- Aldapes Trial Transcript ___ (982) (voir dire) [v.10)

CLO

THE CHANGE STORES

H RUSH 03/23/2006 4:30pm CST R2
HH254 61065883-000003 For: JAASM
VINSON & ELKINS LLP
1001 FANNIN STREET
SUITE 2240
FLOOR 22
HOUSTON, TX 77002-6760
RECORDS MGMT RECORDS MGMT B06155762
JULIE AASMYR-RECORDS DEPT SR
ZZ0865766025
0865766025

1	CAUSE NO. 359,805
2	THE STATE OF TEXAS IN THE DISTRICT COURT
3	VS. OF HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS
4	RICARDO ALDAPE GUERRA 248TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	VOLUME X
13	STATEMENT OF FACTS VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
14	CONTINUED SEPTEMBER 15, 1982
15	
16	
17	
18	1/ol. x
19	Whitson Sadler Pp. 1623-1676
20	PP. 1623-1676
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2	-	Page
3	VOLUME X	
4	September 15, 1982	
5	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION, CONTINUED	
6	NEW JURY PANEL EXAMINED BY THE COURT	1538
7	Anthony Ray Maloy	
8	Examination by the State (Bax)	1549
9	Charles Edward Krezinski	
10	Examination by the State (Moen)	1570
11	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	1608
12	M. Whitson Sadler	
13	Examination by the State (Bax)	1623
14	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	1655
15	Examination by the State (Bax)	1668
16	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	
17	Leslie A. Watts	20.0
18	Examination by the State (Moen)	1676
19	Mrs. Harry M. Darr	1070
20	Examination by the State (Moen)	1680
21	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	
22	Barbara Gray Cook	4146
23	Examination by the State (Bax)	1721
24	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	
25	andminderen by the betense (E1120ndo)	TIST

1	INDEX	
2		Page
3	VOLUME X	
4	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION, CONTINUED	
5	Barbara Gray Cook	
6	Examination by the State (Bax)	1721
7	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	1751
8	Mrs. Harry M. Darr	
9	Examination by the State (Moen)	1680
10	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	1712
11	Charles Edward Krezinski	*
12	Examination by the State (Moen)	1570
13	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	1608
14	Anthony Ray Maloy	
15	Examination by the State (Bax)	1549
16	M. Whitson Sadler	
17	Examination by the State (Bax)	1623
18	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	1655
19	Examination by the State (Bax)	1668
20	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	1670
21	Leslie A. Watts	
22	Examination by the State (Moen)	1676
23		
24		
25		

21

22

23 24

25

(A panel of six prospective jurors was brought into the courtroom, after which the following proceedings were had.)

THE COURT: Good morning. Welcome to the criminal justice system.

My name is Henry Oncken. I am judge of the 248th District Court.

Obviously, we are not in the courtroom. We are in a conference room, and the reason for that is that we are picking a capital jury, a jury to try a capital case. When that occurs, it takes four to six to eight weeks to try one of those cases, and during that period of time, the business of the court has to continue, and therefore, we have to have a visiting judge to handle the normal duties while we pick a jury and that judge has to have a courtroom to operate out of, and that leaves us to pick a jury anyplace we can find.

We will probably find a courtroom to go into later this afternoon, but for the morning, we use the conference room. I know it doesn't make a good impression on citizens who come down to participate in the system, but, believe me, at this point, it's the best we can do.

The case that we are working on, the

Defendant is Ricardo Aldape Guerra. He is the gentleman seated in the corner with the lady, and he is charged with the offense of capital murder alleged to have been committed on July 13th of this year in which a police officer by the name of James D. Harris was killed.

A citizen there at the scene was also killed, and about an hour later when the police arrested several people, there was another police officer shot five times, and one of the individuals they had come to take into custody was killed in the shoot-out.

With the information I have given you -that took place on the corner of Edgewood and
Walker streets out there in the east end -- with
the information I have given you, do any of you
know anything about this case?

MS. COOK: I think I heard something on the news:

MR. SADLER: Sure.

THE COURT: I take it none of you have formed opinions about the guilt of anyone?

The Defendant is represented by these two lawyers, Candelario Elizondo and Mr. Joe Hernandez.

The State will be represented, the Prosecution, by Mr. Dick Bax and Mr. Bob Moen who is making some coffee back there.

The lady seated next to Mr. Guerra is Linda Hernandez. She is an interpreter. Mr. Guerra speaks no English and we are providing him with an interpreter to tell him what is taking place in this case.

Now, my purpose is to acquaint you just a little bit with the process we are involved in and give you a little bit of information, and then I am going to let the lawyers visit with you about your qualifications to serve on this particular case.

A capital case is tried just a little bit differently than a normal case in that a jury is selected on an individual basis.

Normally, if we have a murder case, we bring over thirty-six to forty people and we would all be in the courtroom at the same time for jury selection, and it would take maybe a couple of hours to pick a jury.

In a capital murder voir dire, we bring in six people at a time and go through this process and then bring the jurors in

individually. It takes a great deal of time, sometimes six to eight weeks, just to pick a jury, and so the jury will be -- I lost my train of thought for a second. Excuse me.

I want to tell you a little bit about the charge that will be given to you and some of the presumptions that apply to any particular case.

R

First of all, this Defendant is presumed to be innocent as he sits here today. He will carry that presumption of innocence with him until such time as the Prosecution brings you sufficient evidence to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty of the

offense with which he is charged.

If the State fails to do that, to

convince you that he is guilty, then it is your

duty to find him not guilty. That presumption

offense, regardless of the nature of it.

I have told you that the State has the burden of proving his guilt, and no Defendant in

any criminal case has to prove anything. The

State has brought the charges, and they must

prove them. The Defendant in a criminal case

is not bound to testify. He doesn't have to

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

put on any evidence whatsoever. His lawyers don't have to ask any questions of witnesses who do testify, and I will tell you or tell the jury in the charge, that if he does not testify that is not to be taken as any circumstance of his That is a right given to him. testify or not testify.

I have mentioned the word charge, and what that means is that at the close of all the evidence, after both sides have done whatever they are going to do, I will prepare a legal-size document which will give you all of the law that is applicable to this particular case, so if you are worried about not being qualified to be a juror because you don't know anything about the law, don't worry about that. All I want you to bring with you is your common sense. I will provide you with the law with the help of the attorneys and court reporter; we will draw it I will read it to you and you will take it back in the jury room to have to use as a guideline, and what I am telling you now is some of the things that will be in that document.

The first thing a jury will hear after they are selected and sworn to hear evidence is

the State will read the indictment. That indictment is a legal-size piece of paper on which words are typed. It is a charge, a legal pleading, and I will tell you in my charge that it is no evidence of guilt. 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 be established in a courtroom with witnesses giving testimony under oath before a Defendant can be found guilty.

That instrument is nothing more than a pleading, and it's the same type of pleading that -- let's take for instance a traffic ticket. You get a ticket. That ticket itself is a pleading, if you will, that the City of Houston or whatever municipality in which you got the ticket must prove. It is not evidence of any type. The same principle holds true to an indictment.

Any criminal case is divided into two portions. It is called a bifurcated trial, and if you hear the lawyers use the term, what it means is simply "divided into two parts."

The first part of any criminal trial is to hear facts about an event which occurred,

in this case, the shooting of a police officer, and the second stage of the trial is to hear 2 facts about the individual who committed that 3 offense if you find him guilty. At the first stage, if the Defendant is found not guilty, there is obviously no second part to the trial.

Everybody goes home.

I

5

7

Я

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

So please bear in mind there are two stages, the guilt-or-innocence stage and the punishment phase. You hear facts about the event in the first stage. You hear facts about the individual who committed that offense in the second stage.

Normally in a case not capital murder, the jury goes back to deliberate at the punishment stage and has a range of punishment within which to work. In a murder case, for instance, the range of punishment is not less than five years nor more than ninety-nine years or life, and there can be a fine attached to any punishment assessed, so a juror, having found the Defendant guilty of murder, goes back to deliberate punishment and can assess punishment anywhere within that range. It is strictly up to the jury.

In a capital case, it is different in

that the jury simply answers two questions. Those

two questions are right there on the board. If

you will, take just a minute to read those, and

we will talk with you about them in more detail

later on.

All right. There will be evidence presented on the punishment stage, and you will go back, and I will submit those two questions to the jury, and they will deliberate on what their answers should be. A yes answer to both of those questions will result in my assessing the punishment of this Defendant at death. A yes to one of those questions and a no to one of them will result in my assessing a life sentence. A no answer to both questions will also result in a life sentence. Those are the only two possible punishments in a capital case if the jury finds the Defendant guilty of capital murder, is death or life in the penitentiary.

I need you to be thinking at this time, and until such time as you are brought in to be interviewed for your qualifications, I need for you to think about your feelings on capital punishment, how you feel about it.

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want you to bear in mind when you are brought in here to be interviewed that we are not attempting, intending to be personal. We do not intend to pry into your personal affairs and do not intend to embarrass you in any way and will not argue with you about your views one way or another about any subject. You are entitled to your views, and we respect that. We sincerely want to hear how you feel about certain things. The lawyers have a right to ask you questions, and you have a right to your opinions. Okay?

I believe that that is all I have at this time to discuss with you.

Do you have any questions of me?

All right. Now, it takes about an hour to examine each prospective juror, and I realize that the benches in the hallway are hard and I I wish there was something I could do apologize. Maybe later this evening if we are able to find a courtroom on this floor, you can sit in these chairs. They are at least not quite as hard as the ones you have.

Ms. Watts, Ms. Darr, and Ms. Cook, I know without question that we are not going to be able to get to you before this afternoon, so I am

going to allow you if you want to, to leave the courthouse and you will return about a quarter of 2:00. Now, you may go anywhere you would like during that period of time, and please return here at that time.

Mr. Maloy, Mr. Krezinski, and Mr. Sadler, you will remain with us, and we will visit with you this morning.

juror in this case today, you will not be required to stay here at the courthouse during the remainder of the jury selection. You will be allowed to go home, to go about your normal daily activities, and we will keep you posted on the progress and give you some idea of when it will be you will actually hear the jury case.

We have six jurors selected, and we have been at this some two weeks now, and it will probably take us another two weeks to complete.

The trial, I anticipate, will take about a week, give or take a day or so, to try.

There may be some time during that period, during the actual trial, that the jury may have to stay downtown overnight in a hotel, so I want you to be thinking about that also.

1 As you come into the jury room and you 2 are interviewed and you leave and there are other jurors in the hallway, please do not discuss 3 with those other jurors what was asked of you in here or in the courtroom or wherever we may be 5 when you are interviewed. Once again, are there any questions? 7 8 All right. The three of you may remain, and the other three may return at a quarter to 10 2:00. 11 Mr. Krezinski, Mr. Sadler, please remain in the hallway, and we will be with you 12 as quickly as we can, and, Mr. Maloy, we will 13 visit with you first. 15 MR. SADLER: You estimate an hour? 16 That is what you estimate? 17 THE COURT: About that. Some are 18 shorter, and some a little longer. 19 20 21 22 24 25

1	ANTHONY RAY MALOY,
2	was called as a prospective juror and responded to
3	questions propounded as follows:
4	
5	EXAMINATION
6	
7	QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:
8	THE COURT: Mr. Maloy, please move to
9	the center so we can all get a good look at you.
10	Mr. Maloy, please relax and visit with
11	us. We have a very informal setting, and please
12	answer the questions as you feel and not as you
13	think somebody wants to hear.
14	Can you do that?
15	THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Bax, you may proceed.
17	MR. BAX: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	Q (By Mr. Bax) Good morning, Mr. Maloy. I hope
19	we can talk over the coffee brewing and everything
20	else going on.
21	As the judge told you earlier, my name
22	is Dick Bax. I am with the District Attorney's
23	Office.
24	The fellow behind you making the coffee
25	is Bob Moen, also with the District Attornovia

Office.

R

We have asked you to come here today, or you have been selected to come here today so we could talk with you about capital murder primarily. The judge has given you a little bit about the background of the facts. I don't know whether he mentioned -- let me give you a little more background.

When the police were trying to apprehend the suspects, one police officer was shot five times and one suspect was shot.

Do you recall anything about this in the paper or on TV?

- A I might have heard about it, but I don't know.
- Q There is nothing wrong with hearing about it or not hearing about it.

The reason we ask is to determine if someone may have formed an opinion as to someone else's quilt or innocence. I take it at this time you have formed no opinion as to the Defendant's guilt or innocence?

- A No, I haven't.
- Q Usually when we select jurors in every other type of case, we bring a group of people, usually forty people, and we talk to the people as a

F2068 1593

as a group, but since this case involves the serious punishment of death, the law provides that we talk to each juror individually so they are not influenced, perhaps, by what other people may think or sometimes people aren't as open in a group, and hopefully, this situation allows people to express their views more comfortably and express their opinions.

If this Defendant is found guilty, the State will be seeking the death penalty. I can tell you that right up front. There is no question about what our position will be in the case. We have had almost fifty people come through so far, and we have been able to select six jurors out of the people who have come through.

I find it very difficult to talk above that coffee pot.

MR. MOEN: Just do the best you can.

MR. BAX: Do you have any problems?

Can you hear me way back there?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes. I can hear you. Don't hurry.

Q (By Mr. Bax) We have had people come through

l

12.

penalty; I believe it is a proper punishment in certain cases, and I could with my beliefs return a verdict which would call for the death penalty.

We have had other people come through and say, "You know, because of my beliefs or my religious upbringing, I could never personally participate in a trial which would perhaps result in the taking of another person's life, because personally, I just don't believe that we, as a society, have that right," and there is nothing wrong with feeling that way.

No one in this room today is going to try to change any juror's opinion as to how they believe. That is your absolute right as to how you believe, and no one here is going to think that any person who comes before us is any less a citizen or there's anything wrong because of their beliefs.

The only thing we really need to know is how people feel. You see, the only person who puts himself as a juror in a capital case is the juror himself by the way he answers the questions. We have no way of telling how a juror feels except by the way they tell us, and if a person

comes before us and says, "I don't care what the facts are. I can't ever envision myself voting for the death penalty," that is fine. They may be fine jurors in another case, but because of personal beliefs, they would not make a good juror in this.

Let me ask you if you can tell us in twenty-five words or less how you feel about the death penalty, if you agree with it or disagree with it?

- A Really, to take a life is kind of a hard thing to do anyway, but I wonder what would it solve by taking another person's life even after he took a life, because you are surely not going to bring back the life he took. I don't know whether they are cutting down in the prison or what.
- I take it you don't see any real value in the death penalty, and there is nothing wrong with that. Alot of people have said that same thing to us. What do you accomplish? Somebody's been killed. It is not going to bring that person back.

Perhaps if you could bring that person back by taking a person's life, maybe you could see some value in it, but is it correct to say

saying, it is basically that you don't agree

with the death penalty because there is no real

value to it? It doesn't stop other people from

doing it and doesn't bring back people killed in

- A I was thinking about something -- I was just, you know, putting myself in his position, and to know that my life was up for that, you know, I was wondering, too, and I don't know the reason that he took a person's life or what, but for him, it might have been self-defense or whatever. I don't know.
- Q Uh-huh.

15.

A But it is a hard thing to say.

the first place?

- Do you think there is any situation, any fact situation where you could be a juror and return a verdict which would call for the death penalty, or would you, if there was an option in a case of returning a verdict of life imprisonment, would you automatically go for the life imprisonment because, number one, if there was a mistake made, that could be rectified and he could be let out of prison, and, number two, because you feel the death penalty doesn't serve a purpose?
 - A Sure, if it came to that, I think I could decide.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

someone, during a rape, a kidnapping, or arson,

if you kill someone for money, hire someone to kill or kill someone for somebody, or if you are in prison and kill an employee in the prison or if you kill someone during your escape from a penal institution, those are the only types of cases, murder plus one of those factors are the only types of cases where the person has the possibility of receiving the death penalty. Okay?

First of all, let me take you through and ask, could you find a person guilty if you believed beyond a reasonable doubt that they would commit capital murder, could you find them guilty of capital murder knowing if you did, they could only receive life or death as a punishment?

A. Uh-huh.

Uh-huh.

After a person is found guilty, these two
questions are submitted to the jury. Depending
on the way these two questions are answered by the
jury, the judge will assess either life or death.

If all twelve jurors answer Question 1 yes and
all twelve jurors answer Question No. 2 yes, then
the judge must, by law -- he's got no choice -he must sentence the Defendant to death. Okay?

If either Question 1 or Question 2 is answered no, or they are both answered no, then the judge must assess life imprisonment, so, you see, the jury doesn't go back after finding someone guilty and say, "Should we give him the death penalty or a life sentence," but by the way they answer these questions, they are telling him what to do.

- A It will be up to the jury?
- Really up to the jury, although the judge is the bad guy in that respect of telling the Defendant what his punishment is, but by the way the jury answers, he is required to do one of two things. If you answered both of these questions yes, and he wanted to give the man a life sentence, he couldn't do it. If you answered one of them no and he wanted the death sentence, he couldn't change it. He has to give him life.

It is up to the jury basically.

yes if you believed they should be yes beyond a reasonable doubt, knowing that the man would receive the death penalty, and when I ask you that, knowing what your feelings are, you know, that the death penalty isn't going to solve anything, would you still be able to answer them

yes, or would you answer one of them no which
would mean the judge would still give him a life
sentence which is still a very severe punishment?

- A Sure. I believe I could answer it. You say if that were to come up, either one of the two?

 Could I answer it?
- Q Uh-huh.

5

6

7

8

- A I believe so.
- "Was the conduct of the Defendant that caused the
 death of the deceased deliberate and was it done
 with the reasonable expectation someone would die,"
 that is basically what that question says, if
 you believed beyond a reasonable doubt, would you
 answer that question yes if you believed that
 should be the answer?
- 17 A. Uh-huh.
- 18 Q Knowing if you answered it yes, it is one step
 19 closer to the death penalty? Do you see what
 20 I mean?
 - A Okay. That is saying that if he deliberately just took his life?
- 23 Q Uh-huh.

21

22

A Wasn't thinking about nothing else but taking
his life?

1 Q. Right. 2 Yes, I believe so. 3 Okay. Knowing that it was, you know, what is it? 5 Premeditation? 6 We are not going to tell you what the word 7 deliberately means. To me, it means on purpose. A. Right. That is what you want to happen. Okay? a 10 If you find he did it deliberately and 11 it was reasonable to expect that someone would 12 die, could you answer that question yes knowing 13 that he is that far away from receiving the 14 death penalty? 15 A. Uh-huh. 16 Q. Or would you say to yourself, "You know, I don't 17 believe in the death penalty. To me, the death 18 penalty serves no purpose so I will answer this 19 no which will mean not that he goes home, but 20 that he will receive a life sentence"? 21 Yes, you can answer it two ways. a Yes. 23 I know it sounds stupid. 24 No, it doesn't. What I am trying -- I guess what Q. 25 I am trying to get at is something like this.

I don't believe in the Sunday Blue Laws, but it says there are certain things you can't sell on Sundays.

- A Uh-huh.
- You can buy those items Monday through Saturday.
 You can go to the store and buy, you know, some kitchen appliances or something like that, but if it's Sunday, you can't buy those. I think that is a ridiculous law. I think that law serves no purpose whatsoever. Maybe it did at some other point in time, but I can't agree with that.

Now, I could probably say, if I were asked to be on a jury, I would like to think I am a fair person, that I am not biased and prejudiced, and if the question were asked of me, I could be fair, all right, but deep down inside, knowing I am against the Blue Laws and if someone were on trial violating the law, I wouldn't be as fair a juror as someone who agreed with that law.

Do you see what I mean?

- A. Uh-huh.
- And deep down, to say I could be honest with you and me, I will try to do my best, but I am going to be prejudiced because I disagree with the Blue Laws.

1 That is what I am getting at with my 2 questions with you. All right? 3 Uh-huh. 4 You have told me you don't really believe in the 5 death penalty because it serves no purpose. is fine. 6 That makes you no less a citizen. Do you think because of your feelings you might be biased because of these feelings, 8 9 although it would be harder to prove it to you 10 than someone who, say, didn't have those types 11 of feelings that you have? 12 A. Yes, the way you put it, I can understand it now, 13 too. 14 That is a big --15 You see what I mean? Do you think your feelings a 16 about the death penalty would affect the way 17 you answer these questions? 18 In a way, yes. A. 19 Sure. Okay. I mean, do you think you would be 20 biased in answering these questions knowing you 21 really wouldn't want to give the death penalty, 22 but perhaps your feelings would affect you the 23 way you listen to the evidence and apply the 24 evidence to these two questions? 25 Uh-huh. A. Yes.

25

the fact that you are against the death penalty,

you would try to use that to persuade other

1		jurors that they should give the life sentence?
2		That is fine. I think I would do the
3		same thing on a jury with the Blue Laws. I would
4		say, "This is a stupid law. We shouldn't find
5		this fellow guilty."
6		That would be in violation of my oath.
7		Do you see what I mean?
8	A.	Right.
9	Q	I think that is basically what you are telling.
10		me, is that your personal feelings about being
11		against the death penalty would cause you to try
12		to influence those other people towards your
13		viewpoint that you shouldn't assess the death
14		penalty because you don't believe in it.
15		Is that your statement?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q	When you say you could help, do you think you
18		could go back and probably answer one of these
19		questions no to avoid the death penalty?
20	A.	Yes. Uh-huh.
21	ζ.	Would it be fair to say we are talking about
22		life or death as far as punishment is concerned,
23		either life or death if he is found guilty.
24		If you had to choose one or the other,
25		would you have a preference? I think your

about whether or not they might not be a fair

25

juror," and I raised my hand and said, "I don't
like people who wear tan-colored jackets. I
think they all lie, you know, and I couldn't
trust anything they said," and your attorney
said, "Do you think you can put that out of your
mind? You see, my client has a tan-colored
jacket on." And I said, "Yes, I think I could
put that out of my mind," would you want me for
being a juror?

