your boyfriend is a fireman and your friends are police officers, can you guarantee me you would give this Defendant a fair and impartial trial in a trial of this type of case, and, again, I want you to search yourself.
- A If I was convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that he was not innocent, or was guilty, I could give

you an honest answer; you know, if I felt in my mind that he wasn't proven guilty by the evidence and the witnesses or whatever, I could give you an honest answer and say he was not guilty.

MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, we would respectfully challenge her on the Defendant's failure to testify and on the reasonable doubt theory.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MOEN: May I talk to her just a second?

THE COURT: Sure.

EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:

Ms. Matthews, let me talk to you about something we talked about earlier, and that is the Defendant's failure to testify.

A Defendant has a right, regardless of what he is charged with, whether a traffic ticket, up to the most serious offense in our state, which is capital murder. He has a right if he wants to to get on the stand in his own behalf and testify, or he has the right, for

whatever reason, to not get on the stand and testify. He can remain silent even though it is perhaps the most important day of his life. He is on trial for such a serious offense. If he sees fit or upon the advice of his lawyer or whatever decision or facts go into the decision, he can, if he decides, remain silent.

His lawyers will tell him, "Don't get on the stand. You are an ex-convict. The jurors will find out about it. Don't get on the stand. You are a terrible witness. You slur your words and sound like a jerk," or for whatever reason, he could decide not to testify and say, "It will just hurt my case," or, "Won't help my case if I do," or for whatever reason. If a Defendant does not testify in any case -- I am not talking about this case, but any criminal case -- the charge in the case is always the same. The judge tells the jurors, "Base your verdict on what you have heard."

- A Sure.
- And that silence is not evidence that a person has or has not done anything. The judge won't say it is wrong for jurors to wonder why the Defendant didn't testify or to wish to have

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection. Misstatement of the law.

(By Mr. Moen) Those are natural reactions.

THE COURT: Overruled.

(By Mr. Moen) The only thing a judge will tell Q. you is this, and that is that silence is not evidence. Base your verdict on what you have heard rather than what you didn't hear, and a person is not entitled to be found guilty or not guilty because of something that wasn't said.

Jurors should listen to what is said, and if the witnesses convince them the person should be, they should find them guilty. They should say so. If the evidence does not meet their burden of proof, if they are not convinced after listening to the testimony, they say not guilty.

Do you feel you could do that?

- I see your point. A.
- Do you see what --
- I see your point.
- If the Defendant did not testify, I take it from Q. what you tell me, you would not hold that against him and find him guilty because he did not testify?

1

A No.

3

4

THE COURT: I think there was another objection on reasonable doubt, wasn't there?

5

MR. ELIZONDO: Yes, sir.

6

THE COURT: Do you want to address

7

that one?

8

MR. MOEN: She indicated she would abide

9

by the law of reasonable doubt. I don't have any other questions other than I have asked her.

10

THE COURT: Anything further?

11

12

--

13

14

QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:

against him.

15

Q Ms. Matthews, I hate to belabor the point, but I

EXAMINATION

16 17

have to talk to you and I have to find out how

18

you feel, and you told me earlier you would hold

19

it against him if he didn't testify, and now I

20

think you are saying that you wouldn't hold it

21

22

A Okay. I understand a little bit more about

23

everything, about hearing what you hear and using that as your evidence and

24

that as your evidence and not what you don't hear.

25

Uh-huh.

the theory of reasonable doubt. That is our objection.

THE COURT: Both are overruled.

MR. ELIZONDO: Further, for the record, we re-urge our motion to view the entire venire before we exercise our peremptory challenges.

THE COURT: That motion will be denied.

MR. ELIZONDO: And we will excuse her,

Your Honor.

MR. HERNANDEZ: For sure.

THE COURT: Ms. Matthews, thank you very much. We appreciate your patience. You will be excused.

For the record now, based on having reconsidered objections previously made to a juror, Charles A. Deckert, the Court is going to, out of an abundance of caution, grant the Defense an additional strike to be used in lieu of the one that was used on Charles A. Deckert.

MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, for the record, just for the record, we would ask the Court for five additional peremptory challenges.

We had to use peremptory challenges on Mr.

Deckert, Jerry Thagard, Jack Lee, on Cynthia

Matthews, and on Thurman Matthews, and Mr. Sadler

after objections, after challenges for cause had been denied, and for that reason, we would ask for six additional peremptory challenges.

THE COURT: That will be denied.

MR. ELIZONDO: Thank you, Your Honor.

(At this time court recessed for the

day.)