- A Not after saying that.
 - You see where I am having a problem? You are telling me on one hand you don't believe in the death penalty and you could answer these questions, and I believe you would try to do that fairly the way I would try to, but you see my dilemma and where I am having a problem?
- A. Yes, I think so.
 - Menowing that, do you think you could -- the Defendant has a right to a fair trial. Okay?

 But, so do we. It doesn't mean you are bad or less of a citizen because you may have a bias against the death penalty. A lot of people feel that way, but you are the only one who can tell me deep down inside your heart. You are going to have to wake up the next day after this is

Q.

over and look in the mirror and decide whether you have done the right thing without violating your conscience.

Do you think you can really say you can give us a fair trial, and I don't mean that in a bad way and I am not trying to say you are unfair. I don't mean it in that regard.

But can you see how your personal feelings affect how I feel? Maybe I could never convince you because of your feelings. Do you see what I mean?

- A Right.
 - But you are the only one who can tell me, you know, whether you think you could really be a fair and impartial juror knowing what your feelings are, and nobody is going to think you are bad if you come out and say, "Mr. Bax, I tell you what. I disagree with the death penalty, and I don't think I could be fair in determining whether a person should receive it or not receive it." Maybe you would be a fine juror on another case in a robbery or murder case or rape case where the death penalty doesn't come into play.

What do you think?

A You hit it on the head really. I don't think

- I could really give a person death.
- Q Okay. It's so hard, and these attorneys will ask
 you a couple of questions in a couple of minutes.

 They are going to say that you are going to take
 an oath to render a true verdict according to the
 evidence. Okay?
- 7 A. Uh-huh.

You don't have to take that oath if it would violate your personal feelings or make you feel like, "I don't know if I could follow that oath when it comes down to the nitty-gritty." Okay?"

"I don't know if I could ever answer those questions yes because of my personal feelings."

- 15 A. Uh-huh.
 - It is better that you tell us now than two weeks from now, and it is the last day and there are eleven other jurors saying the answers should be yes, and you are saying, "I agree the answers should be yes, but if I answer yes, I will be participating --
 - A Participating.
 - Q " -- in this guy's death."

Do you see the conflict? You will have your oath versus what your personal feelings are,

1		and I think most people would put their personal
2		feelings, above an oath when you are talking of
3		taking a life. Do you see what I mean?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	You might answer it not answer no, but refuse
6		to answer it. Do you see what I mean?
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	Knowing what your feelings are, do you think you
9		can ever participate in a death penalty case and
0		really be fair to both sides?
1	A.	Not really.
2	Q	Okay. Do you think that you would either not
3		answer if you believed let's say you took
4		the oath and you believed the answers should be
5		yes. Do you think you would probably not answer
6		one of the questions to avoid the death penalty,
7		no matter what the facts in the case would be?
8	A.	Yes. I hope I am not puzzling you.
9.		MR. MOEN: I think we can agree with
20		Mr. Maloy.
21		THE COURT: Both sides agree to Mr.
22		Maloy?
23		MR. BAX: We will agree.
24		THE COURT: Mr. Elizondo and Mr.
25		Hernandez?

1	MR. ELIZONDO: We agree.
2	MR. HERNANDEZ: We do.
3	THE COURT: Thank you very much. We
4	appreciate your time.
5	
6	
7	
8	CHARLES EDWARD KREZINSKI,
9	was called as a prospective juror and responded to
10	questions propounded as follows:
11	
12	EXAMINATION
13	
14	QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:
15	THE COURT: Mr. Krezinski, can we get
16	you a cup of coffee before we start?
17	Just relax. Obviously, we are informal
18	here. I am not wearing a robe, not even a coat,
19	so just try to relax and visit with us. The
20	lawyers are going to ask you some questions.
21	Q (By Mr. Moen) Is Krezinski the way you pronounce
22	your last name?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q I am Bob Moen from the District Attorney's Office.
25	The fellow who got up and is getting a cup of

1 coffee is Dick Bax, also with the District Attorney's Office, and Mr. Bax and myself will 2 be representing the District Attorney's Office 3 in the prosecution of this case. It is styled the State of Texas versus J. D. Harris (sic), and 5 we will be representing J. D. Harris -- excuse me. 6 It is the State of Texas versus Ricardo Guerra. 7 J. D. Harris was the victim. We will be 8 representing J. D. Harris in the prosecution of this case, as well as the District Attorney's 10 Office. That is what our job is, and that is what 11 12 we are doing. 13 Mr. Guerra is charged with killing 14 J. D. Harris on July 13th, 1982, and as the judge 15

Mr. Guerra is charged with killing

J. D. Harris on July 13th, 1982, and as the judge

mentioned when he gave you some of the facts

generally speaking, because no one is allowed to

go into the specifics at this time.

Those facts will help you make your decision as you hear them based on the evidence on the witness stand.

But we can talk in general about the facts to see if the jurors remember either reading or hearing anything about the case whatsoever in the newspaper or television or radio, and does the general description of the facts that

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the judge gave you ring a bell in your mind about anything you may have read or heard about the case?

- A Possibly on television. I heard something. I don't know if it's this particular one or not.
 - There is absolutely nothing wrong with having read or heard anything about a case or seeing something on TV. The only reason we ask jurors about it at all is to see if jurors have formed opinions or conclusions about the guilt or innocence of the man on trial based on what they have read or heard, and have you formed any opinion in your mind based on what you have read or heard on television?
- A. No.
- Let me explain in a little more detail what the judge touched on briefly when you were in here.

informal: In a capital murder case, the law provides we have to interview jurors individually, just like Mr. Bax and myself are doing, and we have been doing this two and a half weeks now, and it will probably be another week or so before we get the twelve members that will comprise our jury panel.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The reason we go so slow, one of the reasons, and the reason we talk to jurors individually is because it is a very serious case, a life-or-death case.

For a person convicted of a capital murder, a man can receive only one of two possible punishments, life imprisonment or the death sentence.

I think you realize we live in the type of country where no person is required to be on a jury panel where their service would violate their religious convictions, conscientious, or moral beliefs, whatever they may be.

One of the things I am going to ask you is your feelings concerning the death penalty and whether or not your feelings would allow you to serve on a jury and participate in returning a verdict you know would result in someone getting the death penalty. But before that, I want you to know to an absolute certainty in your mind there are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions anyone asks you this morning. What we ask the jurors to do, more than anything else, is to be honest and frank in their responses, to give us the response that most accurately reflects how

the juror feels in his heart and mind.

If you have a disagreement, please tell us now. The only way that we can excuse a juror is if the juror is frank enough to tell us that his or her jury service would violate his or her personal, religious, or conscientious beliefs.

We can't guess on that, can't read someone else's mind, so we ask people for the feedback and we tell the jurors. "Don't place yourself in the position of being a juror on such a case such as this, on any case, but particularly a capital murder case, by answering the way you think a lawyer wants to hear you answer or by being afraid to say, "I have a disagreement."

Don't put yourself as a juror on a case where you have disagreements. The only way we know that is by what the juror tells us.

Knowing that there are no right or wrong answers, can you tell us what your opinions or beliefs are concerning capital punishment, whether or not your feelings and beliefs would allow you to participate in such a trial, or would they not allow you to participate in such a case? I don't think my religion or anything like that

affects me as far as my beliefs, and I think 1 3 5 7 8 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 In some cases. a 19 20 21 22

23

24

25

justice should be done regardless of what it is. I don't disagree with the death penalty. Well, good. I certainly hope you didn't think I was trying to talk you into disagreeing, but so often people say, "Well -- " When they come in and sit in a chair in a room filled with total strangers, a lot of times, they hesitate to tell us what their true feelings are. The only thing I wanted to assure you. of is there are no right or wrong answers. I want to ask you about your background, but I will ask you first of all about your feelings about the death penalty. Is that pretty much that in some cases, it is a proper punishment for persons who commit certain crimes? Of course, that is the law in our state. all cases of murder does the death penalty apply. Our legislature has said the death penalty will apply in a limited type of circumstance, ten different types of circumstances in which the death penalty can apply. For instance, to commit a murder while breaking into someone else's home, burglarizing, whoever it might be, and they wake

3

7

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

24

25

up and hear a noise and the burglar shoots one of them to death. That is capital murder.

For the rapist to kill his rape victim. that is capital murder; kidnapper to kill his kidnap victim; the robber to kill his robbery victim; and finally, for an arsonist to set a fire and as a result of that fire, death results.

Those are examples of capital murder. Also, the legislature has said to kill someone for money or hire someone to do the killing, that is capital murder, murder for hire.

To murder a police officer or fireman in the course of their official duties, that is capital murder.

For a convict to kill anyone while he is escaping from a penal institution, that is capital murder, and finally, for a convict to kill anyone employed in the running of the penal institution, whether that be a guard, librarian, medical staff personnel, someone working in the kitchen, someone taking care of the grounds, someone taking care of the running of the penal institution, that is capital murder, too, and I think you are probably familiar with hearing of the death of Warden Pack, the gentleman who

l

ł

died in a case like that.

That is a capital murder case. The warden was provided in the penal institution for the State of Texas. That is capital murder, regardless of what has happened in the case.

All other murder cases -- now, it

doesn't make any difference how often or how

awful, such as the Hinley killings, whether he

killed twenty-seven boys, those are murder cases,

not capital murder cases. Capital murder doesn't

have anything to do with how the people meet

their deaths. The murder has to take place

during the commission of one of those felonies

or during -- or to the particular individual I

have mentioned or to the other individuals I have

talked about.

Do you follow me there?

THE COURT: Excuse me just a moment.

(The voir dire was interrupted by a telephone call.)

MR. MOEN: Okay. That is my headache, not the judge's.

(By Mr. Moen) So, it is just those instances we have mentioned that are capital murder. All other murder cases have a different range of

punishment for taking another person's life.

The range of that punishment is five to ninetynine years or life. Murders fall into this
punishment. The capital murders fall into the
other type of punishment.

Do those types of cases fall into what you think of as capital punishment, a man being killed by a murder-robber, murder-rapes?

A Death penalty?

- Q Do those strike you as the kinds of cases you have in your mind?
- A. Yes. I can see this as being the result, but not always the answer, depending on --
 - No. I am not asking you what your answers would be. I am not trying to stake you out. That is not what my intentions are. I am trying to ask you whether you think those are the cases where the death penalty is the best possible punishment, because a man can receive a life sentence on those cases. The way the sentences are assessed is a different proceeding altogether.

I wanted to see if those sounded like the fair and right cases for which the death penalty cught to be a possible punishment?

A Yes.

Q.

You see, the way a person receives a life

sentence or the death penalty when they are found

guilty of capital murder is by their answers to

questions that appear to my right.

You see, at the first stage of the trial, all they do is hear evidence about whether a man is guilty or not guilty of the offense.

Both sides can present evidence if they choose to at that portion of the trial, and the judge will give you a legal-size paper like this, and he will put the legal definitions down and you will apply the facts as you heard them to the legal definitions as to the facts of the case and you will come back with an answer of guilty or not guilty of capital murder.

If the jury finds someone guilty of capital murder, they come in the courtroom again and we proceed with the trial and the jury can hear additional evidence at that time. There doesn't have to be additional evidence. There can be, but there doesn't have to be. Once again, the jury can hear additional evidence to help them answer those questions, and after the entire trial is over, the jury goes back to deliberate on what the answers ought to be to

those questions.

No one tries to hide anything from

you. You know in advance, and I want to tell

you right now if both questions are answered

yes, the man receives the death penalty. If

either question, it doesn't matter which one, one

no answer, and the man receives a life sentence

rather than the death penalty.

Do you understand me on that?

A. Yes.

All twelve jurors have to agree before the answers are yes which would result in the death penalty. Only ten have to agree before a question can be answered no.

You see, there is a slight distinction.

To answer a question no, ten jurors; to answer a question yes, all twelve have to agree.

Let me ask you if you could to take a few seconds and go over those, read those questions to yourself, and I want to go over some of the words that appear.

Okay. That first question would be asking you, after you found the man guilty of capital murder, to make a determination about the conduct of the man, and of course, you answer that

question basically on what you have heard about the offense; what part did the man play in the case? Were there Codefendants involved? Was only one man the triggerman, or what part that person actually played in murdering the deceased? What were the parts played by everyone?

And you go back and answer that question. Was that conduct displayed by the man committing capital murder, was that conduct done with the reasonable expectation that the deceased would die?

that question applies to a hypothetical case.

Imagine a man goes into a convenience store and goes in with a pistol and demands from the cashier that she turn the money over to him and she is terribly frightened like anyone would be under the circumstances. He looks around and sees there is no one in the store and he is an exconvict and doesn't want to go back to the penitentiary for a long time. He fires the pistol at her and she dies. Unbeknownst to him, she steps on an alarm and calls the police and they are waiting outside the store. The man has committed capital murder. He has taken a

life during a robbery.

Я

would have to decide: Was that conduct on that man's part that caused the death of the deceased, was that deliberate conduct and was that done with the reasonable expectation she would die?

In other words, when you take a loaded pistol and point it at a human being and point it at their chest, is that deliberate conduct and done with the reasonable expectation -- when you take a loaded pistol and fire it into someone else's head, would that person die? Is that done with the reasonable expectation that the person would die?

You see, in that hypothetical, you make a decision as to whether the conduct was deliberate and done with the reasonable expectation that the death of the deceased would result, and then you pass to the second question and decide in the second question what type of person was this on trial.

You can use all the evidence to make that decision, but then you make a decision about the type of person on trial. Is the man on trial the type of person that would --

2068 NESS

Excuse me just a second.

Then you answer the second question and you make a determination about the kind of person on trial. Is the man the type of person who would probably commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society?

There are two words and phrases I want to point out to you in there. The first word is probability. You will have to make a determination from the evidence if there is a probability that the man on trial is the type of person, and you will have to use your own definition for that word. The legislature drew these questions up and said, "This is the decision on how capital murder will work. The judge will make a decision based on the answers to these questions."

That is fine, but they didn't give us definitions for the jurors. You will have to use your own definitions for the word probability.

I want to point out one thing, and that is the decision you will be making there, there is a probability, you will notice it is not a certainty, and I think you will know as well as I do why it is not a certainty is because the only person in the world who can predict something to

F2068 #1629

a certainty is God himself, and you are not to be
put in the position of playing God.

What you are required to do is make a determination as to whether there is a probability, not a certainty.

That phrase "criminal acts of violence": You would have to believe there is a probability the man would have to engage in that type of conduct. You don't have to prove or believe the man would commit any specific acts of violence, capital murders, robberies, assaults, rapes, any particular acts. It is only is there a probability he would engage in that type of conduct, and would that conduct constitute a continuing threat to society.

"society." You will have to bring me your definitions on that word. We don't have a definition from the legislature either. I think you realize from your common sense, like everyone, once a man is found guilty of capital murder, the society or portion of society the man will find himself in is the prison society.

Do you follow that?

Because he is not going to come live

next to you and not going to come live next to

me. That is the portion of society we live in.

He is going to live in the prison society. That

is the portion of society I would suggest is going

to be the most unfavorable part of our society,

or portion of our society where all the people

who can't get along wind up in the penitentiary

at one time, it seems like, who can't get along.

That is the portion of society he will find himself in. The only thing I want to bring out, to find out whether you agree or disagree with me on -- I am not trying to talk you into it -- but do you feel there are persons in the prison system who need protection from other prisoners in the society? Do you think there are convicts who, although they are in the penitentiary, have the right to serve out their time in a reasonably safe manner as well as employees in the system who have the right to go and work in that system protected?

- A. I would agree.
- Now that we have had a chance to go over Questions l and 2, do you have questions of me about Questions l and 2 that I can clear up for you at this time?

A. No.

Do you feel like Question No. 1 and Question No.

2 are the type of questions you would be able to answer depending upon the evidence you would hear? I am not asking you how you would answer them. That is based on the evidence. But do you feel like the type of questions and the way the questions are worded, that is the type of questions you could answer depending upon the evidence you would hear?

A Yes, sir.

I want to point out in regards to Questions 1 and 2 -- at the punishment phase of the trial, you can hear additional evidence. You don't have to.

There is no requirement you hear additional evidence before you answer Questions 1 and 2 yes.

You could answer in a proper case both of those questions yes based on the facts of the trial itself. That can be enough for the jury to answer both questions yes. The jury doesn't have to hear additional evidence at the punishment phase.

The trial itself, in a proper case, can have enough evidence for the jury.

Do you understand that?

1 A. I understand that. 2 What does your dad do? I take it he is an 3 employer? A. Semiretired. 5 What is his occupation? Q A. Building contractor, self-employed. 7 Q. How about your mom? Has she ever worked outside the home or is she a housewife? She works for Nabisco here. 10 For what? 11 Nabisco here in Houston. 12 That is the plant over off of Almeda, isn't it? 13 A. Right. 14 Q Behind the park? 15 Off Almeda. I don't know where the park is A. 16 situated. 17 Do you have any brothers and sisters in your 18 family? Yes. 19 A. 20 Q. How many brothers and sisters do you have? 21 Three sisters and three brothers. A. 22 Okay. Are there any of your brothers and sisters Q. 23 still alive at the home with your mom and dad?

My youngest sister and youngest brother live in

25

the home.

1	Q	Tell us then about your other brothers and
2		sisters older than yourself.
3		What type of jobs or occupations do
4		they have?
5	A.	My oldest brother, also my second oldest brother,
6		is an architect here in Houston, and my youngest
7		brother is going to high school in his senior
8		year.
9	Q	Where does he go?
10	A.	St. Pius.
11	Q	Who was coach of baseball when you were going to
12		St. Pius? Do you know? Wasn't a fellow named
13		Dorski it?
14	Α.	Dorski, no. They changed two or three times while
15		I was there.
16	Q	I just wondered. A fellow I knew from St. Pius
17		played baseball, and I wondered if he still is.
18	i i	What about your sisters? What type of
19		work do they do?
20	A.	My oldest sister works for the phone company,
21		second oldest works for an insurance company,
22		and the youngest sister, I believe she works for
23		an insurance company also no, she works for
24		a bank.
25	Q.	Now, I see that you are a jet aircraft mechanic.

1 How did you wind up in that field? 2 I was always interested in aircraft. 3 Did you train for it? You have to go through fifteen months of school, 5 and sometimes schooling gets you a government 6 license. 7 You have to be actually licensed by the F.A.A. 8 or Federal Government to be able to work on a jet aircraft? 10 You don't have to be, but most places require it. 11 Most places require it. 12 Does the school you attend, does that 13 have to be certified or approved by the Government 14 as well? 15 A. Yes. 16 Airesearch? 17 Airesearch Aviation. 18 What kind of business is that? 19 They are part of the Garrity Corporation, 20 Airesearch. They manufacture engines, aircraft 21 engines actually, but more or less, they are a 22 service center for the aircraft engines. 23 Pretty good line of work? Q. 24 A. Yes.

As far as weathering the recession and economy

1 here in Houston? Pretty good? 2 We work mostly on corporate jet aircraft and stuff like that, so --3 I ask it for a couple of reasons. One is I am just curious, and also I anticipate if you are selected 5 as a juror, you would probably be down here a week 6 7 on the case. What is your policy at work? They pay us full-time for jury duty. 9 A. It wouldn't cause you problems or loss of a job 10 by your being down here? 11 12 No. 13 Good. 14 What type of hunting do you like to do? 15 Bird hunting, deer hunting, or both? 16 A. Deer hunting. 17 How about fishing? Salt water or fresh water? 18 Salt water. 19 What type of cases have you been interested in 20 down here at the courthouse? Have you been 21 following any case in particular recently? 22 Just the big cases on television, watching the 23 news and hearing big cases. The Hinley case 24 and stuff like that, that is gory, but still is the kind of stuff you watch. 25

Let me talk to you a little bit now, take a little break from talking about the questions and that aspect of the law and tell you some of the things required of you by your jury service.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The judge will tell you there are certain things you have to do to be a juror on a criminal case. He will put them in writing. will be part of the Court's charge, and you will deliberate and the judge will tell you, "Here are the definitions, legal definitions, of what constitutes capital murder." He will also put pages in there that will say, "Here is what you have to do while you are deliberating," and it will tell the jurors that you don't have to consider the Defendant's failure to testify. If the Defendant doesn't testify, you are not to consider the Defendant's failure to testify as evidence of his guilt. You are not to find a person innocent because he fails to testify. doesn't mean you can't wonder why in the back of your mind and say, "Why would someone not want to testify at their own trial? It's an important trial. Why couldn't they get on the stand and testify?"

There is nothing wrong with wondering

why, but you can't hold a person's silence as evidence of their guilt.

Do you follow me on that? Does that feel like a fair thing in your mind that you would be able to abide by?

A Yes.

He will tell you there is a presumption of innocence that attaches to the Defendant in this case. What that basically means is this. You are not to find the Defendant guilty just because we are in the courtroom. Of course, we are in the chambers today, but if actually selected, we will be in a courtroom, and you will be instructed not to find the Defendant guilty just because he is in one of the courtrooms charged with serious allegations and represented by attorneys, and the jury is a judge, but you are to decide a man is guilty or not guilty and keep an open mind in that regard until the evidence is in and base your verdict on the evidence after it is all in.

Do you feel like that is the type of situation you could abide by? Does that sound fair to you?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q The judge will also charge you in writing that the

Grand Jury indictment is no evidence of anything.

It is a piece of paper you will probably never get
a chance to look at during the trial. It is like
a pistol in a footrace. The race can't begin
until the indictment is returned. We can't begin
the trial. It is the way we are to start this
trial. That is all.

You are not to give it significance other than that. It is no evidence of anything.

Do you feel like you could abide by that ruling or admonishment by the judge?

- A. Yes.
- Q Okay. The judge has talked to you about this, and
 I hope to explain it just a little bit more.

always rests with Mr. Bax and myself. We have the burden of proving that Mr. Guerra is guilty, and we have the burden of proving -- of course, the burden of proof means we have the obligation to call witnesses and prove our point. We have to put witnesses on the stand. In some European countries, if you are charged with a crime, the burden shifts to the Defendant. He has to prove he is innocent, and because he is charged with a crime, the State can remain silent. They don't

2 Defe

have to call any witnesses whatsoever, and the Defendant has to find himself innocent of the allegations he is accused of.

That is not the way it works in our country. You know that. The burden rests with Mr. Bax and myself. The State has the burden of proof.

Just because we can call witnesses
doesn't mean the Defense can't call witnesses.

The trial is a wide-open proceeding. If they want
to subpoen someone to the courthouse and get them
to testify to whatever they want to prove, it
doesn't cost them a penny to issue a subpoena to
call somebody. The Sheriff will go out and call
the person and even arrest them. Only one side
has the burden of putting on witnesses, but both
sides can, and you have to hold Mr. Bax and
myself to the burden of proving it. Okay?

- A Okay.
- The State has that burden, and we must prove it before you can say a person is guilty of any crime, all the way from a traffic ticket to all the way to a murder charge. You have to believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the man is guilty. That is the phrase, and the judge was right when

he indicated a little while ago, we can't give you a definition for what the phrase "beyond a reasonable doubt" means. I can only tell you beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean we have to prove this case to you beyond all doubt or any doubt or a shadow of a doubt, and for a jury to believe that, they are wrong. Okay?

The burden of proof is to prove beyond a reasonable doubt. I will suggest to you, I will tell you I can't prove any criminal case to you or any other juror -- I am not just talking about this case; I am talking about any case.

No case can ever be proven beyond any doubt or all doubt.

The only way you can prove that or convince a person in their mind to all proof beyond any doubt, a shadow of a doubt, would be if the jury were present and saw the offense itself take place, and of course, a person who knows anything about the crime cannot be a juror, and that is why we ask jurors, did you form opinions or conclusions?

People who form opinions or conclusions or people who are witnesses to a crime can never serve as jurors on that case. They are

specifically excluded from jury service. We take people and put them in the jury box who don't know anything about the crime, haven't seen anything, aren't witnesses, haven't formed any opinions or conclusions, and we have to prove the case to them beyond a reasonable doubt, not beyond all or a shadow of a doubt.

That specifically applies to Question

2, because number one, the only person in the
entire universe who could prove Question No. 2

to you beyond all doubt or a shadow of a doubt
is the Almighty himself. That is why Question 2

is proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt, if
there is a probability the Defendant will commit
criminal acts of violence that would constitute
a continuing threat to society.

Do you follow me about how that fits together? I hope it fits together.

The final thing the judge will charge you on is this. He will tell you when you are judging the credibility of a witness, you are not to give a witness any more belief or any less belief just because of the witness' job.

Let me explain. As a juror, you will be the judge of the credibility of the witnesses.

You will hear what took place on July 13th. You will believe that from what you hear on the witness stand.

4 5 A juror has a right to believe or disbelieve everything a witness told you, even though the witness is under oath.

7

Я

That sounds crazy to think that someone gets on the witness stand and takes an oath to tell the truth and lies. I wish we lived in the type of world -- I mean this sincerely -- I wish we lived in the type of world where somebody would take an oath to God and not lie.

11

12

10

People aren't perfect, so the jurors

13 14

decide when someone is telling them about a fact

15

situation whether they believe a witness or not.

16

They can believe part of what a witness says or

reject a part or reject the whole thing if it

18

doesn't make sense, in fact, if they don't believe

19

20

the witness.

Do you understand that?

21

The only thing the judge will tell you,

22

he will tell you, Mr. Krezinski, don't believe

23

or disbelieve someone because of the job someone

24

has, because no one, regardless of the church we

25

attend or regardless of the minister, whoever it

might be, no person in the eyes of the law is

deemed to be an automatic truth-teller because of
his job. Okav?

And now the final thing I want to talk to you about, and I will pass you to the Defense and they are going to have questions, the final thing I want to talk to you about is this. The offense of murder carries a different range of punishment, five years to ninety-nine years or life. Why did I mention that? The only reason I mentioned it is this. The crime of capital murder includes the crime of murder as one of its elements.

Remember how we talked about in order to commit capital murder, you had to commit a murder during the course of one of the crimes we mentioned or you had to murder the class of individual we talked about? An employee of a penal institution, a fireman, a policeman?

You see, someone could be, hypothetically speaking, charged with capital murder and the jury could hear all the evidence and believe that the person is -- no question in their mind -- guilty of murder, but that murder did not take

1 place during the commission of one of these 2 crimes or in the murder of a police officer; 3 at the time he committed the murder, he did not know at the time he was a police officer or 5 fireman. 6 In that event, the jurors' proper verdict would be not guilty of capital murder but 7 Я guilty of the offense of murder. 9 You see, murder is an included element of the crime of capital murder, and that would be 10 just as proper a verdict in the case if the juror 11 12 believed that as it would be for the jury to find someone guilty of capital murder if they believed 13 that to be the case. That is a determination the 15 jury makes from the facts. 16 If you find someone guilty of murder, 17 the range of punishment is different, five to ninety-nine years or life. 18 19 Have you ever heard the phrase 20 "probation"? 21 Yes, sir. 22 You are familiar with what that means? 23 A person who gets probation doesn't 24 go to the penitentiary. He has to report to his

probation officer once a month, has to allow the

probation officer to visit him in his home; has
to work at a place of employment; avoid persons
or places of disreputable or harmful character;
not violate the laws of this state or any other
state or of the United States; avoid the use of
habit-forming -- you know, just stay away from
alcohol and drugs and things like that. In other
words, live a life like a decent human being and
stay out of trouble, and the only admonition
basically is to report to the probation officer
once a month for the length of your probation.

Now, the only way the person can get probation is if the jury recommends it, and the only way the jury can recommend probation is first, if they find the man guilty of the crime he is charged with and then the jury has assessed a penitentiary sentence of ten years or less. Then the jury can discuss among themselves and decide, "Are we going to recommend probation to the judge for this man? Do we feell this is the proper case for probation for this man," and if the jury decides to recommend probation, it is a binding recommendation on the judge. He has to give the Defendant probation.

What I want to ask you is this. Do you

feel like if you were a juror on a case where you had found someone guilty of the offense of murder and you felt like it was a proper case for probation, do you feel like you could recommend probation to the judge even though you found someone guilty of murder?

Now, before you answer that question, let me give you some hypothetical examples of cases that would fall within the technical definition of murder.

Okay. Murder is defined as the intentional or knowing taking of another human being's life, to intentionally or knowingly cause someone's death, but there are many different types of murder that fall within that definition of murder. For instance, I think you would agree with me that a man standing out in front of Foley's killing men, women, and children as they come outside to attract attention to his political cause, and he has murdered seven or eight people, is the type of person who needs to spend the rest of his life in living hell if it were possible. If there were a place under the courthouse to put a man like that, that would be fine.

ı

*

There is a difference in that type of killing and someone who comes to his house and finds his wife and child sexually abused and his daughter dead in one of the bedrooms. His wife is in another bedroom, and she was tortured, and in her dying breath, she says, "It was Joe Blow down the street who did that to us," and this portion of the house has been set on fire to cover up this crime, and here is the cornerstone basically, the foundation of his life, and his wife is dying saying, you know, "Joe Blow did it," and she dies.

He gets his pistol and goes to Joe
Blow's house to get an explanation. He goes down
and he is plenty mad. He knocks on the door, and
Joe Blow answers the door, and he says, "I want
to talk to you about my wife and daughter," and
Joe Blow says, "I did it. What are you going to
do about it?" He fires one shot into Joe Blow's
body, intentionally takes a life. That is
technically murder.

You see the difference in standing before Foley's and the man who comes and finds that type of situation that exists?

That is why the legislature has decided

that the range of punishment for murder can be all the way from five years' probation to ninetynine years or life, and that the crime should fit within that range depending upon the facts as the jury hears them, and if the jury finds it is a proper case for probation, the jury can even recommend that.

I can give you another case that would fall within the sympathetic range for murder, but the thing I want to ask you is this.

Do you feel you could at least keep an open mind to this question of probation even though you found someone guilty of murder, and if you felt like it was a proper case, not be afraid to recommend it to the other jurors or the judge?

- A Yes, I feel I could.
- The word murder has a horrible connotation, and when you ask someone, "Could you give someone probation for murder," it is hard to see without that explanation. There are many different ranges that fall in that definition.

I want to start you thinking along that line.

Do you have any questions on what we have talked about?

I know I have tried to explain so many things.

I know I am guilty of doing a lot of talking at times, but after you are selected for the jury panel, I won't have a chance to talk to you at all. And that is the right way. There should be no suggestion after a case is over with that a juror has voted the way he does because the juror has struck up a friendship with Bob Moen.

We are instructed to avoid personal contact with the jurors.

Let me ask you a few final questions about the death penalty.

What particular purpose do you think the death sentence serves in society as far as being the possible punishment for certain crimes? Why do you think it is useful?

- A Why? It is hard to answer really.
- I know when you came down, you didn't know what kind of case you might be a juror on, but I will bet you a dollar to your dime you didn't think it was this type of case.

I am trying to ask you questions, and I don't know how to do it except to ask you something.

A About it being a useful tool?

I Q. Well, what part do you think it plays? 2 don't necessarily have to use that phrase I 3 used, but what part do you think the death penalty plays in an ordinary society? 5 Well, how I think on this thing? Α. 6 Do you really feel it's a punishment to be used 7 under certain circumstances as either a deterrent 8 or the type of punishment a man ought to receive if he has unlawfully taken another life? 10 Under particular circumstances. 11 Okay. I take it from your responses here this Q. 12 morning that your feelings would allow you to 13 serve on a capital murder jury and return a 14 verdict that you know would result in someone 15 receiving the death penalty. 16 If you were elected foreman, and I take 17 it if you were elected foreman on a case, you would 18 be able to sign your name to a verdict sheet you 19 knew would result in someone receiving the death 20 penalty? 21 Yes. If you were elected foreman, you would have to 23 sign the verdict page with guilty, and if both

questions were answered yes, you would have to

write that and return it to the Court, and I take

24

A.

There would always be someone to take care of the

children.

l

And finally, the judge will ask you when you are deliberating on those questions, he will you you are not to consider -- this is an absolute admonition -- if any of the jurors did this, we would have to start all over again, and it may take five to six weeks to try this case, and we would have to start all over again if there was any mention of how long a person might have to serve if he received a life sentence.

MR. ELIZONDO: I object to the prosecutor stressing the law of parole.

(By Mr. Moen) How long a person would have to serve on a life sentence, that is for the Board of Pardons and Paroles to decide. They have to say that, and jurors, if anyone brings it up and starts talking about it, you must tell them to shut up and knock on the door if they don't so we can take care of it then.

A judge cannot have talk about how long a person would serve on a sentence, and the judge will put that in writing, too. That is for the Board of Pardons and Paroles.

I wish there was a way to do this quicker. Unfortunately, there is not.

F2068-4653

MR. MOEN: I will pass you to the
Defense attorney.

THE COURT: Let's let Cindy stretch her fingers a minute.

EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HERNANDEZ:

I guess it is my turn to ask personal questions, but let me tell you this: That all the questions we ask, Mr. Moen and I will ask, it is all done in good faith. Basically what it is is an attempt to find or select the best possible twelve jurors that can be free of any biases and prejudices and could be fair and just and honest, and basically what we are asking is sincerity and truth in your answers, and that is all we are asking, how you feel. Okay?

There are no right or wrong answers, and, believe me, we accept any answers that you might give us simply because it comes from you, comes from your heart, and it is the feelings that you have had all your life and your views, and perhaps if you are not able to serve on this jury, that does not detract from the fact that you can be --

and a reasonable doubt.

and you could be a good juror on another jury.

Do you understand what I mean?

Yes, sir.

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

So please don't take the questions we are asking as prying into your personal life. It is all done only in good faith, and I am not here to

humiliate or embarrass you in any way. Okay?

All right. A.

There are several questions that I will ask you, but before I get into that, there are three concepts of law that you are required to know, and the judge will charge you on that, and Mr. Moen has explained to you, and that would be the presumption of innocence and the burden of proof

But, first of all, Mr. Guerra, who is our client sitting right here, has been indicted by the Grand Jury. He sits here today charged and indicted with knowingly and intentionally causing the death of J. D. Harris, a police officer, while Mr. Harris was in the lawful discharge of his duties.

By the mere fact that he sits here today represented by two attorneys, would that -and charged and indicted by the Grand Jury of

ì intentionally and knowingly taking the life of a police officer -- would that affect you in any 3 way? What do you mean by affecting me? 5 Well, would that affect your -- say, for example, Q. 6 in considering the trial, in being fair? 7 No, it really wouldn't affect me. I would have 8 to hear all the deliberations or whatever. 9 just, you know, him being here and there --10 Let me go one more step further than that. 11 fact that it will be known in the trial that Mr. 12 Guerra, our client, is an illegal alien, would 13 the fact that he is an illegal alien, the fact 14 that he has been indicted by the Grand Jury, the 15 fact that he is sitting here indicted and charged 16 with knowingly and intentionally causing the death of a police officer, would that affect you 17 18 in any way? 19 THE COURT REPORTER: Would you please 20 speak out? 21 MR. HERNANDEZ: I am sorry. She can't 22 take a nod. You need to say yes or no. 23 No. 24 Are we saying for the simple reason he is an 25 illegal alien it would not affect you in any way?

l	A.	No.
2	Q	What are your feelings towards illegal aliens, if
3		I might ask?
4	A.	I really don't have feelings on them, but when
5		it comes to something like this, being illegal
6		doesn't affect me whatsoever, when it comes down
7		to being charged with something like that. It
8		wouldn't sway my feelings one way or the other.
9	Q	Okay. So then we might say, hypothetically
10		speaking, as he sits here today, you are on our
11		side? Would you be in agreement with that?
12	A.	I am not really on anybody's side.
13		MR. MOEN: Of course, I know that is
14		where he would like you to be.
15		Objection to that.
16		THE COURT: On the record, the objection
17		is sustained.
18	Q	(By Mr. Hernandez) Well, let me put it another
19		form then.
20		The fact that he sits here today and
21		is indicted by the Grand Jury is no evidence of
22		guilt whatsoever?
23	A.	Right. I will agree with that.
24	Q	Do you agree with that statement?
25		Okay, then, that is fair enough.

l

2

3

4

Then let's go to the -- first or pre-concept you are required to know, and the judge will charge you on that, and that would be the presumption of innocence.

5

7

8

9

10

11

The law states that a Defendant is presumed innocent until proven beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty and that you are not to be swayed, for example, sway in any matter of his presumption of innocence until the State has proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt or overcome that presumption.

- 12 A. Uh-huh.
- Q Do you agree with that law or disagree with it?
- 14 A I agree with it.
- So in essence, we can say as he sits here today,
 you can presume that he is innocent?
- A As he sits here today, yes.
- And as he will sit in front of you and the other eleven jurors throughout the trial?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q Could you give him that presumption?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q Okay, then, you would definitely make the State prove to you his innocence or non-innocence?
- 25 A. Yes.

produce any evidence or witnesses would not affect
your deliberations in any way?

A. No.

Okay, now, we go with reasonable doubt, and of course, there is no definition for reasonable doubt as Mr. Moen was telling you.

basically what it means or would mean to me would be common sense. In other words, if you have reason founded in doubt or simply put, a doubt founded in reason, now that burden is much, much heavier than the civil burden, say, in a civil case where it is preponderance of the evidence or the greater weight of the credible evidence. In other words, whoever puts on more evidence, wherever it tips a little bit, this side would win, while in a criminal case the burden is much, much heavier. The State would have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt, and of course, that is not any doubt and not all doubt, but beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you understand? Do you follow me?

- A. Yes.
- Now, could you follow the law as it is today that the State would have to prove his guilt beyond a

reasonable doubt, or would you agree with that law?

- A I could agree with that law.
- Now, we get to the point of the first question that Mr. Moen was talking to you about. As you know, any trial, any criminal trial has two stages. The first stage is the guilt-or-innocence stage. That is where the State would present their evidence to overcome the presumption of innocence.

If he is convicted or found guilty by the jurors, then you would come back and be asked to answer Question 1 and Question 2, which is at the second stage and what we call the punishment stage. Okay?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Now, the first question, or should we say -- let's assume in a capital murder case that you find the Defendant intentionally and knowingly takes the life of someone. You have found him guilty of that, and you go into your second stage and you are asked to answer those two questions.

Read with me, if you will, the first question: Whether the conduct of the Defendant that caused the death of the deceased was

committed deliberately and with a reasonable expectation that the death of the deceased or another would result.

The word deliberately will not be explained to you or defined for you. You would have to make your own definition. At this point, let me ask you what your definition of deliberately would be?

- A. It seems like as far as that question goes, to me, to me it seems like he was knowing what he was doing at the time, deliberately.
- Q Knowing what he was doing at the time?
- 3 A Yes.
 - Q What do you mean? You mean thinking about it?
 - A There is some good word. It seems like what he was doing and he was wrong, whether he -- he knew what he was doing was wrong at the time. That is the way I see it.
 - All right. So you will consider -- let me ask you this: Will the mere fact that you found him guilty in the first stage of intentionally and knowingly taking the life of someone, and then you get to the first question, would you answer that question automatically yes simply because of the word "deliberately"?

A. Okay. Can you say that again?

Okay. You found him guilty in the first stage of intentionally and knowingly taking the life of someone.

Are you with me on that one?

Then you get to answer Question 1 and 2, and you are asked to answer Questions 1 and 2.

Do you understand now how close finding someone guilty of knowingly and intentionally causing the death of someone, and then having to answer Question No. 1 as to whether the conduct of the Defendant that caused the death of the deceased was committed deliberately, would you answer that No. 1 yes simply because you found him guilty in the first stage of intentionally and knowingly killing someone?

MR. MOEN: I object to the way the question is phrased. He can't answer the question yes just because he's found someone guilty of intentionally and knowingly causing someone's death.

The question that would disqualify the juror is would he automatically do it just because he has found someone guilty, because of the

evidence. ı 2 THE COURT: Sustained. (By Mr. Hernandez) Let me rephrase the question. 3 Let me ask you this. Simply because you found someone guilty of intentionally and 5 knowingly causing the death of someone, would you 6 want or expect evidence in order to answer No. 7 1? 8 9 I would need some type of evidence. 10 Huh? Q. 11 Yes. So then what you are saying, you wouldn't 12 automatically answer Question No. 1 yes or you 13 14 would? 15 I wouldn't automatically. 16 You would not? Okay. 17 Then you are asked to go to Question No. 2: Whether there is a probability that the 18 19 Defendant would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to 20 21 society, and considering the seriousness of this 22 case, would you expect to hear evidence before you 23 could answer that question, or would want evidence 24 or testimony before you could answer that question?

For sure, No. 2, yes. I would want some type of

25

A.

evidence.

Q Would you agree with me or disagree with me that people can change?

A Yes.

All right. Now, then, we get to a sticky question that Mr. Moen was asking you about, and that was probation, whether in certain situations if you found someone guilty of a lesser offense, not capital murder, but murder, and the punishment came in from the jurors and their agreement was a punishment of ten years or less, the question is, could you consider probation where that punishment range comes in between one year or two years and ten? Could you consider probation?

A. Yes.

For someone that has been found guilty of intentionally and knowingly taking the life of someone? In other words, murder in a proper case?

A In a proper case, yes.

Q Pardon?

A In a proper case, yes.

Q Okay. Basically, the reason for all these questions is to seek out honest answers to see whether you can set aside feelings of biases and

prejudice, and, of course, everyone has them, but 1 not to the extent they would affect their 2 judgment, or at least we would hope not, or my 3 client would hope not. 5 Can you decide solely and only on the evidence and set aside any kind of feelings of 6 prejudice or bias that you might have? 7 8 Yes. I can. Yes. Do you have the ability -- or could you keep an open mind until you retired to reach a verdict? 10 11 A. Yes. And would you not be influenced by the fact that 12 the media -- or probably there would be media 13 14 coverage? 15 No, I wouldn't. And most importantly of all, would you make the 16 State prove the case to you? 17 When I heard that was what they were 18 A. Yes. 19 supposed to do. 20 Pardon? From what I heard, that is what they were supposed 21 22 to do. Yes, sir. 23 And you would make them prove every element of this crime he is charged with beyond a reasonable 24

25

doubt?

ı A. Yes. 2 And any element in doubt, would you then vote 3 for not guilty? MR. MOEN: I object to the form of that question. 6 THE COURT: Sustained. (By Mr. Hernandez) Just a few more questions. 7 Q. Mr. Elizondo has brought to my attention some questions concerning police officers. 10 There will be police officers testifying in this trial. Of course, you are aware by now 11 12 that he is charged with the death or causing the 13 death of a police officer, and, of course, I am 14 sure growing up, you were always taught to 15 respect police officers, and what I am getting to 16 is whether you could give or would give or how would you give witnesses, being police officers, 17 18 more credibility or more weight simply because 19 of the mere fact that they are police officers? 20 No. 21 Then would you agree with me that they are humans 22 just like you and I? 23 A. Yes.

Q And subject to the same human frailties as you

and I?

1	A.	Yes.
2	Q.	And they are subject to mistakes just like you
3		and I?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q	And you can be fair and just and render a true
6		verdict in this case?
7	A.	Yes.
8		MR. HERNANDEZ: That is all we have.
9		MR. MOEN: We will accept Mr. Krezinski.
10		THE COURT: What says the Defense?
11		MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, may we have
12		a moment?
13		Your Honor, prior to excusing Mr.
14		Krezinski, we re-urge our motion to examine the
15		whole venire and hope we can have peremptory
16		challenges at the end of the examination of the
17		whole venire.
18		THE COURT: Motion overruled.
19		Mr. Krezinski, you are not required to
20		be a juror on this case.
21		You see, each side has a certain number
22		of strikes, and the Defense has chosen to exercise
23		those strikes.
24		Thank you for your cooperation.
25		MR. BAX: Thank you.

1	M. WHITSON SADLER,
2	was called as a prospective juror and responded to
3	questions propounded as follows:
4	
5	EXAMINATION
6	
7	QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:
8	THE COURT: Mr. Sadler, we promised
9	you we would be somewhere else.
10	Please relax and visit with us a little
11	while.
12	You may proceed.
13	MR. BAX: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	Q (By Mr. Bax) Good afternoon, Mr. Sadler.
15	A Good afternoon.
16	Q As the judge told you earlier, my name is Dick
17	Bax. The man to my right is Bob Moen. We are
18	both Assistant District Attorneys here in Harris
19	County. The county of the coun
20	We will be representing the State and
21	the family of Officer James Harris.
22	(An object was moved from the front
23	of the witness stand by Mr. Moen.)
24	THE JUROR: Thank you.
25	MR. BAX: I don't know if he thought

you were going to steal that or not.

ı

MR. MOEN: I didn't know if you could see with that stuck in front of your face.

(By Mr. Bax) Mr. Moen and myself will be representing the State of Texas and the family of James D. Harris in this case against Ricardo Aldape Guerra, seated to your right and third from my left.

The judge has gone over a few of the facts about this case in outline form. Did that jog your memory about anything you may have read or seen on TV about the case?

- A Not really. I read some newspaper accounts. I am not familiar with the case.
- There is nothing wrong with reading something in the newspaper or seeing someting on TV. I don't think there is really any way a person could avoid it. The reason we ask that question is to find out whether a prospective juror may have formed an opinion as to the Defendant's guilt or innocence, and I take it you have not?
- A I have no opinion.
- Q In most cases, we select a jury by bringing over a group of people, forty or so, and talking to them as a group, explaining certain principles of

law that will be involved in the case, and each
side has a certain number of strikes they can
eliminate a juror with, and usually within two

A capital case is different. We talk to each juror individually and differently, and usually go through anywhere from a hundred to a hundred fifty or so prospective jurors before we can seat a jury, taking up, I guess, between two and four weeks, I guess would be the average time.

hours, we have a jury and evidence begins.

The reason we do that is, number one, the law requires it, and I think in this case, it benefits the parties involved. It gives us a chance to visit with each of the jurors and see if there is anything about the case, and especially the death penalty as a possible punishment, which might violate their religious or personal or moral scruples if they were to have to serve on a jury like that.

There are no right or wrong answers to anything we discuss here today. Certainly everyone has a right to their opinion about the death penalty.

What we need to do -- to know, is whether

a person can, in fact, render a verdict if the evidence called for the result of the death penalty. The only person who can put someone on a jury is the juror himself by the way he answers the questions. No one here will change their opinion, no matter what it is. We need to know what it is.

Could you briefly, in twenty-five words or less, tell us briefly what your position is on the death penalty; tell us what you know about it?

- A I believe in the death penalty if it is proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime was committed by the Defendant.
- Q Okay. Let me give you -- there are only a limited number of cases in which a person becomes eligible for the death penalty.

Let me go over those with you and see if that would fit your feelings in this area.

First of all, you have to have an intentional taking of a life. You have to have a murder.

- A. Uh-huh.
- But a murder alone -- and I don't mean to say that, that murder is something that is a lesser

offense -- but murder alone is not sufficient,
no matter how many people are killed and no matter
what the person's background is that does the
killing.

For example, if someone were to stand outside of Foley's this afternoon and gunned down people as they walked out to further a political view that they might have, that would be a murder case. The maximum punishment would be life in prison.

If you commit the murder during the course of one of five felonies, during the course of a burglary, a rape, an arson, or a kidnapping, that elevates it to capital murder. If you murder for money; if you murder a police officer or fireman when they are in the actual discharge of their official duties and you know that the person was either a fireman or policeman, that is elevated to capital murder.

If you are a prisoner and kill someone while trying to escape or if you are a prisoner and kill any employee of the penal institution, that is elevated to capital murder.

Those are the only areas in which a

1 person is subjected to the possible punishment 2 of death. 3 A. Capital murder? Right. 5 Whether or not it was intentional? 6 Q. First of all, we have to show an intentional 7 taking of a life. That is murder. Say, in a robbery if a person was robbing a A. store and he claims it was unintentional but 10 he shot someone in the course of the robbery, 11 that is not capital? It can be capital. 13 It can. 14 You see, first of all, it is hard to go into Q. 15 specific cases. 16 All right. 17 Let me give you an example. 18 I am sorry I jumped in. Go ahead and finish. A. Let me give you an example. That is one of the 19 20 questions this jury will have to decide. Okay? 21 You have to have an intentional taking of a life. 22 In any case, a person may get on the stand and 23 say, "I didn't intend to take a life. It was an 24 accident." In that case, it would be up to the 25 jury to decide whether the person was telling the

truth or not telling the truth, and you look to all the evidence. If all the evidence shows the person pulled a gun and discharged a bullet which struck the person in the head or chest, you could say as a juror, "That is fine. That is what you say is an accident, but as I see the evidence, that is an intentional act on his part." But you do have to have an intentional killing. If someone were walking down the street and shooting in the air and there happened to be a fireman up on a ladder and you believed from the evidence it was accidental, that would not be a capital murder.

All right?

A All right.

Q If you consciously engage in your conduct, if you consciously desire to engage in the conduct, you have acted intentionally. Okay? So you've got to have an intentional taking of a life plus one of those other circumstances attached to it. Okay?

A Right.

Those types of cases I mentioned to you, do they fit within your thought process as a proper type of case for the possibility of the death penalty?

l

- Let me tell you at this point in time simply because a person is found guilty of intentionally taking the life of a police officer or taking the life of someone during a robbery, that does not mean automatically they would receive the death penalty. All right?
- A. All right.
- Q We would go on to the punishment stage of the trial.

At the punishment stage of the trial, two questions are asked of the jury. The jury has to answer those questions based on the evidence. The two questions asked are there to your right that the judge pointed out earlier.

Take a few seconds to look at them, and we will discuss them and I will show you how they work in relation to the death penalty.

- A Okay.
- Okay. Assume with me, if you will, you are on a jury with eleven other people and you have returned a verdict in open court that a Defendant is guilty of capital murder, be it a murder of a police officer, murder for hire, whatever the situation, but these two questions were created by our

So, it is a little more of a burden to answer it_yes in that it takes all twelve jurors to agree.

Again, when you reach the punishment stage, simply because you have found the Defendant guilty of intentionally taking a life does not mean these two questions are automatically answered yes.

If that were the situation, we wouldn't need the punishment stage.

In looking at Question 1, the word "deliberately" is underlined.

- A. Correct.
- That is underlined because the judge will not give you a definition for that term. The jury is expected to use a common, everyday definition for the word "deliberately."
- A. Yes.
- A lot of people say it pretty much means intentionally or on purpose or along those lines. I can't tell you what the definition is, and I think until you hear the evidence, it would be pretty hard to put a definition on words like that, but you can see by Question No. 1, Question No. 1 asks you to go back and look at the

evidence and make another decision on what you heard.

One, was his conduct deliberate, and two, was that conduct done with the reasonable expectation someone would die as a result of that.

- A. Uh-huh.
- A lot of people say, "Wait a minute now. We have already found he intentionally caused the death of somebody. I think I have already answered that question at that point."

Let me give you an example, maybe two examples, where that question could be answered no where you found someone guilty of killing someone during the robbery of a police officer.

Assume someone goes into a Seven-Eleven and there is only the clerk inside, and after he goes inside, he says, "After I have robbed this person, I don't want him chasing me outside and getting my license plate number, but I don't think I can kill him."

He gets the money from the clerk and shoots the clerk in the leg hoping that will stop him from going outside and getting the license plate number. He does that and goes outside, and when he shoots him in the leg, he severs an

artery and the man dies from loss of blood.

Under our law, that is intentional murder; that is, he shoots him in the leg and he dies.

The jury, if they believed that, would find the man guilty of capital murder.

Then when you get to Question 1, the jury may say, "Yes, his conduct was deliberate, but he did not have, perhaps, the reasonable expectation someone would die," so can you see where that question would not automatically be answered yes, but it would depend on the evidence?

- A. Yes. Sure.
- Question 2 is a little different. You are really talking about the person on trial, and what are his tendencies? What is he likely to do? Is he likely to commit criminal acts of violence which would be a continuing threat to society?

The word "probability" is the first word underlined. Again, that word will not be defined for the jury. To most people, that means chances are, more likely than not, something more than fifty percent. It is underlined to point out the fact that we don't have to prove to the jury before they can answer that question yes that

l 2

3

5

6

8

a

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

there is a certainty something will happen in the future.

There is no way Mr. Moen and myself in any case could prove to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt to a certainty a person would commit criminal acts of violence in the future.

- A. Uh-huh.
 - Only God himself could probably answer that question for us to a certainty, so the law only requires that we prove it to a probability, and prove that he would be probable to commit criminal acts of violence, not a specific crime, not that he would be likely to go out and commit another capital murder or likely to murder someone, but just that he is the type of person that would probably be an assaultive-type person, perhaps rob, maybe steal, rape people. Who knows? there is no way I could prove to you what crime a person would be likely to commit in the future, and those acts would be a continuing threat to society, whatever society the person might find himself in. Either the penitentiary or perhaps back on the street at some time. All right?
- Uh-huh.
- Q. That question -- of course, there can be other

23

24

25

evidence offered at the punishment stage other than the crime itself, but the jurors can, if they believe the evidence proves it, answer Question 2 based solely on the facts before them when he committed the crime. They can look at the person who committed it, the mentality of the person who has done the crime and answer that question yes or no based on the facts of the case alone.

- Uh-huh.
- Or other evidence available.

Is there anything about Question 1 or 2, the way they are written, that would cause you a problem in answering those questions based on the evidence?

- Well, as I said before, I think you would have to see the evidence of the case and determine it then. It might possibly give me problems, but I don't see problems right now.
- The way they are written or anything?
- So now you can see that is basically the way the death penalty works.

First of all, one of those cases enumerated to you, it has to be first proven he

1 is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and then at the punishment stage based on the evidence, the jury either answers yes or no to Questions 1 and 3 2, and there are no automatic answers. Do you feel that is a fair way for a jury and a judge to determine how a person receives a life or death sentence in those 7 Я situations? 9 A. Uh-huh. 10 Really clinical in a way. 11 Never having really been familiar with the details 12 of it, it seems, I would say, more than fair, 13 really. 14 Here is how they used to do it --15 I would say that, seeing it for the first time. Up until 1967, a person could be eligible for the 16 17 death penalty for murder without these circumstances, robbery, rape, even where a person 18 wasn't killed. In that case, the jury was given 19 20 a punishment range anywhere from two years to the maximum of death, and the jury would go back 21 22 and decide, "Does this person deserve the death

penalty?"

24

25

Of course, the Supreme Court of the United States struck that law down and said, "You

have to have certain guidelines," and these are 1 2 the guidelines they set forth. Everyone is treated the same with the 3 death penalty issue. All right? All right. I would certainly think if a person 5 A. had a reasonable expectation they were going to 6 kill someone and you thought they were going to 7 continue to commit criminal acts of violence, Я 9 that is a good test. And that would be all based on the evidence we 10 could produce for you. And you can see certain 11 cases would call for two yes answers and certain 12 cases would call for two no answers, and all that 13 the law requires is that a juror could answer those 14 questions based on the evidence. 15 16 Do you feel you could do that? 17 A. Yes, I do. Let me go over -- you have never served on a criminal jury before, correct? 19 20 A. Correct. Have you ever been brought over in a large panel? 21 A. 22 No. Let me go over certain obligations that apply to 23 this case or any other case, either driving while 24

intoxicated or a theft case or whatever it was.

1 First of all, I will tell you and read it to you, this Defendant has been indicted by a 2 Grand Jury. 3 I think you will understand we didn't pick this man off the street and say, "We thought 5 we would try you for Officer Harris' murder." 6 I think the people would be foolish if 7 they thought that is the way we conducted our 8 business in regards to law enforcement, but the fact a person has been indicted cannot be used 10 as evidence by the jury to determine whether head is guilty or not guilty. The indictment tells 12 him what he is charged with and tells us what we must prove to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt to be entitled to a guilty verdict. The fact that he has been indicted and the fact he is here with two lawyers representing him is no evidence of guilt. Can you afford the Defendant that right at this point? Certainly. Certainly. He is under our law, what we say, presumed to be innocent. All persons charged with a crime,

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

whether a traffic offense or capital murder, at

this time, the law says they are presumed to be innocent. In other words, the jury must take the box with an open mind and not have any preformed or preconceived ideas about his guilt or innocence.

Is there any problem with that?

- A. No.
- Of course, the presumption of innocence doesn't mean a person is innocent. It really just puts the State up to the test of proving it.

If he is guilty the day it is alleged he committed the offense, certainly he is guilty the day he walks in this courtroom and he will be guilty until the day he dies.

We must prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt. I can't tell you what that is. That is something that is individual to each and every juror, and hopefully, the twelve people who sit in a jury box will have the quality of common sense to listen to evidence and decipher it and reach a judgment based on that evidence.

If you are convinced after hearing the evidence that he is guilty, I believe it has been proven to you. If you are not convinced after hearing the evidence, I will ask you to find the

Defendant not guilty.

Question 2. There is no way I could prove to you or anyone else beyond all doubt or a shadow of a doubt that that person is guilty of an offense. The only way I guess I could come close to doing that would be if the twelve jurors were all eyewitnesses to the transaction that took place. Of course, if you are a witness, you can't be a juror.

A Uh-huh.

And even if we had twelve jurors as witnesses,
they would probably have twelve different stories
as far as the things they saw.

Do you follow me there?

- A On the second question?
- 17 Q Sure.
 - A Can you present the past history of the Defendant or do you have to deal with just the one incident?
 - All right. You can hear further evidence. As far as past history is concerned, we could only prove up any convictions we knew about, anytime the Defendant was convicted.

You can hear other evidence. My point was, the law says that the facts in a particular

1	<u> </u>	case may be in and of themselves enough.
2	A.	I understand.
3	Q	You may or may not hear further evidence, or
4		based on whatever evidence you hear, have to make
5		the decision at that time. Okay?
6	A.	Uh-huh.
7	Q	Any problem with burden of proof or proving a case
8		beyond a reasonable doubt? Any problems with that
9	A.	I don't think so.
10	Q	Do you think that is a fair burden of proof?
11	A.	Uh-huh.
12	Ω	A Defendant in a criminal trial does not have to
13		testify. Okay?
14	A.	Okay.
15	Q	He can sit there and not say word one. His
16		attorneys don't have to ask one question, and that
17		is simply because the State is bringing the case.
18		The State is accusing someone of committing this
19		offense.
20		You must look entirely to the State in
21		making your decision as to the guilt or innocence.
22		If the Defense doesn't put on one
23		witness, if they don't put on the Defendant, you
24		can't hold that against him.
25		The judge will instruct you if the

ı Defendant doesn't testify, you cannot use that 2 as evidence against him. 3 Can you follow that? 4 A. Can I follow it? Can I abide by it? 5 Yes. 6 Certainly, if you weren't able to present any 7 case, I can't see that would determine someone 8 is guilty. 9 That is, would you, you know, say, "Now, they 10 haven't met their burden of proof because he 11 didn't testify"? 12 No. 13 You wouldn't do that and still find him not guilty 14 in that instance? 15 We have to talk about credibility of 16 witnesses. A Defendant can testify. If he 17 does testify, maybe he gives up this right that 18 he has not to testify, and that doesn't make him 19 an automatic truth-teller. You have to judge the 20 % Defendant's credibility the same way you would 21 any other witness' credibility. 22 When a witness takes the stand, he will

23

25

600

take an oath to tell the truth. It is too bad that is not the case and they don't always follow that. That would make our job easier and probably

we wouldn't have a job if that were the case, but you, as a juror, along with the eleven other jurors, must listen to the witness testify, judge his demeanor, his motive or bias for testifying the way he does, and ask yourselves, "Is it reasonable what he is telling me in relation to what everyone else has said," and you must determine if you believe all, part, or nothing of what he says.

The only rule is that no witness takes the stand with automatic believability before they open their mouth. Okay?

If a person walks in and they say, "Call Dr. Smith to the stand," it would be wrong for the jury to say, "That is a doctor. I am going to believe everything he has to say." The same with ministers, police officers, plumbers.

No one takes the stand with automatic believability.

Do you follow me and agree with me on that?

- A Absolutely on that.
- The judge will also instruct the jury that at the punishment stage of the trial, they are not to discuss, allude to, or mention in any manner

parole. They will tell you and the judge will instruct you that the area of parole is left solely to the discretion of the Board of Pardons and Paroles.

MR. ELIZONDO: I object to the prosecutor stressing the law of parole, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q (By Mr. Bax) The judge will tell you the area of parole is left to the exclusive discretion of the Board of Pardons and Paroles.

The reason I mention that to you is it is such a strong admonishment that if anyone in the jury room were to mention the word "parole" while you were trying to arrive at a punishment, the judge will tell you to tell the other person to stop the discussion immediately, and if the person continues that discussion, to knock on the door and tell the judge, "We have this problem.

Someone is discussing the law of parole," and let the judge handle it from there.

The reason I am emphasizing it from this point is because if that is discussed by a jury, we start all over again. We may have spent five weeks. A case would be reversed, and we would

1		have to start all over again, and I want to make
2		sure if that came up, you would be able to tell
3		that person you are not allowed to discuss it.
4	A.	I guess I could certainly do that. I guess
5		everything else you have said thus far, I
6		understand, at least feel I understand the logic
7		in it.
8		I don't really understand the logic about
9		not talking about parole.
.0	Q	I don't know if I understand the logic about it
.1		either.
2	A.	Okay. I certainly wouldn't want to waste the
3		taxpayers' money and mine going halfway through
4		the trial and having a mistrial because of it. I
5		could abide by that, but I don't understand it,
6		really.
7		THE COURT: Nor do I, sir.
18	Q.	(By Mr. Bax) You are probably in the ninety-ninth
19		percentile of our population that doesn't understand
20		that.
21	i	The question is: Could you follow the
22		Court's admonishment and not consider that?
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q	Let me talk to you about what we call the lesser
25		included offense of murder.

F2068 1692

l

As I mentioned earlier, you have to have a murder, the intentional taking of a life, — combined with a robbery, burglary, or what not.

Can you imagine a situation where, after hearing the evidence and listening to the evidence and saying, "I am convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the person took the life of another person," but for some reason, you know he did not believe he knew it was a police officer. He never identified himself as a police officer, didn't have a uniform on, may not have known the person he killed was a police officer. In that case, you couldn't return a verdict of capital murder, because one of the elements would be missing. Okay? But you could return a verdict of what we call "the lesser included offense of murder."

In that case, the punishment range is no longer life or death. The punishment range is now a minimum of five years to a maximum of ninety-nine years or life, and in addition, the jury can give a fine of up to ten thousand dollars.

You can see in the first place that is a very, very wide range of punishment?

A Yes.

Murders are committed by people from different backgrounds and committed for different reasons.

The case I gave you earlier about the man shooting people indiscriminately coming out of Foley's.

I imagine most jurors would feel that would be the upper end of the punishment range because of the way it was committed and they would give him ninety-nine years and a fine.

If a juror decides this case falls
between the five-year and the ten-year range,
after hearing the case and they say, "This case
is somewhere between five and ten years," the
jury can, if they believe it is proper, grant
probation to the Defendant.

Of course, probation -- I am sure you are aware of this -- means the release of a convicted person.

If he were convicted of the offense of murder -- this is another thing most people say, "I don't know if I could consider probation in any type of case like that." Let me give you an example of where it might be proper to give probation and get your mind thinking about some facts.

A Please.

i

Imagine a man comes home and when he gets home from work, he finds his two children have been brutally murdered, his wife has been sexually abused, had her throat slit, and in her dying breath, she says, "Joe Blow down the street did it." The man gets his .38 pistol he keeps under the bed and walks down the street and knocks on the door and Joe Blow comes to the door with a big smile, and he says, "I heard you killed my wife and two children."

Joe Blow says, "Yes, and I had a lot of fun." The man shoots Joe Blow and kills him.

That is murder. The law doesn't ask us to go out and take the law into our own hands. But, can you see that would be a proper case for probation?

- A. Yes, I see.
- Then I would take it that you can, if it were a proper case in your mind, consider the area of probation in the intentional taking of a life, if the facts were proper?
- A. I could consider it.
- Q Let me ask you this. On your questionnaire it states back in 1966, your brother was the victim

1 of a murder. Is that correct? 2 Correct. 3 Could you tell us a little bit about that? He was living in a suburb north of Atlanta and he was murdered. He had a van and he was shot in his van and the case has never been solved. 6 7 Was some of his property taken? Q. No. They have never solved it. They couldn't find a clear motive in the case, either. There were 10 a lot of different theories: drugs, his wife, and various theories, but they have never solved it. 11 12 Is there anything about that incident in your life that you feel would affect you in any way, 13 14 any manner, in listening to the facts of a case 15 such as this? 16 We will be talking about a case where 17 more than one person has been killed, as a matter 18 of fact. 19 Only to the extent which I have already stated, 20 that I do believe in the death penalty for 21 murder if it meets these criteria, yes, and I would certainly feel that in the case of my 22 23 brother's murderer. 24 That wouldn't reduce my burden of proof, though,

25

and wouldn't make it easier for me to prove it to

1 you than if it hadn't happened? You would still require me to meet the requirements of the law 3 and prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt? Absolutely. 5 It says here also someone -- and it looks like 6 you may have underlined close friend studied 7 some law? 8 I've got a number of friends who are lawyers. 9 That is all I meant there. I never studied law, 10 no. 11 You are fortunate. 12 Yes. 13 Is there anything about those acquaintances or 14 anything that would affect you in listening to 15 any of this? 16 A. I didn't understand that question, quite 17 frankly. 18 These are questions that -- it is funny. 19 the fifth time I have been involved in picking a 20 capital jury, and every time we come up with a 21 different information form, and I don't know who 22 is responsible for creating those, but they float 23 around and lawyers agree on the questions, and some are probably good and some are probably bad.

25

Have you and your wife ever discussed

1		the death penalty? Is she basically of the same
2		opinion you are?
3	A.	Yes. I think she would be. Uh-huh. I am sure
4		we have discussed it.
5	Q	Where do your two boys go to school?
6	A.	Kinkaid.
7	Q	Where were you stationed while you were in the
8		Navy?
9	A.	Washington, D. C.
10	Q	And your interest in lawsuits, I guess that would
11		be as the average citizen?
12	A.	Blood and Money, Blood Will Tell, that sort of
13		thing.
14	Q	Can you think of any reason whatsoever why you
15		could not be a fair and impartial juror in a
16		case such as this?
17	A.	No reason why I couldn't be fair and impartial.
18		The only concern that I would have, if
19		the trial should drag on for a long period of time,
20		I am trying to run a business. It might I
21		don't know. I would have my thoughts elsewhere,
22		perhaps.
23	Q.	Let me give you my best estimate.
24		If you are selected, you will be Juror
25		7, and I imagine the rest of this week and probably

the end of next week or so, we will complete

the selection of the jury and you will probably

have at least three or four days' prior notice

before you have to come and begin your service.

I would imagine the case will take approximately five days, give or take a day or two, and that will consist of 9:00 o'clock in the morning until 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon, and you will be able to go home up until the time the case is given to the jury for deliberation.

If it is overnight, the jury is sequestered in a hotel and brought back the next morning to continue deliberations.

Would that be too much of an imposition where it would take your mind away from the facts of the case where it would take your mind off the facts?

Let me say I can't believe if I were involved in a capital murder charge or any murder charge I wouldn't be able to concentrate on the facts.

However, that time would be a tremendous burden. In that time period, I have scheduled a trip to Europe, have two or three board of directors meetings scheduled during that period you mentioned.

1	Õ	When is your trip scheduled?
2	A.	The week of the 27th of September.
3	Ģ	When were you planning on returning?
4	A.	That following weekend, the 1st or so.
5	Ċ	We have already discussed this before, and I
6		think our tentative kickoff date would be no
7		sooner than October 4th.
8	A.	I have scheduled a board meeting on the 14th of
9		October. I have one on the 13th and the 14th of
.0		October.
1	Q	I would imagine on the 4th, if we start on that
2		date, we would be done by the 13th or 14th.
3	A.	That would give me a lot of time to prepare for
4		my board meeting.
5	Q.	It is going to be a burden on anyone, I am sure.
.6	A.	I am not trying to duck out on that account. I
7		am saying that is the only reservation I have.
18	Q.	If you actually did serve, it wouldn't detract
9		from your listening to the facts?
20	A.	I would imagine I wouldn't be able to concentrate
21		on the facts.
22	Q.	Mr. Sadler, I have no further questions of you.
23		Do you have questions of me about
24		things we have discussed today?
25	A.	Just one thing. This trial, is this for the

1		innocence or guilt of the Defendant or is this
2		the sentencing phase?
3	Q	It will be two stages. The first stage of the
4		trial would be the guilt-or-innocence stage.
5	A.	You would have the same jury for both?
6	Ġ	Right. The same jury that hears the facts in the
7		guilt-or-innocence phase, if we find him not
8		guilty, we would all go home.
9		If they return a verdict of guilty,
10		we will proceed to the second phase of the trial.
11		Mr. Sadler, I look forward to working
12		with you if you are selected on this jury.
13		MR. BAX: Pass the juror.
14		
15		EXAMINATION
16		
17	QUE	ESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:
18	Q	Mr. Sadler, how are you doing?
19	A.	Fine.
20 .	Q	This part of the trial is known as voir dire
21		examination.
22	A.	Voir dire?
23	Q	Voir dire. It is a French word, and they tell me
24		it means to speak the truth. That is what they
25		say, and the reason we are here, we want to ask

you certain questions about how you feel about certain things.

As the prosecutor mentioned, this is a capital murder case. As in all trials in Texas, it is divided into two parts.

First of all is the guilt-or-innocence stage, and the second part is the punishment stage. If you find him guilty, we go to the punishment stage, and if you find him not guilty, we don't go to the punishment stage.

As in all criminal trials in Texas, the State has the burden of proving its case to you as a prospective juror beyond a reasonable doubt. They must prove to you that on a certain date in Harris County, Texas, this Defendant shot and killed a police officer in the lawful discharge of an official duty, knowing at the time that he was a police officer.

They have to prove those elements to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

The judge won't give you a definition of reasonable doubt. They won't give you one.

I can't give you one because there is no legal definition of the term "reasonable doubt."

About all I can do is give you

1 comparisons or, by way of analogy, compare it to 2 the civil courthouse across the street at 301 3 Fannin where they try lawsuits for millions of dollars sometimes over Workmen's Comp cases, personal injuries, and the burden of proof over 5 there right across the street is proof by a preponderance of the evidence, the greater weight 7 of the credible evidence. 8 However, here in the criminal courthouse 10 where a person's life is literally at stake, the legislature said before you can put a man's 11 life out, before you can convict him of capital 12 murder or any kind of criminal case and sentence 13 14 him to death, you better make sure we have the 15 right man, so we will make the State prove this 16 case to the jurors beyond a reasonable doubt. 17 How do you feel about that? I guess I was brought up believing in proof beyond 18 19 a reasonable doubt. I don't know what reasonable 20 doubt is any better than you do, obviously. 21 Q Correct.

A But I believe in --

Q Let me give you another analogy or another comparison, for example.

Let's assume for a minute that a person

25

22

23

1		wants to go to the banker and get a loan. The
2		person goes to the banker. The banker says, "Let
3		me see your financial statement. Where do you
4		live? How much are your house payments? How much
5		are your car payments? How much do you owe
6		Foley's? How much do you owe Joske's? How many
7		children do you have? Are they going to school,
8		to college? Are they working?" And, based upon
9		that, the banker makes a decision, and that
10		decision is either to loan them money or not loan
11		them money.
12		I submit to you that banker made a
13		decision by a preponderance of the evidence.
14	A.	Uh-huh?
15	Q.	Because if he made his decision beyond a reasonable
16		doubt, theoretically, that banker should never have
17		a default.
18	A.	That is right. I agree with that.
19	, Q	We know bankers have defaults and foreclosures.
20	A.	Right.
21	Q.	So, anyway, how do they go about doing that?
22		First of all, they call witnesses who
23		take the same stand where you are sitting and give
24		their rendition of the facts.
25		Then after they are through, the State

will then rest their case, which means in so many 1 words, "That is all we have." 2 Then the Defendant can, if he chooses, 3 he can testify. He doesn't have to. Let me give you a hypothetical and let 5 me see how you would react to this hypothetical. Let's assume that the State has rested 7 its case. The Defendant has not, or will not put Я on any evidence. You are back there in the jury 9 deliberation room and you are thinking, "Well, I 10 think he did it, but I haven't been convinced 11 beyond a reasonable doubt." 12 What would your verdict or decision be 13 in that case? 14 I think you would have to let him go. He is 15 innocent if I don't feel that the Prosecution has 16 convinced me beyond a reasonable doubt that he is 17 guilty. 18 Okay. Of course, the Defendant can, if he chooses, 19 he can testify, and when he does testify, he can 20 be impeached or discredited by proof of any prior 21 felony convictions within the last ten years, let's 22 23 say, and you, as a juror, will be able to listen 24 to the way he is talking, look at his demeanor,

25

how he answers the questions, and based upon that,

1659

2.6

make some kind of a decision as to whether or not he is telling you the truth.

Do you agree with me there?

- A. Uh-huh. Uh-huh.
- The Defendant can also call witnesses to testify in his behalf, and I suggest to you that if he does, there will be two different versions of the facts, two diametrically opposed stories, and it will be your job as a juror to be the judge of the facts.

Judge Oncken will be the judge of the law, but you, as a prospective juror, will be the judge of the facts.

It will be your job, your function, your duty to decipher the facts.

You can, as a juror, believe some of, all of, or none of what a particular witness says.

Let me ask you, you know, I know when

I was growing up, I was taught to believe that
a police officer always tells the truth. I was
always taught to believe or obey a police officer.
I suspect that in this type of case, the State
will have numerous police officers taking the
stand and testifying, but would the fact that
they are police officers, would you give them any

1		more credibility than you would, say, an ordinary
2		citizen
3		MR. BAX: Judge, the only objection I
4		have to that, they can't give a police officer
5		more credibility
6	Q.	(By Mr. Elizondo) before he testifies?
7		THE COURT: As the question is now
8		stated, I will overrule your objection.
9	A.	Would I give a police officer's testimony more
0		weight than anyone else's testimony? Is that the
1		question?
2	Q	Automatically, because he is a police officer,
3		before he testifies, of course, would you?
4	A.	No. No. Not automatically, no. But I think
5		certainly, I think it's been proven that police
6		officers don't always tell the truth, also.
7		Uh-huh.
8	Q	Okay. So then, you would more or less just wait
9		and listen to what they testify to and then form
20		your own opinion after you heard them testify?
21	A.	I think that is a fair statement. Yes.
22	Q.	You wouldn't automatically think just because they
23	,	are police officers you would automatically give
4		them more credence before you heard what they
25		testified to, let's say?

1	A.	Correct.
2	Q.	Correct?
3		In a capital murder case, if you find
4		him guilty of capital murder, then we go to the
5		punishment phase. At that point in time, there is
6		only two possible punishments, life or death, and
7		that is determined, of course, by the way you
8		answer those two questions.
9	A.	Uh-huh.
10	Q	And the first question is asking you whether the
l I		conduct of the Defendant that caused the death
12		of the deceased was committed deliberately
13	A.	Uh-huh.
14	Õ	and with a reasonable expectation that the death
15		of the deceased would result.
16	A.	Uh-huh.
17	Q	The word deliberately is underlined in that first
18		question.
19		It won't be underlined in the charge.
20		The reason it is underlined there is
21		to bring attention to the word, because there is
22		no legal definition of the word deliberately.
23		The legislature when they drew up those
24		questions didn't see fit to give us a definition
95		of doliborately
75	1	A

A Uh-huh.

I have been told deliberately means to ponder or think about with measurable consideration or to premeditate.

For example, if you were in the guilt-orinnocence stage, you will go into the jury
deliberation room and you will deliberate or
ponder or think about whether this man is guilty
or not.

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q What does the word deliberately mean to you?
- Mell, I really haven't thought about it in great
 detail in listening to this definition, but I
 don't think I would ascribe as strong a definition
 as you are, seemingly, that you have to ponder
 over something, and I think if somebody turned
 and fired on somebody in a reaction-type thing -but on purpose would be, I guess, closer to my
 definition. On purpose, he turned on purpose
 and fired on someone and killed them. That would
 be deliberate to me.
 - Would you say the word deliberately means the same thing as intentionally?
- A Close. Yes. Yes.
- Q Okay, now --

1	A.	Same thing. If you turn and intentionally fire
2		on somebody, you don't have to ponder over it.
3		It can be done very rapidly. Ponder, to me, it
4		implies a great deal of time.
5	Q	Premeditated?
6	A.	Not necessarily premeditation. It could have been
7		done, thought of ahead of time.
8	ð	Let me backtrack a little then.
9	A.	Uh-huh.
10	ζ	As I said, there are two parts to a trial.
11	A.	Uh-huh.
12	Q	The first part is the guilt-or-innocence stage.
13		At that point in time, if you find him guilty,
14		you would have found him guilty of intentionally
15		and knowingly killing a police officer.
16	A.	Uh-huh.
17	Q.	Then we go to the punishment stage.
18	A.	Right.
19	Ō.	Would you automatically answer Question No. 1
20		yes solely because you have already found him
21		guilty of intentionally and knowingly killing a
22		police officer?
23	A.	Well, the example the prosecutor gave before where
24		he shot a fellow in the leg without the intent of
25		bringing about death. there I would not

automatically.

1

2

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

However -- and maybe I should think
about this further before answering -- I would
think before he was found guilty that he did it
intentionally during the guilt-or-innocence
phase of the trial. Intentional would probably fit
the same definition for me as deliberate.

- Q Well, would you automatically answer Question No.
 1 yes solely because --
- A If he intentionally fired on somebody with the intention, the expectation that he was trying to cause the death of that person, I would say yes.

 I would probably have to say yes to No. 1.
- Q Okay. Let me see now if I've got this right, and
 I don't mean to belabor the point. I just want to
 make sure I got this right.
- A. Okay. I am not sure. These are all new words to me, too.
- 19 Q In the guilt-or-innocence stage, you have found
 20 him guilty, let's say --
- 21 A Correct.
- Q -- of intentionally and knowingly killing a police officer.
- 24 A. Uh-huh.
 - Q Then we go to the punishment stage.

it would be repetitive.

1		MR. ELIZONDO: Okay.
2	A.	It's y'all's time. I have already blown today.
3		I don't mind going over it one more time.
4	Q	(By Mr. Elizondo) Thank you.
5		Let's go on to the second question.
6	A.	All I am saying is No. 1 has two parts to it.
7	Q	Right. It is a two-part question.
8	A.	And it would seem to me the first part would be
9		answered by the first finding of intentionally,
10		automatically, it seems, maybe yes, but not
11		necessarily the second part.
12	Q.	Okay. Can you think of any instance where you
13		would automatically where you would not answer
14		Question No. 1, the first part of Question No. 1
15		yes after you have found the Defendant guilty of
16		intentionally and knowingly killing a police
17		officer?
18	A.	No, I don't believe so. If he intentionally
19		killed ampolice officer, in my mind, he deliberately
20		killed a police officer, and those are one and the
21		same to me.
22	Q.	So excuse me just a minute.
23		(Consultation between attorneys.)
24		THE JUROR: It must be awfully boring
25		for y'all all day, all week.

1	THE COURT: Try two weeks.
2	Q (By Mr. Elizondo) So then the first part of
3	Question No. 1 is what I am saying, in your
4	own mind, is the same as when you have convicted
5	the Defendant of intentionally and knowingly
6	killing a police officer?
7	A The first part of the question, correct, would be
8	one and the same with the definition of the word
9	deliberately. Yes.
0	MR. ELIZONDO: May it please the Court,
1	I would respectfully challenge the juror.
2	MR. BAX: I have a few questions.
3	
4	EXAMINATION
5	
6	QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:
7	Q. When we were talking a few minutes ago, I said
.8	there were two examples, and we went over Question
9	l and ran out before Question 2.
20	Let me give you another example where
21	you may, in fact, find from the evidence the
22	person didn't act deliberately in causing the
23	death. Okay?
4	That may sound strange, but we have the
25	law of parties, and if two or more persons

conspire together to commit a felony, and if
during the course of that felony, one of the
coconspirators commits another felony, the law
says all of the coconspirators are guilty of
the act committed by the one, even if they didn't
commit it, if they could anticipate the
possibility of that taking place during the
conspiracy --

- A Uh-huh.
 - For example, Mr. Moen and I decide the District
 Attorney's Office is not paying us enough money.

 We conspire to make a little extra money on the
 side, and we go to the delicatessen and I talk
 Bob into waiting and keeping the motor running
 in the car and I go in and go inside. While I
 am inside, something goes wrong with my robbery
 and I commit murder by killing the clerk. I am
 guilty because I am the triggerman.

Under our law of parties, Mr. Moen is also guilty of capital murder, and he would be acting the same as I if he intentionally caused the death of a clerk, but do you see when we got to that first question as to Mr. Moen's case, you would see he was a coconspirator by his conduct, but none of his conduct that caused the death --

1		all of the conduct was on the triggerman's part.
2	A.	Uh-huh.
3	Q	Can you see in that case where a person could be
4		convicted of capital murder, causing a death as
5		a party, and yet both of those questions could
6		be answered no based on the evidence one way or
7		the other?
8	A.	Sure. I see what you are saying.
9		MR. BAX: I believe he is nuts Your
10		Honor.
11		THE COURT: Objection is overruled.
12		
13		EXAMINATION
14		
15	QUE	STIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:
16	Q	Do you still say the word deliberately means the
17		same in your own mind as the word intentionally?
18	A.	Quite honestly, I didn't know the second fellow
19		would be intentionally a murderer under the case
20		presented, so no.
21	Ō	You didn't? Okay.
22		The second question, whether there is
23		a probability that the Defendant would commit
24		criminal acts of violence
25	A.	Yes.

1	Q	that would constitute a continuing threat to
2		society.
3	A.	Uh-huh.
4	Q.	Would you agree with me that that question is
5		asking you to foretell or forecast the future?
6	A.	Pretty much, yes. You have to assign a
7		probability to actions in the future. That is
8		correct. Uh-huh.
9	Q.	Do you think a person can change his mode of
0		behavior or his mode of conduct?
1	A.	Yes. Uh-huh.
12	Q.	Let me talk to you a little bit about your brother.
13		Your brother was killed in Atlanta?
14	A.	Uh-huh.
15	Q	Is there anything about that case in any way,
16		shape, form, or fashion that would bias you in any
17		way against this Defendant?
18	A.	I don't believe so. I can't think of any reason
19		why it would.
20	Q	Do you have any friends that are prosecutors?
21	A.	No. No, no.
22	Q.	I was just wondering.
23		You said you had a lot of friends who
24		were lawyers?
25	A.	No, mostly corporate lawyers.

1	Q	Mr. Sadler, I think it's been three or four
2		months ago, maybe longer. I don't recall exactly
3		when it happened, but the Supreme Court came down
4		and said that the children of illegal aliens had
5		the right to a free education.
6		Do you remember that?
7	A.	Yes. I sure do.
8	Q	How did you feel about that and what was your
9		immediate reaction?
10	A.	My immediate reaction was I disagree with that.
11	Q	How do you feel now?
12	A.	I still disagree with that.
13	Q	As a result of that, have you formed any kind of
14		bias against, let's say, illegal aliens as a class?
15	A.	Biases against illegal aliens as a class?
16		I think the word illegal alien says it
17		itself. It is illegal. I wouldn't call that a
18		bias, though. I don't think we should have
19		illegal aliens. It's an illegal thing.
20	Q	Okay, but and I am using the word "illegal"
21		for lack of a better word
22	A.	Let me say I would not allow any feelings I had
23		about illegal aliens to affect my judgment on a
24		life-or-death decision on anybody, whether or not
25		he was an illegal alien or Martian or anybody else.

1	Q.	If you should come to find out that this
2		Defendant is an illegal alien, would you hold it
3		against him in any way in the trial of this
4		case?
5	A.	I can't believe that I would in any way in the
6		trial of this case, in a murder trial.
7	Ď.	Uh-huh.
8		Could you give him the same rights, the
9		same constitutional rights that you could give
10		an ordinary citizen of this country?
11	A.	Or any country. Yes.
12	Q	A little while ago, you told Mr. Bax I am
13		sorry what is your position at Soltex?
14	A.	I am the president of Soltex.
15	Q.	You run the outfit then?
16	A.	Uh-huh.
17	Q.	Is there no, only you can answer this question.
18		You've got a busy agenda. On October
19		the 4th, I believe you have a conference, a board
20		of directors meeting, I believe, and then after
21		that, you have what?
22	A.	After that, I have another board meeting on the
23		13th and one on the 14th, and I am not sure
24		exactly what in between. Those are the only
25		really important things.

Q The 13th and 14th?

I

- A. Well, actually, my one board is on the 5th. I

 think I did say on the 4th, but on the 5th, and
 the other is on the 13th and 14th. One is in

 Chicago, and the 13th and 14th are here in Houston.
- As Mr. Bax was saying, this trial will probably start around the 4th of October, and do you foresee any problems -- I am sure you do.
- A I do, yes. That is why I mentioned it before.
 Yes.
- A If you were a juror in this case, could you pay attention to the facts irrespective of this meeting you had in Chicago on the 5th, or would that in any way, shape, form, or fashion, would that hinder your deliberations?
- At least I will be consistent since it's being recorded, I cannot believe in a capital murder charge that I could not pay complete attention to the facts presented, and I still, though -- it would have to bother me somewhat, being away from my business during that kind of critical period.
- Q You said it would bother you.

That is what bothers me now.

ı	A.	Well, I don't know how to answer it more
2		honestly.
3		MR. BAX: I don't think we would tell
4		a person to be more clear about his feelings than
5		he has stated twice on the record now.
6		THE COURT: Yes, I agree.
7		MR. ELIZONDO: Pass the juror, Your
8		Honor.
9		MR. BAX: We would accept Mr. Sadler.
10		THE COURT: What says the Defense?
11		MR. ELIZONDO: May I have a moment,
12		Judge?
13		THE JUROR: What was that, Judge?
14		When he says, "We will pass the juror," that means
15		they are done questioning?
16		THE COURT: Yes.
17		MR. ELIZONDO: Prior to excusing Mr.
18		Sadler, we would re-urge our motion to examine
19		the entire venire and exercise our peremptory
20		challenges at that time.
21		THE COURT: That motion will be
22		overruled.
23		MR. MOEN: That means you are excused.
24		THE COURT: That does mean you are
25		excused, Mr. Sadler.

1 Thank you very much. I wish we could 2 have citizens as alert and as intelligent as you 3 serve on all of our juries, and I appreciate your time. THE JUROR: Thank you very much, and I 6 wish you luck in getting this along. 10 LESLIE A. WATTS, 11 was called as a prospective juror and responded to 12 questions propounded as follows: 13 14 EXAMINATION 15 16 QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN: 17 THE COURT: Ms. Watts, as I talked to 18 you briefly this morning in the little room that 19 we had the lawyers in, I told you the lawyers were 20 going to ask you some questions, and I know you 21 have been waiting around here all day. 22 THE JUROR: Actually, I went back to 23 work. 24 THE COURT: I know you are probably a

25

little apprehensive about being in this situation,

but please just relax and visit with us a little 1 bit and answer those questions and don't tell 2 them what you think they want to hear, just how 3 you feel about different things. You may proceed. 5 Thank you, Judge. 6 MR. MOEN: 7 (By Mr. Moen) Ms. Watts, my name is Bob Moen, 8 and I am with the District Attorney's Office here in town. Seated beside me is a gentleman 10 by the name of Dick Bax, also with the District 11 Attorney's Office. 12 Before I go into the aspects in the course of the trial, let me cover a topic with 13 14 you particularly because of some of the other answers you have given to us on the jury information 15 form you have filled out earlier about your job --16 A. Okay. 18 -- and the inconvenience your jury service might Q. 19 have with regards to your occupation. 20 Five weeks is how long I think the 21 trial would be going on, five working days, give 22 or take a day or so. 23 A lady in this state who has a child 24 at home under the age of ten has a right to claim

exemptions from the jury service. I'm not

suggesting you do that. I am only telling you that is your right to claim such an exemption, but we have to have a juror claim it before any juror can be excused for that reason.

Would you like to claim your exemption because you are a mother of a child under ten?

- A No.
- How would you reconcile your absence from work?

 We can't give excuses whatsoever for work anymore.

 We could at one time give allowances for doctors

 or other persons whose patients relied on their

 particular expertise or whatever.
- A What do you mean by reconcile? What would happen?
- The only thing I am getting at is, yes, what would happen over at work with your bosses downtown and you are over here?
 - I work for the newspaper, the Houston Chronicle, and my boss and I put out a section. We are under deadlines, and she is sitting there putting proofs, and I worked until midnight and went back there during the break to work, and it would be very difficult. I would probably be, if it lasted any longer than a week, I would certainly have to be replaced. They would have to call someone else in to train. No one else is trained

l to do the job, and she is going to be out of town 2 next week and in October, out two more weeks, and 3 I will do it single-handedly during that time. a I anticipate the trial will start roughly 5 October 4th. 6 I am also involved in a divorce myself, and I have a tentative hearing set sometime during the 8 next six to eight weeks. 9 Who takes care of your kids in the event you are 10 locked up overnight --11 A. Their father. 12 -- in the case you are a juror. 13 That is why I am going to explain what 14 might be involved in the jury service. Jurors at 15 times can be sequestered during the course of a 16 jury trial. 17 I understand, of course. 18 You would be locked up in a hotel room, not locked up in any other facility other than a hotel room, 20 where the jury would be kept together perhaps 21 overnight, but I anticipate the trial would last, 22 give or take a day or so, a week, at least five 23 working days. That is what we are looking at. 24 I don't want you to lose your job. 25 Well, it would be very, very critical, and if it A.

1	were at a time when she was also out of town,
2	it would I quite frankly don't know what they
3	would do. I would probably have to go back to
4	work and work at night to make up the section.
5	I normally work fifty hours a week. I also work
6	a part-time job as well. I put in fifty hours a
7	week as it is. It is a financial thing.
8	Q I am concerned for a couple of reasons.
9	MR. ELIZONDO: Yes.
10	MR. MOEN: Both sides are willing to
11	agree to excuse you. I think it is only fair.
12	THE JUROR: Thank you.
13	THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Watts.
14	
15	
16	
17	MRS. HARRY M. DARR,
18	was called as a prospective juror and responded to
19	questions propounded as follows:
20	
21	EXAMINATION
22	
23	QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:
24	THE COURT: Ms. Darr, you have been
25	waiting around all day. Now you find yourself in

ı the courtroom practically being questioned. 2 Please, as I mentioned this morning, 3 please relax and just visit with us and answer the questions that the lawyers ask of you. Okay? 5 THE JUROR: 6 THE COURT: Thank you. 7 (By Mr. Moen) My name is Bob Moen. I am with 8 the District Attorney's Office here in town. Seated next to me is Dick Bax, also 10 with the District Attorney's Office. 11 Mr. Bax and myself are representing the family of Officer J. D. Harris and the 12 13 District Attorney's Office in the prosecution of 14 this case styled the State of Texas versus Ricardo 15 Aldape Guerra, and he is charged with having killed 16 Officer Harris back on July 13th, 1982. 17 The judge asked all the jurors earlier 18 if they had heard anything about the case other 19 than on television, and I don't think you made any 20 response. 21 I take it you don't remember anything. 22 about the case, either having read or heard 23 anything? 24 I don't remember it. As to my knowledge right 25 now, I might have read something or heard something l

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

on television, but I don't remember it.

No problem with remembering or not remembering. Sometimes we ask the question because sometimes jurors form opinions or conclusions based on what they have read or heard, and that is why we touch base with them on that, to see if they have reached any type of conclusion or opinion.

The Defendant will be represented by two gentlemen, Candelario Elizondo and Joe Hernandez, both lawyers here in town who will be representing the Defendant who is on their left, and I think the judge mentioned earlier, the lady whispering in the background is the interpreter, translating what we are saying from English to Spanish.

This portion of the trial is unusual in criminal cases in Texas because in no case except a capital murder case are we allowed to bring jurors in individually and visit with them.

In the usual criminal cases, the usual rule is that we bring all jurors in together, thirty or forty at a time, and make our remarks as a whole, but on a capital murder case, the law requires us to talk to jurors individually to see how they feel, to see if they have agreements or

that may come up during the course of the trial or with anything that would be required of them by their jury service, and why do we do that? Well, because there are many people who agree or disagree with aspects of the law. Many people come in and find themselves in the seat you find yourself in this afternoon and they tell us, "We agree with that principle of law and disagree with that principle of law and disagree with that principle of law and death penalty, or do not agree with the death penalty."

The reason we ask jurors to tell us how they feel is because people are not required to be a juror on a case where their jury service would cause them to violate or be in conflict with any personal opinions or beliefs that the juror holds dear to their life -- to their way of thinking. In other words, no one has to be a juror where it is going to violate any moral, religious, or conscientious beliefs a juror happens to have. They don't have to do it.

How do we know that is the case unless the jurors tell us? That is basically what we are going to ask you to do, give us your frank

concerning the death penalty? Would they allow

1		you to serve on a jury knowing someone might be
2		receiving the death penalty, or would your
3		feelings keep you from being a juror in such a
4		case?
5	A.	Well, I think if I was convinced to my knowledge
6		and what I have heard, if a person deserved it,
7		I think I could go along with it myself.
8	Q.	I take it what you are telling me is if the case
9		were the right case and you were convinced from
10		the evidence, that you are in favor of the death
11		penalty?
12	A.	That is right.
13	Q.	Is that pretty much the way you have felt all your
14		life?
15	A.	Not until I got older and knew more about things.
16	Q	Pretty much a decision you made for yourself
17		based on things you have read or people you have
18		talked to, et cetera?
19	A.	Right.
20	Q	Okay, but not particularly the product of your
21		teaching or anything by your mom and dad when you
22		were growing up?
23	A.	No, nothing like that; just something I have come
24		to conclude on my own.
25	Q.	Okay. Do you know how your husband feels? Is he

1 of the same frame of mind? Have you people ever 2 discussed it at the house --3 Not that much. Q -- some crimes or things you have read in the 5 paper? 6 Not that much, really. Let me ask you a question by way of testing your 7 feelings, and I don't mean to pick at you, because I am not, but what purpose do you think the death 10 penalty serves in an ordinarily lawful society? 11 What purpose do you think the death penalty plays? 12 What reason do you think we have that particular 13 type of punishment for certain crimes? 14 Well, I guess it would be that if a person is 15 like a habitual criminal, somebody that you think 16 would go out and do it again, murder someone again, 17 you know, if they take someone else's life 18 intentionally --19 Q Uh-huh. 20 -- I think they should be punished. 21 Yes. Of course, our law applies to someone who 22 may, in fact, even be a first offender. 23 offender can receive the death penalty, even 24 though they've never committed any other criminal

25

act in their entire life, so the law applies to

the crime, basically, and not to the person.

- A Yes, I understand.
- Q Okay. I want to get around to explaining some things to you in just a second, but I wanted to ask you some questions first off in regards to that.

Our legislature has said there are only ten different situations or ten different instances in which a person can receive the death penalty anyway. Not all crimes -- not all crimes are punished by the death penalty.

A man driving while intoxicated doesn't have to worry about the death penalty, or someone who steals something from the store worth four or five dollars.

Our legislature has said someone who commits murder during the course of a fire, sets a fire, and when the people come to put out the fire, he shoots one of the firemen, because that is his idea of having a good time, that is capital murder; to kill a police officer during the course of his official duties; to murder someone while breaking into their home; for a rapist to kill the rape victim; the kidnapper to kill the kidnap victim; arson-murder, the arsonist

2068 1733

kills his victim; murder for hire; or someone incarcerated in one of our penal institutions kills while trying to escape, that is capital murder; or killing anyone who is employed in our penal institutions, whether that be a librarian or someone working in the medical department or one of the wardens or guards or anyone else of the numerous people employed in running our penal institutions.

If a person is convicted of any one of those, that is capital murder. That keeps the convict in line. They know if they hurt anybody we ask to keep our penal institutions running and to keep us protected from anyone in prison, convicts, they know if they hurt those people and take their lives, they stand to lose their lives as well. It is a way of protecting them as well.

All other murder cases fall into a totally different range of punishment, five to ninety-nine years or life. That is the range of punishment for someone who takes another person's life. But only those murders that occur under the circumstances we have talked about are punished as capital murders.

Do you follow me on that distinction

there?

A. Yes.

Okay, and the way a person receives either a life sentence or the death penalty, which are the only two possible punishments you can receive for being found guilty of capital murder, the way a person receives those punishments is not by the jury deliberating and deciding should we give this person a life sentence or the death penalty.

Instead, the jury answers those two questions over your right shoulder. No one tries to hide anything from you, because you know by your answers to those particular questions, two yes answers, and he receives a death penalty.

A no answer to either one and he receives a life sentence instead. Two yes answers, and the Defendant gets the death penalty. A no answer and the Defendant receives the life sentence rather than death.

Now, all twelve jurors have to agree

to answer a question yes, but only ten of the

jurors have to agree to answer a question no,

so there is a slight distinction there. Ten

jurors have to agree to answer a question no.

All twelve have to agree to answer a question yes.

168 1735

1 Do you follow me on that --2 A. Yes, sir. -- how that works? Most of the time, I am going to be doing the talking, trying to explain things to you. Anytime you have questions, tell me to shut up 7 and ask a question and tell me what you want. want to go over them with you. I want you to understand what will happen during most of the 10 course of the trial. 11 Even though I will be doing most of the 12 talking, at the same time, I want to explain 13 everything to you so I will be sure Ms. Darr 14 will know what is required of her. 15 Look at these two questions and you may 16 have had a chance to read them earlier, but if 17 you haven't, go ahead and read them again, and I 18 want to talk to you about them. Okay. 😁 19 A 20 Q. These questions are the ones that will be 21 submitted to the jury. 22 Now, let me tell you how these questions 23 come into play. At the first portion of the trial, 24 all you hear is people getting onto the stand 25 like you are seated on today, and they will tell

you what happened back on July 13th. They will be witnesses and they will take an oath to tell the truth and tell the jury what they saw, heard, or any investigation they conducted back on July 13th, and that will be evidence concerning whether or not the man on trial is guilty or not guilty, and the jury will hear the evidence and they will go back and deliberate and make a decision as to whether or not the man is guilty or not guilty and they will come and tell the judge after the man is convicted, "Judge, we find the man guilty," or "not guilty."

After they find the man guilty, they take their seats again and we proceed to the punishment phase of the trial. These questions aren't submitted to the jury until after the entire trial is over with. There is a first phase and a second phase of the trial.

Then the jury gets these questions and then they try to answer them based on all the evidence they have heard about the crime the man committed, what kind of person do we have here, whether this man has been convicted of other crimes before or convicted of other crimes we haven't heard about yet, because in a capital

You take all that evidence back and it asks you to decide -- the first question asks you to make a determination about the conduct of the man on trial and was the conduct of that man deliberately done and was that conduct done with the reasonable expectation the deceased would die.

That is legal talk. Let me give you an example of how a hypothetical situation fits in there. Okay?

A Okay.

-20

Imagine a man who goes into the convenience store and he points a pistol at the lady working there as a cashier. It is early in the morning and no one else is around, and he points a pistol and says, "I want all the money from the cash register." She is afraid and scared to death like anybody would be, and gives him the money. He grabs the money and he looks around and sees no one else is in the store. He is an ex-convict and doesn't want to go back to the penitentiary. He shoots her once in the head and takes her life.

1720 1692

F2068 1738

•

Unbeknownst to him, she has stepped on an alarm and calls the police and the police are waiting and he has committed a capital murder.

murder. He has committed murder during a robbery.

The jury would have to answer this question

after the man's trial if they had found him guilty,

and then they would answer this question here,

this first question, and they would decide: Was

the conduct on the part of that man, the pointing

of the pistol at that woman and the firing of those

bullets into her body, was that deliberate conduct

and was that conduct done with a reasonable

expectation she would die?

Is it reasonable to expect a person will die when you shoot them in the head with a gun?

It is reasonable to me. The woman would be very lucky to live.

It is reasonable to me, too.

That is basically the decision you make.

It is based on the evidence you have heard and the conduct on the man's part, and determining is that conduct deliberate on his part, and so you make a determination from the facts and you determine this question here about the man on

trial. What kind of person is it that would go in and commit a robbery with a pistol and shoot someone in the head and chest? Is that the type of person where there is a probability he would commit acts of criminal violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society?

That is a mouthful, too.

Let me explain what this question asks. This calls for you to make a judgment about what kind of person is on trial. Is there a possibility that the person, if he is allowed to roam free in this world, would do the same thing again, do other crimes of violence that would constitute a threat to society that would hurt people? Is he the type of person who, if allowed to roam free, would likely hurt other people? That is basically what that question asks, or is he the type of person if he were locked up in jail, there is a probability he would hurt other people in jail, whether the employees or other convicts?

That second part is asking you to make a determination about the type of man on trial. You can answer that question yes or no depending upon the evidence you hear. Just the crime

itself can be enough evidence.

I will give you an example. Are you

familiar with the name Ronald Clark O'Bryan? Are

you familiar with that case? The name might ring

a bell.

I remember that.

Uhe poisoned his children on Halloween.

I remember that.

Whether the man had ever done anything else in

- Whether the man had ever done anything else in his life, you could get a feel about what kind of person that man was, even though he had never done a single other thing in his life. You could get a feel as to whether there was a probability he would hurt other people again or commit other crimes and that he would wind up being a threat to other people in society.
- A Uh-huh.

Just the crime itself might be enough, but you also have other evidence, but there is no requirement you get other evidence. You can get other evidence about the man on trial. Sometimes you don't. You just have the crime to make a decision on.

Do you follow me on that?

A Uh-huh.

A. No, I Haven't.

l

R

- The judge is going to tell you in writing there are certain things you have to do as a juror. He will tell you the Defendant in a criminal case is presumed to be innocent. That doesn't mean the man is innocent just because he finds himself in the courtroom here getting ready to go to trial. I think you realize from the hypothetical we talked about, the lady who was shot by the man in the convenience store, he is just as guilty the day he did that as the day he comes to the courtroom to answer for it. The presumption of innocence means this: Jurors should keep an open mind and wait until they hear the evidence and make a decision based on the evidence.
 - A Definitely.
 - And that is how you decide whether a person is guilty or not guilty. You listen to what people tell you from the witness stand and then make a decision as to whether this man is guilty or not guilty. That is the presumption of innocence.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q The judge will also tell you the burden of proof in a criminal case, the burden of proof someone

F2068 1743

has, in fact, committed a crime here in Harris

County in our community rests right here with

Mr. Bax and myself -- the waiter who was bringing
the coffee in right now, that is Mr. Bax.

MR. BAX: I can do a little more than this, but not much.

(By Mr. Moen) We have the burden of proving to you, before you and the other jurors can say by your verdict "guilty", we've got to prove it to you. That is what is called the burden of proof.

The Defense doesn't have the burden of proving anything. Mr. Elizondo and Mr. Hernandez, they don't have to prove anything, if they don't want to. You see, they don't have any burden to do it, but a trial is a wide-open proceeding, and either side can call whatever witnesses or whomever they want.

It is not a closed trial. Don't get the idea they don't have the same rights we do. They do. They can call whomever they want to to the stand. Just by issuing a subpoena, the Sheriff's Department will go get them and bring them down here, and if they don't come willingly, they will come by whatever way to tell the jury what they want to prove. They don't have to

ı prove anything, but if they want to call witnesses, 2 they can. 3 A. Uh-huh. But the judge will tell you the only person you should hold to proving it to you is Mr. Bax and 5 myself. We have to prove it to you before you can 6 say by your verdict "guilty," and before you can 8 answer yes, Mr. Bax and I have got to prove it to you again. If we don't prove it to you, I 10 expect you to answer no and say by your verdict 11 "not quilty." 12 That is our fault if we fall down in our 13 burden of proof. I expect the jurors to come and 14 tell us about it and not be afraid to do so. 15 Okay? 16 A. Okay. 17 a Would you like coffee? 18 No, thank you. I don't drink coffee. 19 σ The burden of proof now is to prove beyond a 20 reasonable doubt -- not all doubt, any doubt, or 21 a shadow of a doubt -- and I don't know what type 22 of television programs Ms. Darr watches at her 23 house, but let me just tell you that when I grew up as a kid, my mom's favorite program, and that 25 meant my dad's favorite program -- that is the way

things worked in our house -- was Perry Mason, and I grew up weaned on Perry Mason. I think it was every Friday and Saturday night, and I was a kid growing up, and the greatest phrase on Perry Mason was Mr. Burger had not proven his case beyond a shadow of a doubt or any and all doubt, were his favorite phrases.

Those were great for TV lawyer shows.

However, our law says before a juror can find someone guilty, they have only to be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt, not all doubt or a shadow of a doubt.

I want to tell you there is no way in the world I am a smart enough lawyer to prove any case to you beyond all doubt or beyond a shadow of a doubt. You may have a doubt listening to the evidence on any criminal trial. The test is whether you believe beyond a reasonable doubt, not beyond all doubt.

Do you follow me on that?

- A Yes, sir.
- That applies to those questions as well, and I want to tell you right now there is no way in the world I can prove to you what type of person a man is beyond any, all, or a shadow of a doubt.

That is not the test.

about what type of person a man is, and the only thing is you have to believe beyond a reasonable doubt that there is a probability he is the type of person that would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society, and if you believed that, you could answer the question yes.

Do you follow me on how that works?

A Yes, sir.

ı

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

- Have you ever heard or read in the paper the phrase "probation"? Do you know what that means?

 Have you ever heard that phrase used?
- 15 A. Yes, part of it.
 - Q In discussion on what goes on down here at the courthouse now and then?
 - A I have heard the word probation, yes.
- Q Let me explain what probation means, and I will go over it as briefly as I can.

Probation means a person doesn't have to go to jail or the penitentiary. Probation means a person gets released from custody by the judge.

Now, the judge places that person on certain terms and conditions that he must live up to, such as,

"You've got to report to a probation officer once a month." There is a building a couple of blocks down the street from the building you are in right now, and you've got to go and report there once a month.

You've got to work faithfully at suitable employment, and you've got to remain within the limits of Harris County. If you are going to leave the county, you have to go tell your probation officer so they can keep tabs on you.

If you are going to change residences, you tell your probation officer so they can keep tabs on you.

You are supposed to support your dependents, any people who are going to rely on you for your support. You are supposed to take care of them.

You are supposed to avoid persons and places of harmful and disreputable character. That is what we are supposed to do every day.

You are supposed to avoid habits,
vicious and injurious habits is the way it reads,
such as the use of narcotics and habit-forming
drugs. In other words, try to lead a decent life

and stay out of trouble. 2 That is basically the terms of 3 probation. Now, a person can receive probation even 5 though a person has committed a felony crime, and a person can receive probation even though they 7 have taken another person's life and been found 8 guilty by the jury, rather, of the offense of murder. 10 Did you know that? 11 I didn't. No. 12 So even though a person has killed another person, 13 a person can still receive probation from the 14 jury if the jury recommends it and if the jury 15 feels like it is a proper case for probation. 16 You see, those are the two qualifications 17 there. No person can get probation after they 18 have been found guilty of a crime by a jury unless 19 the jury recommends it because the jury felt like 20 it's a proper case for it, and even though it is 21 a murder case.

22

23

24

25

Now, let me give you an example of what

I am talking about -- okay -- of a crime that

is technically murder, but yet might be a probation

case.

Imagine a man comes home to his house from work and he finds that his wife and child have been horribly attacked. They have been sexually abused. The little girl is dead. goes in to see about his wife and she is dying. About the last few words out of her mouth is. "Joe Blow down the street did this." The man goes to the room where he keeps a pistol there in the bed-stand or next to the bed and he gets a pistol and goes down the street to talk to Joe Blow about it. He is mad. There is no question he is mad when he goes down there. Let's say he doesn't have murder in his heart at that time, but he goes and talks to the man to get an explanation, and Joe Blow goes to the door and has a big smile on his face, and maybe has a bloody T-shirt he had on when he committed that crime, and he says, "I want to talk to you about the death of my wifemand child," and the man looks him in the face and says, "I did it. What's it to you," or makes some similar smart remark, and the man fires the gun and kills him and he falls and dies.

Technically, that man has committed murder. I would think it would be difficult for the jury, if the jury believed he was also the

fellow who murdered that man's daughter and
wife, it would be hard for a jury to find that
man should go to the penitentiary for that act,
even though technically he has committed murder.

I am trying to stimulate your thought processes to the fact that though a man committed murder, he might be an eligible candidate for probation.

Do you follow me on that?

- A Yes, sir.
- on a case where you found someone guilty of
 murder, do you feel like you could consider
 probation if you felt like it was a proper case,
 depending upon the facts that you hear?
- A I could consider it. It would depend on the facts of the case.
- Q That doesn't mean you have to do it.
- A. Uh-huh.
 - No person has a right to expect a juror to give probation. The only thing the law requires is for the jury to keep an open mind for probation if and when that becomes a subject matter for their consideration.

Do you follow me on that?

1 A. Yes, sir. Do you have any questions of me so far? 2 3 A. No. Okay. It looks like earlier this year that a family member of yours was a victim of a crime, 5 some type of theft? 6 Yes, sir. 7 A. 8 Q. When did that happen? 9 My daughter and son-in-law were coming home. 10 was at a doctor's office. She was pregnant, and 11 they had stopped on Highway 59 at a service station 12 to use a phone and buy gas, and three colored men 13 walked up, pulled a gun, and stole my car from 14 them. 15 That is armed robbery if he pulled a gun and stole Q. 16 a car. 17 I didn't know how it should be put down. 18 Q. From the way it looks, it doesn't appear on paper to be as serious as it was. 20 Was anybody hurt at all? 21 That's what happened. She was just shook up. 22 She didn't lose her baby over that or anything? Q 23 She was just about a week past due at the time. 24 No. 25 It didn't start her into labor, did it? Q.

- A No, it didn't. She went a full month overdue.
- 2 Did you ever get your car back at all?
- 3 A Yes, I did get my car back.
- 4 Q How about the men who did that? Were they arrested or punished for that?
- To my knowledge, I don't know. My son and daughter did go down and identify one person, I know definitely. They did tell me that, but I never heard any more from the police about it.
- I notice you are a leader in the club out there

 and you people -- I see you people -- and I don't

 mean to say that -- but you people from Humble

 pronounce it Humble, don't you?
- 14 A. Humble.
- 15 Q The H-H is there in Humble, isn't it?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q What type of club is that?
- 18 A. 4-H.
- 19 Q It looks to me on the Xerox as if it were H- -20 H-, H-period.
- What appears to be an H is actually a 4-H Club?
- 23 A. That's right.
- Q And I take it your husband pretty much has always
 been a machinist? How long at Cameron Iron Works?

A Sixteen years.

Я

- Are they having problems with layoffs?
- A Yes, they are. I am keeping my fingers crossed.
- You know, it seems like I wanted to talk to you about something else.

The only reason I mentioned the issue of probation and murder when we were talking about a capital murder case is because the crime of capital murder, the crime of capital murder includes what is called the lesser included offense of murder.

That doesn't mean that murder is a lesser offense.

Murder is a serious crime. I think you realize that, but the crime of capital murder is made up of two elements. It is made up of the crime of murder and the other crimes we have talked about.

For instance, to kill a person when you know that person is a police officer; to kill a person when you know that person is a fireman; to kill a person during the course of committing a burglary; robbery; kidnapping; rape; arson; and of course, the other individuals we have mentioned, so, you see, it takes that aggravating type of circumstance, if you would, to elevate the crime of murder to the crime of capital murder,

and the only reason I even touch on the offense of murder is to let you know that if a person were charged, you see, with the crime of capital murder, the jury could, in fact, after they had heard the evidence, believe the person is only guilty of the offense of murder rather than capital murder, and in that case, the jurors proper verdict would be not guilty of capital murder but guilty of murder.

A. Okay.

Do you see how that can work? Depending upon the facts you hear and what you believe from the facts, you can, in fact, find someone guilty of the offense of murder rather than capital murder if you don't believe the murder took place as the judge would charge you, that it was either a police officer or a fireman or it was during the course of one of these felonies we have talked about. That is why -- and yet, in the event such a verdict were returned by a jury, the range of punishment would be five to ninety-nine years or life and including probation if the jury felt like that was proper.

One of the things I want to mention to you about probation that I did not, and that is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

A Okay.

it.

19

It would be their choice, whether they felt this was the type of case and type of person deserving

that the jury can only consider probation where

all of the twelve jurors unanimously agree that

You see, if the jury feels like it is

the maximum time the man should serve in the

the type of murder case where the man deserves

or twenty or forty years, they don't even talk

jury honestly feels like this is a proper case

where the man or woman should receive ten years

themselves, also, and decide whether or not they

are going to recommend probation to the judge or

whether they are not going to recommend it, and

the jury can do either one, recommend it or refuse

or less. Then the jury can discuss among

to spend the rest of his life in the penitentiary

about or consider probation. It is only where the

penitentiary is ten years or less.

20 21

of it. That is for the jury to decide.

22

Do you follow me on how probation

23

94

A Yes, sir.

works?

25

Q Okay. I have talked to you about so many things,

1	in the trial will show that the Defendant is,
2	in_fact, an illegal alien, that he is not
3	lawfully here in this country.
4	Do you feel like that might affect
5	your decision in any way at all as to whether or
6	not the man is guilty or not guilty just because
7	you might learn during the course of the trial
8	he is, in fact, an illegal alien?
9	Now, whether it does or not, I don!t
10	mind. I am not going to pick at you, but I just
11	want to hit you in the face with that cream pie
12	and see how you feel.
13	A I think I would have to go by the evidence presented
14	during the trial.
15	Q Ms. Darr, thank you for letting me visit with
16	you. I will pass you to the Defense, and they
17	will have questions to ask of you. Okay?
18	THE COURT: Do you need a break?
19	THE COURT REPORTER: No, Your Honor.
20	
21	EXAMINATION
22	
23	QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:
24	MR. ELIZONDO: Thank you, Your Honor.
25	Q (By Mr. Elizondo) Hi, Ms. Darr. How are you

doing today?

A Just fine.

R

As the judge said earlier, I am Candelario

Elizondo, and this is Joe Hernandez. This is

the interpreter, Linda Hernandez, and this is

the Defendant, Ricardo Guerra.

this is a capital murder case. In a capital murder case as in any criminal case in Texas, the State must prove its case to you beyond a reasonable doubt. The term "reasonable doubt" will not be defined for you by the judge, by the Prosecution, or by us. All I can tell you is that across the street at 301 Fannin in the civil courthouse where they are trying lawsuits over contract disputes, over Workmen's Comp cases, over personal injuries, the burden of proof over there is proof by a preponderance of the evidence, the greater weight of the credible evidence.

The legislature says in the criminal courthouse before a person's life can be forfeited, the State will have a higher burden of proof, proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you agree with that or disagree with that?

A I agree with that.

In a capital murder case, the State has certain elements to prove. They have to prove it happened in Harris County, Texas; that on a particular day, this Defendant shot and killed a police officer in the lawful discharge of an official duty, knowing at the time that he was a police officer. They have to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

The way they will do that, basically, is they will call witnesses to the witness stand who will take the same chair where you are sitting and they will give their rendition of the facts.

You, as a juror, will be sitting close to the witnesses. You will be able to watch their demeanor, see how they answer the questions, and based upon that, form an opinion in your mind as to whether or not they are telling the truth or shading the truth. You, as a juror, can, of course, believe all of, none of, or some of what a particular witness says.

After the State is through presenting evidence, they will then rest their case. That means, "That is all we have for right now," or "That is all we have period."

Then the Defendant can, if he chooses, he can put on evidence. He doesn't have to.

So let's assume that you are on the jury panel and the State has rested its case and the Defense also rests their case and don't put on one bit of evidence and you are back there in the jury deliberation room and you are thinking and you are saying to yourself, "Well, maybe he did and maybe he didn't commit the crime, but I am not sure if the State has proven its case to me beyond a reasonable doubt." In that particular situation, what would your verdict be?

- Well, they would have to -- I wouldn't be able to decide, you know, yea or nay. I guess it would have to be nay if they hadn't proven to me definitely, you know, beyond a reasonable doubt that he was guilty.
- Q So you could come back and say "not guilty" if they hadn't proven the case to you beyond a reasonable doubt?
- A That is right.
- The Defendant can, if he chooses, he can put on evidence. He can take the stand himself, and if he takes the stand himself, the Prosecution can impeach him or discredit him with any prior

felony convictions within the last, say, ten years.

He can call witnesses to the witness stand, and then you, as a juror, if you are selected, then I can almost guarantee that you will hear two different versions of the facts.

Then it will become your job, your duty, and your function to decipher the evidence and see if the State has proven its case to you to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt, and if they haven't, then it will be your job, your duty under your oath, to find him not guilty.

Can you do that?

- A Yes, I could.
- Q Do you think that the Defendant, as he sits here right now, do you think he is guilty of something?
- A I couldn't tell, myself, without hearing any evidence of any kind. I don't presume to judge anybody until I hear evidence.
- Well, even though he is represented by two lawyers, he is sitting here in court, he has got to answer some accusations, you don't think he is guilty at all or think he is guilty?
- A Well, he could be, yes, but I am not going to say he is because I haven't heard anything to tell

me if he is or isn't.

ì

2 .

5

6

7

8

9

18

19

20

21

- Q Well, do you think that he could be guilty?
- A He could be, and then he could not be. I would have to hear the evidence.
 - Q The fact that he has been indicted by the Grand
 Jury, would that be a strike against him in your
 own mind?
 - A I really don't know about that, because I don't know that much about the Grand Jury.
- 10 Q Do you think -- is there anything --
- 11 A. What it would entail?
- 12 Q Well, I am just trying to find out how you feel
 13 about certain things, and of course, there are
 14 no right or wrong answers in this type of situation,
 15 and all we want to know is whether Ricardo Guerra
 16 is starting off with a strike against him in your
 17 own mind?
 - A Not to my knowledge, no. Not to my thinking, because like I said, I would have to hear each side myself. That is what I would have to hear to judge him by.
- Q What if you didn't hear our side?
- A I would have to hear, you know, just go by what

 I had heard, what had been presented to me.
 - Q And if the State had not proven its case to you

my ability.

ı	Q.	That is all we want.
2		Ma'am, I notice you have a child under
3		the age of ten years.
4	A.	He is ten.
5	Q.	He is ten?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	You know, under the law, you have an exemption
8		that you can take if you believe that you need
9		to be there to take care of him. I suspect that
0		this trial might take anywhere from five to six
1		days to seven days. I don't know, but at some
2		point, you might have to be sequestered or put
3		up in a hotel room, and in view of all that and
4		knowing that, you can take your exemption if you
5		do want it.
6		Do you think that your child would be
7		left with adequate supervision if left alone?
8	A.	No, he wouldn't.
9	Q	Your husband?
20	A.	To my knowledge, the way I understood that
21		exemption was the child had to be under ten years
22		of age.
23		THE COURT: That is correct.
24		MR. ELIZONDO: Thank you, Judge.
25	A.	I thought ten or under. I am sorry. I thought

1	1:	it was under ten years of age.
2	Q	(By Mr. Elizondo) I didn't recall for sure. I
3		thought it was ten or under.
4	A.	And he is taken care of anyway at home.
5	Q	Is he the only child?
6	A.	I have a daughter nineteen who is married and has
7		two children of her own.
8	Ď.	Do they live at home?
9	Α.	No, she doesn't live at home.
10	Q	Hold on for a second.
11		How long have you been in the 4-H Club?
12	A.	I just became a leader this year. My son's been
13		in it. This is his second year. I was in 4-H,
14		oh, several years ago when my daughter was in
15		school in the 4-H program.
16		MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, we have
17		agreed on the strike.
18		MR. MOEN: Yes, we would agree.
19		THE COURT: Ms. Darr, it will not be
20		necessary for you to serve on this jury. Both
21		sides have agreed to excuse you for whatever
22		reason. I don't know why.
23		THE JUROR: That is okay.
24		THE COURT: Thank you so much for your
25		patience with us.

1	THE JUROR: Thank you.
2	
3	
4	
5	BARBARA GRAY COOK,
6	was called as a prospective juror and responded to
7	questions propounded as follows:
8	
9	EXAMINATION
10	
11	QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:
12	THE COURT: Ms. Cook, do you feel like
13	you have been forgotten?
14	Please bear with us, and these lawyers
15	are going to ask you questions.
16	Q (By Mr. Bax) Ms. Cook, my name is Dick Bax.
17	As the judge told you earlier, to my
18	right is Bob Moen. We are both with the
19	District Attorney's Office. We will be representing
20	the State of Texas in this case, and also the
21	family of James Harris.
22	I believe you were one of the jurors
23	who raised your hand when the judge gave a brief
24	outline about the case, if you recalled reading
25	or seeing something on TV about the case.

- A I think so. I think I may have seen something on the news.
 - Q Is there anything about what you read or saw on

 TV that made you form an opinion as to the guilt

 or innocence of the persons involved or arrested

 at that time?
 - A. No. No.

There is nothing wrong with a person reading or seeing something on TV. The only reason we ask that question is that the law requires that the twelve people listening to the case have not formed an opinion.

I take it by your answer, there is nothing you have read or heard about this case that would cause you to form an opinion at this time as to the Defendant's guilt or innocence?

- A No.
- Q You served on a jury once before? It was a civil jury?
- A. Yes.
 - And I imagine in that case, all the jurors were brought over in a group and talked to by the judge and lawyers as a group and asked certain questions and what not.

In this type of case -- this is a

l

criminal capital murder case, it is done individually, primarily because of the serious questions concerning punishment in the case.

We have had -- you are the fifty-first person we have talked to in some two and a half weeks -- we've got six jurors, and we need six more. You can see it is a long process to get people to come before us with many different opinions concerning the death penalty, and that is fine. We are not here trying to have a debate on the pros and cons of the death penalty, and why we do this individually, of course, is to try to let the jury feel a little more comfortable about telling their true feelings concerning the death penalty, and we don't want one person influencing someone else about what their opinion may be. Okay?

A. Okay.

We get people who say, "I believe in the death penalty. I agree with it, and my conscience would not be violated by returning a verdict calling for the death penalty," and we have the other belief where people come in and say, "I personally could never participate in a death penalty case because, number one, I don't believe

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in it, or, number two, I just personally, because of my beliefs, could not participate in it even though I believe in the death penalty."

No one can require that you serve on a jury that would require you to violate any of your personal, religious, moral, or conscientious scruples. All right?

So what we are here for today is to just basically see how you feel and see if you could serve on a jury where you may be called upon to return a death penalty verdict, or whether because of your feelings, you could participate in that type of trial.

- Yes.
- And the big sixty-four-thousand-dollar question is: How do you feel about the death penalty? feel you could participate in returning a verdict of death in a proper case?
- Yes, I do. A.
- Is that a feeling -- could you tell me what you feel about the death penalty as far as what purpose it serves, if any, and why you believe in it?
- I guess partly because of the way I was raised. Both my parents have always believed in the death

penalty, and --

2

3

is proper because it is punishment for punishment's sake, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,

Some people say, of course, that the death penalty

something along those lines.

5

6

I believe that to some extent. A.

7

Others believe it is a deterrent not to other

8

people but to the person on trial, of course, a

9

deterrent to others when the death penalty is

10

actually carried out.

11

12

14

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me give you just a little bit of background information on how the death penalty operates in the State of Texas. First, you have to have an intentional taking of a life, a murder. But a murder alone, no matter how violent it is and no matter how many people are killed, does not automatically bring in the death penalty. There has to be another factor to elevate it to capital murder.

If a murder takes place during the course of any one of five different felonies, it elevates it to capital murder.

If you kill someone during the course of a robbery; if you kill someone during the course of a burglary, a burglar breaks into a

home and kills anyone in that home during the course of that breaking in, that is capital murder.

If a rapist kills his rape victim, that is capital murder.

If you kill someone during the course of kidnapping or arson, that is also capital murder.

If you kill a classified group of people, classified, as the law says, who need to be protected, if you kill a police officer and you know he is a police officer and he is acting in the lawful discharge of his duties or a fireman with the same conditions, that is capital murder.

If you kill for money or if you hire someone to kill for money, that is capital murder, or if you are a prisoner and you either kill an employee of the prison or if you kill anyone during an escape attempt from the prison, that is capital murder.

Those are the only areas in which a person is subjected to the possibility of the death penalty.

So you can see -- I am sure you read in

penalty is automatically then assessed. We have two stages to the trial in every criminal trial.

innocence stage of the trial. At that time, we are only concerned with did the person do it or did he not do it. If the jury finds he did, in fact, commit the crime, the jury comes back and we go into the punishment stage, another trial, if you will. At that stage of the trial, the punishment phase, these two questions on the right are asked of the jury. Then, depending upon how they answer these two questions, the punishment is assessed at life or death. Okay?

If all twelve jurors answer Question 1 yes and all twelve answer Question No. 2 yes, the judge must, by law, assess the death penalty.

If either Question No. 1 or Question

No. 2 is answered in the negative, then the

judge must, by law, assess the punishment at life

imprisonment. Okay?

So, the jury doesn't go back in a capital murder case and say, "Does this person deserve the death penalty or deserve the life sentence," but you can see by the way the jury

answers those questions, he is put in a position where he must do one of two things. All right?

- A Yes.
 - Looking at the first question -- and let me tell you this. The death penalty was reinstituted in Texas back in 1974, and we had a period of seven years when there was no death penalty in Texas. In 1974, the legislature came out with these questions. These questions aren't particular to this case or this judge or the Defendant involved. Every Defendant accused of capital murder has had to deal with these two questions since 1974.

The first question is really rather straightforward. I guess to capsulize it, was it deliberate and done with the reasonable expectation someone would die as a result of that conduct. That calls for the jury to look back at the same evidence they have already heard at the guilt-or-innocence stage.

Do you follow me there?

A. Yes.

To get to that point in time, we have to find that the Defendant acted intentionally in the taking of a life. The word "deliberately" has

l been underlined in Question 1. There will not be 2 a definition given to the jury. You have to use 3 your everyday meaning to the word. To me, deliberately means on purpose. 5 To some people, they say that means something 6 a lot like intentionally. 7 Do you see where Question 1, though, 8 is really in two parts? Was it deliberately done, Question 1, and the second part, was it 10 done with the reasonable expectation someone would 11 die? 12 Simply because you found a person 13 guilty of intentionally taking a life does not 14 automatically mean Question 1 is answered yes. 15 Uh-huh. 16 The jury is asked to look to the evidence and base 17 their answer to that question and also the second 18 question on the evidence. 19 Do you feel you could do that or do you 20 feel if you find a person guilty, you would 21 automatically answer that question yes? 22 I think I could decide between the two. I could 23 make it into two questions. 24 You could look to the evidence to make that 25 decision?

Some people come in and they say, "If I find someone killed someone during the course of a robbery, I am going to automatically give him the death penalty, which means I would automatically answer the question yes, no matter what the evidence shows."

Even though it says "reasonable expectation he would die."

Question 2 is different. Question 2 is asking you about the person on trial and is asking you to predict, as much as humanly possible, what the probability or likelihood is that person would commit criminal acts of violence in the future in whatever society he may find himself in from that point on.

The word "probability" is underlined again because you will not have a definition given to you as to that term.

To me, it means more likely than not, chances are, or something more than fifty percent.

Would you agree with that?

A Yes.

There is no way I could ever prove to a juror something is certain to happen in the future. I have no crystal ball I could use or a juror could

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

use to determine what is absolutely positively going to happen at some given time. There is only one person who could probably ever do that, and that person would not be a juror in this case or any other case.

Do you feel you could look to the evidence and determine from the evidence whether a person is likely to commit criminal acts of violence in the future based on his conduct in ... the past?

- Based on the conduct in the past, I think I could.
- Based on the criminal acts of violence, and that would include other murders, rapes, robberies, breaking into someone else's home with a vehicle, or someone who has a tendency to go up and beat up on people?

The law doesn't require us to prove he is the type of person that would kill again, just engage in some type of activity that would involve persons or things, that that type of conduct would be a continuing threat to society, either the society we live in or the society we like not to think about, the society within the penitentiary system, not only inmates but also guards, librarians, the medical staff, wardens,

they have done?

2

ı

Do you feel those are the proper types of questions that a jury should ask in determining whether a person should live or die for what

6

A I do.

7

Do you feel you could answer, especially as to

8

Question 2, based on the evidence, whether a

person is likely to commit criminal acts of

10

violence in the future?

11

With the past history, I think I could.

12

Sometimes that past history may be the one case Q.

13

the juror hears about. Certainly, you can be

14

given other evidence if there is other evidence

15

that is available and known at that time, but

our law says in certain circumstances, the facts

17

alone can provide enough information for a jury

18

to answer whether or not he is likely to commit

19

criminal acts of violence in the future.

20

21

Ronald Clark O'Bryan case where back in, I think

One case that comes to mind is the

22

it was '74 or '75, he had poisoned one of his

23

children and attempted to poison another child

24

of his with some Halloween candy --

25

Uh-huh.

1 Q. -- in return for some insurance proceeds. 2 is capital murder, killing for money. 3 That jury answered both Question 1 and Question 2 based solely on that evidence. 5 MR. ELIZONDO: Objection, Your Honor. 6 Misstatement of the law. 7 THE COURT: Overruled. 8 Q. (By Mr. Bax) You can see where the jury can look to a certain one case and say someone would do 10 this or act this way in a particular case. That 11 alone would prove he is capable of committing 12 criminal acts of violence in the future and would 13 be a threat to society as a whole. 14 Is there anything about Question 1 or 15 2, the way it is phrased, that you think would 16 make it impossible for you to answer either 17 question? 18 No. 19 a Okay. Let me ask you a few questions. 20 Your husband is an attorney? 21 A. Yes, sir. a I have been with the District Attorney's Office 23 about seven years and came to the District 24 Attorney's Office right out of law school, and I 25 am not familiar with many attorneys other than the

l attorneys I see day in and day out. Is that a civil law firm? 2 3 Yes, sir. A. Does your husband do any type of criminal law at 5 all or refer out any criminal cases they get, if 6 you know? 7 They don't accept any at all. How long has your husband been practicing law? A. For four years. 10 Where did he go to school? Q. U. of H. A. 12 Anything about that fact, that your husband 13 is an attorney, that you feel might affect you in listening to the evidence or anything like 14 15 that? 16 No. When you served on that civil jury, let me ask you 17 18 first of all, was that a six-person or twelve-person 19 jury? 20 Twelve: 21 You said that there was a jury experience that 22 either aggravated you or upset you to a degree. 23 Were you one against eleven in that case? 24 It was two, and it was relatively minor. 25 us most of the afternoon. We were deliberating

by the Court? I know they do the same thing here.

You get the law from the judge, and what you are

saying is y'all disagreed as to perhaps who was

23

24

25

F2068 1782 1736

telling the truth?

A Uh-huh.

Q Or what not?

Do you feel that that situation would have affected you to the extent if you had to serve on another jury you may have a problem in that area again?

- A. No.
- Q Is there anything else about that situation that would affect your listening to the evidence in a case such as this?
- 12 A. No.
 - Q Usually in a criminal case -- I imagine is the same in a civil case -- the main function of the jury is to decide or resolve conflicts in the testimony. If there weren't conflicts in what the facts were, we probably wouldn't need to have judges or lawyers or anything else.

they are going to tell the truth, some people do and some people don't. Your main function as a juror is to decide between two different sides of the story, especially in criminal law. You may get people who get up on the stand and say, "That is the guy who did it," have five people who did

that, and other witnesses may say, "He couldn't have done it. He was with me down at Joe's Bar and Grill."

telling the truth in that situation. Do you feel even though you hear two different versions diametrically opposed, would that automatically cause you to have a reasonable doubt or do you believe you could decide, listen to both sides, and decide which side is believable and which is not believable?

- A I think I could resolve it.
- 13 Q Were there many conflicts in the testimony you heard in that case?
- 15 A. Quite a few.
 - Let me just go over with you briefly some of the requirements you would have as a juror in either this type of case or a driving-while-intoxicated case. To doesn't make any difference, because we are talking about capital murder and talking about the death penalty.

The law does not raise the State's burden of proof. There is the same burden of proof whether you are trying to decide if a person were intoxicated while driving a motor vehicle.

Okay?

First of all, the fact that the

Defendant has been indicted, the judge will tell
you that is no evidence of his guilt. In other
words, the jury can't consider that as evidence.

Do you feel you could follow that obligation, you know, that requirement of the law?

- A. Yes.
- Obviously, we didn't just go pick somebody off the street and say, "I think we will try you for the murder of Officer Harris." The Grand Jury heard some type of evidence, and he is here represented by attorneys.

You would not let that affect your verdict as far as the evidence is concerned?

- A No, sir.
- I am sure you have heard about the fact that the Defendant in a criminal trial does not have to testify. You may only hear evidence from one side of the table or one side of the courtroom.

How would you feel if you sat there and listened to the evidence and only heard from the State's witnesses and the Defendant didn't testify?

Would that affect you in any way?

A I don't think so.

That is what the judge will tell you. You can only base your answers on what you hear. You cannot use that failure to testify as evidence of guilt.

Of course, the Defendant may testify.

If he does testify, he is like any other witness, and you have to judge his credibility the way you would any other witness, if it is reasonable what he is telling you and what is his demeanor and what is his motive for telling you what he does.

Do you follow me there?

- A. Yes.
- I am sure Mr. Elizondo and Mr. Hernandez will talk to you about this, but in a civil case, the burden of proof is by a preponderance of the believable evidence. Whichever side presents more believable evidence, that is the way they should vote.

In a criminal case, the burden is higher than that, beyond a reasonable doubt. I can't tell you what that is. I can't give you a definition for it, and the judge would not give you a definition for it because, frankly, the

lawyers and judges have not been able to agree
on a definition for that term.

each and every juror. I can tell you what it is not. It is not proof beyond all doubt, beyond a shadow of a doubt, and not beyond all doubt, but beyond a reasonable doubt. The only way I can prove anything to anyone beyond all dout or a shadow of a doubt or any doubt would be if those people who composed the jury were actually witnesses to each and every transaction that took place, and if you had twelve people who saw the same thing, I am sure you would have twelve different versions. Okay?

The law doesn't require that. Do you feel that is a fair burden of proof?

- A. Yes.
- Would you hold the State to any higher proof than proof beyond a reasonable doubt?
- A I don't understand that.
 - Q Okay. Some people say, "Bax, I understand that is what the law says, but, you know, we are talking about a death penalty case, talking about if he doesn't receive the death penalty, he is at least going to get life imprisonment which is a serious

1 you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that 2 the person, in fact, killed a police officer, if 3 that person that was killed was a police officer, but for one reason or another, you felt the State 5 didn't prove to you as to whether or not that person knew that person was a police officer --6 it could have been an undercover narcotics 8 situation or something along those lines -- if that were the jury's belief, they could not find 10 the person guilty of capital murder because you would only have one of two elements. 11 12 The jury could still find the person was guilty of the offense of murder. All right? As I mentioned earlier, the punishment range for murder would be from five years to a fine of up to ten thousand dollars.

ninety-nine years or life, and in addition, assess

Can you imagine a situation where a person intentionally takes the life of another person where you could consider probation if the punishment were less than ten years for the intentional taking of a life?

- Would I accept that? Is that what you mean?
- Could you consider it?

Let me give it to you this way.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 should have put this in it. 2 If the jury, after hearing all the 3 facts, believes that the punishment range is somewhere between ten years and five years, the 5 jury can recommend probation. If the jury, after hearing the evidence, 7 says this case is worth fifty years, probation 8 is not an issue, but between five years and ten 9 years, the jury can recommend probation. 10 Do you feel there is any fact situation 11 you can conceive of where you could consider 12 giving probation for the intentional taking of a 13 life? Intentional? To prove that? 15 No. 16 No. 17 It is not fair really to phrase that that way, to 18 bring you down here one day and throw you on the 19 hot seat 20 Let me give you something to stimulate 21 your imagination a little bit. Can you imagine 22 a woman married to a no-good bum who doesn't work. 23 She works two jobs to support him and the two or 24 three children they have, and every night he 25 comes home drinking and beats her up and beats the

kids up. She has tried everything to straighten out his life. He is no-good. He will scoop up the money and take it to drink with, and this has been going on month after month after month, and finally, she has enough, and when she gets that paycheck, she goes out and buys a .38 and she knows in her own mind the only way to stop him is to kill him.

He comes home one night and passes out on the floor, and she takes the gun and shoots him. It is murder.

I am not asking you what you would do in that case, but can you see where murders take place in different situations, and even in those types of situations, could you consider probation if you felt like it were proper, or are you the type of person who says, "Murder, no matter what the facts are, if you take a life, you cannot possibly consider probation in a situation like that?

- A I could consider probation.
- I believe the evidence will show in this case that the Defendant is not legally in this country, nor was he at the time Officer Harris was killed.

Would that have any effect on you in

1		listening to the evidence?
2	A.	It_could.
3	Q	I feel: like you had a thought that went through
4		your mind. Could you tell how that might affect
5		you?
6	A.	Well, I don't think it is fair. I think there
7		should be stricter laws about illegal aliens, to
8		begin with, and if one would come over and if
9		the case proved he was guilty of killing somebody
10		here
11	Q	Let me ask you this. Would it make my job any
12		easier to convince you he was guilty simply
13		because he may be an illegal alien?
14	A.	No.
15	Q	Would it make my job easier to answer those
16		questions yes simply because he was an illegal
17		alien?
18	A.	No.
19	Q.	I think what you are saying, the term "illegal
20		alien," it is illegal?
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q	And that concept, you certainly could give that
23		person a fair trial under our laws?
24	A.	I think so.
25	Q.	The judge will instruct you if you are on the jury

that you could not consider, discuss, or allude to or mention in any way or go over what parole is in determining whether a person receives life or death.

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection, Your Honor, to the counselor stressing the law of parole.

THE COURT: Overruled.

(By Mr. Bax) That is what the judge will tell you. That will be in the law he gives the jury. He will say you are not to discuss the law of parole. That is left exclusively to the jurisdiction of the Board of Pardons and Paroles.

The reason I mention that is should a juror during your deliberations begin to talk about parole at the punishment stage or any stage of the trial, the judge will also instruct you you are to tell that person to stop and get off of that subject immediately, and if the person persisted in discussing parole, then you would be under an obligation to ring the buzzer and knock on the door and inform the judge if there was a person in the jury room doing that.

Do you feel you could do that?

THE COURT REPORTER: Please answer out.

A I am sorry.

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(By Mr. Bax) Do you understand that that would be your obligation if anyone were to discuss how long a person had to serve on a life sentence?

Your obligation as a juror would be to first tell the person to stop and then inform the judge?

A Yes.

Q It is automatic reversible error if a person discusses how long a person has to serve on a life sentence.

we are going to put in a week or so presenting evidence, and that would be at the tail end of this, and we would have to start over again, and that is the only reason I bring it up at this point.

You have on your juror information sheet "tennis" written down and a slash through it and then a question mark.

- A I didn't know if they would include it as a hobby.
- Q I think it would be.

Do you have brothers and sisters?

- A. Sisters.
 - Q What are they doing now?
- 24 A. One is a housewife. She baby-sits, and the other 25 one works for an advertising agency in Lubbock.

Q. I take it your family moved here to Houston l 2 seventeen years ago? 3 What does your father do? 4 A. He is deceased. 5 What did he do? He worked for a chemical company in Sugar Land. 6 And your mother? Q. A dress shop, but mostly a housewife. 8 I imagine this case will take approximately from 9 five to six days as far as the evidence is 10 concerned. It would be 9:00 to 5:00 during the 11 12 day. When it came time to deliberate, the 13 jury could possibly be sequestered and put up in 14 a hotel overnight. Would that cause any problems 15 16 for you or for your family? A. 17 No. Can you tell us about your duties as a nurse there 18 at Baylor? Do you work in an operating room, or 19 20 what type of nursing? I work in a family practice clinic. We see 21 22 patients like any other doctor's office would. However, it is more or less a training clinic 23 for family practitioner residents. I am a staff 24 25 nurse assisting the doctor.

- Q And jury duty would not affect that?
- 2 A. No. There is only one slight problem, and I am
 3 not sure it is a problem. The nurse I work with
 4 is going on vacation in two weeks for two weeks.
 - Q That will be around October?
- The last of September to the first of October.

 There are two other nurses that work with us.

 It would leave them a little short.
- 9 Q It looks like October 4th that we will probably
 10 be starting testimony which will probably be two
 11 weeks from this coming Monday and it will probably
 12 last from that week and perhaps to Monday or
 13 Tuesday of the following week.
 - A That would only leave them short a week. That would be all right.
- 16 Q If you were here and knew they were short over
 17 there perhaps a week or so, would that affect
 18 your concentration as far as listening to the
 19 facts?
- 20 A I don't think so.
- 21 Q Do you have any questions of me?
- 22 A. No.

14

15

23 Q Suppose that you are elected foreman of the jury
24 in a capital murder case and you believed that
25 the Defendant was guilty of capital murder. Would

1	you be able to sign that verdict sheet with
2	"guilty" knowing that then he would receive
3	one of two possible punishments, life or death?
4	A Yes, sir. I think I could.
5	Q And taking it all the way to the ultimate step,
6	you are the foreman or foreperson, I guess would
7	be a better term, and you and the eleven other
8	jurors believed beyond a reasonable doubt that
9	both questions should be answered yes, do you feel
10	that you could sign that verdict sheet with both
11	answers yes knowing then the Defendant would be
12	sentenced to death by injection?
13	A. Yes, sir.
l 4	Q Ms. Cook, I have no further questions of you.
15	If you have none of me, I know it is
6	getting late, I will pass you at this time.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
8	
9	EXAMINATION
20	
21	QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:
22	Q Hello, Ms. Cook. How are you doing?
3	A. Fine.
4	Q My name is Candelario Elizondo.
5	This is Joe Hernandez, Ricardo Guerra,

and Linda Hernandez, the interpreter for Ricardo

Guerra.

This is a capital murder case, and this part of the trial is known as the voir dire examination.

Voir dire, they tell me, is a French word which means to speak the truth, and the reason you are here today is to allow us to ask you a few questions and see how you feel about certain things and see if we could give Ricardo Guerra a fair and impartial trial.

Most of the questions will be directed toward the first part of the trial, the guilt-or-innocence stage, because when the trial starts, Ricardo Guerra will plead not guilty to the offense and if the State proves it to you beyond a reasonable doubt that he did it, then it will be your job to find him guilty.

- A Uh-huh.
- Q If, however, they do fail in their burden and don't prove it to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt, it will be your job under your oath to find him not guilty.

If you believe, after you hear the evidence in this case, and you don't believe the

l State has proven its case to you beyond your 2 reasonable doubt, can you find this man not 3 guilty? 4 Yes, I believe so. 5 The term reasonable doubt will not be defined for a There is no definition of the term reasonable 7 The judge won't give it to you; the 8 Prosecution won't give it to you. I can't give you one because there is no legal definition of 10 the term reasonable doubt. All I can do is tell 11 you that across the street in the civil courthouse 12 at 301 Fannin where they try lawsuits over personal 13 injuries, contract disputes, over Workmen's 14 Compensation cases, the burden of proof over 15 there is proof by a preponderance of the evidence. 16 Over here in the criminal courthouse, 17 the legislature, in their wisdom, said, "Wait a 18 minute. Before anybody forfeits their life, 19 literally their life in this case, the State 20 better prove the case to you beyond a reasonable 21 doubt."

How do you feel about that?

A. I think it is fair.

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. In a capital murder case such as this one, there are certain elements the State has to

prove: That it happened here in Harris County,

Texas; this Defendant on a particular day, shot

and killed a police officer in the lawful

discharge of an official duty knowing at the time

he was a police officer. They have to prove that

to you to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable

doubt.

And let me backtrack a little bit. I am sorry. We have seen fifty-one jurors, and I don't really recall if Mr. Bax went through some of the facts in this case.

Let me run them by you real fast and see.

Back on July 13th of 1982, a police officer stopped two individuals in a routine traffic stop over here on the east end on the corner of Edgewood and Walker streets. The main thoroughfare around there is Dumble and Harrisburg. The police officer got shot, got killed. About seventy feet away, an innocent bystander was driving his car with his children, and he got shot and he later died. About an hour and a half later, the police got there, or they had been there earlier, but they got there and they arrested two individuals, one of whom was a

1 gunfighter, and the person firing at the police 2 officer managed to hit the police officer five times himself. The police officer returned fire and shot him and killed one of the suspects in this case. The officer who got shot lived. 6 got wounded, but he lived. 7 Do you remember anything about that? A. Just hearing about it in the news. Q. When you heard about it in the news, did you form 10 any kind of opinion about that? 11 Not really. I think I read it one time. I don!t 12 really read the paper. I listen to the news 13 sporadically. I think I heard it once or twice. 14 Did you hear the suspect's name being mentioned? 15 If I did, I don't remember. 16 Q I take it then you have not formed any kind of 17 opinion about this? 18 Right. Anyway, the way the State proves their case, they 19 20 go ahead and they will read the indictment to the 21 jury. The Defendant will plead not quilty. They will then present evidence by way of witnesses. 23 They will come in and take the same chair where 24 you are sitting now, and you, as the juror, will 25 be sitting in the jury box as one of the jurors.

You will be able to judge their demeanor, any inconsistent statements, if any, how they answer the questions, any bias or motive they may have or may not have, and based upon that, you may be able to form an opinion about a person, because that will be your job as a prospective juror. You will be the judge of the facts.

There will be twelve judges of the facts and Judge Oncken will be the judge of the law.

You can believe any, part of, all of, some of what a particular witness testifies to...
That is your sole function.

Let's assume for a minute that the State puts on its evidence and then they rest their case, which means that is all they've got. That is all. The Defendant does not have to put on any evidence. He does not have to testify. In fact, we can rest our case right behind the State.

Let's assume you go back into the jury deliberation room and you are sitting back there and you are saying, "Well, I think he did it.

Maybe he did it, but I am not sure the State has proven its case to me beyond a reasonable doubt."

22

23

24

25

Juror to decipher the evidence, decipher the facts, and based upon what you have heard, form some kind of an intelligent opinion as to whether or not the State has proven its case to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

If the State has not proven its case to you beyond your reasonable doubt, can you come

23 24

25

back and say to this man "not guilty"?

- A Yes.
- If, however, you do find him guilty -- and I am talking to you about this mainly to get your feelings on the punishment stage -- if you find him guilty, then we go to the punishment stage.

At that point in time, you will have to answer two questions, and based upon your answers to those two questions, the judge will then sentence him either to life or death.

In the first question, it is asking you whether the conduct of the Defendant that caused the death of the deceased was committed deliberately and with the reasonable expectation that the death of the deceased would result.

The word deliberately is underlined in that example there. There is no legal definition of the word deliberately. The legislature, when they draw up those two questions, didn't see fit to give it a definition, and I mean no legal definition.

About all I can do is give you, by reason of analogy, when you go into the jury deliberation room, you will deliberate on whether or not Ricardo Guerra is guilty or not.

You will think about it.

_ What do you think the word deliberately means?

- A Intentionally. He meant to do it.
- Q Okay. Let me backtrack a little bit then.

As I said, there are two parts to the trial, the guilt-or-innocence stage and the punishment stage. At the guilt-or-innocence stage, if you have found him guilty of murder, you will have found him guilty of intentionally and knowingly causing the death of a police officer.

Then you go to the punishment stage and you have to answer the question as to whether or not the conduct was committed deliberately and with a reasonable expectation that the death of the deceased would result.

Would you automatically answer Question

No. 1 yes solely because you found him guilty in

the first part of intentionally and knowingly

killing a police officer?

I am a little confused. I would first say yes, but in the first phase, you could find him guilty of killing a police officer without him knowing that he was for sure the police officer?

δ	No, if you find him guilty of intentionally
	and knowingly killing a police officer, you would
	have to have found him guilty of intentionally
	and knowingly killing a police officer knowing
	he was a police officer.

- A Well, then I would say I would have to answer yes to the first question.
- Q Well, let me give you an example to maybe clarify the whole thing.

Let's assume that you've got a thirtyfive-year-old two-time ex-con walking to a SevenEleven and he needs some cash and he runs into
a seventeen-year-old and he gives the seventeenyear-old a gun and he says, "Look, why don't you
be the lookout here? I will go in there and rob
the Seven-Eleven." The thirty-five-year-old excon goes in and robs the Seven-Eleven and he
kills the cashier. They both run. They both
get arrested.

Under our law of parties, if a person encourages, aids, or abets in the commission of a felony offense or aids another in the commission of a felony offense, then he, too, is guilty of the same crime.

MR. BAX: Judge, I want to object on

that theory without showing intent on his part to the capital murder.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. ELIZONDO: I am sorry.

(By Mr. Elizondo) Under our law of parties, if a person intentionally aids, abets, and encourages or assists another in the commission of another felony, then he, too, is guilty under the same felony the other has committed.

Do. you see what I mean?

could be prosecuted and could be found guilty of capital murder. When you get to the punishment stage, you are going to ask yourself to answer that question as to whether the conduct of the Defendant that caused the death of the deceased was committed deliberately and with a reasonable expectation that the death of the deceased would automatically result.

Would you answer that question yes

if you believed it beyond a reasonable doubt,

or would you think about that one?

A If you are prosecuting the seventeen-year-old, let's say, if it was proven beyond a reasonable doubt, I would say yes. I mean, if I thought it

ı		was that situation, I would have to say no
2		because for the seventeen-year-old, it wasn't
3		deliberate.
4		MR. BAX: I want to be sure she
5		understands under this theory he is talking about
6		it would have to be shown that the seventeen-
7		year-old knew and intended that someone would be
8		killed in the course of that robbery, even though
9		the triggerman
10		THE COURT: I think by her response
11		she understood what the law of parties was.
12		Are you confused?
13		THE JUROR: I am slightly.
14		If you proved what you said, that it
15		was deliberate, if it was or wasn't, either he
16		knew or didn't know.
17	Q.	(By Mr. Elizondo) Can you see where you would
18		answer Question 1 no sometimes after you had
19		found him guilty of killing a police officer?
20	A.	Yes, in that situation. I can see it is possible
21		to answer no.
22	Q.	Question No. 2 is more or less asking you to
23		predict the future.
24		Do you think that a person can change
25		his mode of behavior or his mode of conduct?

ì	A.	Yes. I think they can.
2	Q	Do you think it is probable they may change their
3		mode of behavior and mode of conduct?
4	A.	Are we talking about anybody in particular?
5	Q	Anybody that you can think of.
6	A.	I think there is always the chance.
7	Q	Okay. About three or four months ago and I
8		don't recall exactly when it came down the
9		Supreme Court said the children of illegal aliens
10		had a right to a free education.
11		Do you remember that?
12	A.	Uh-huh.
13	Q.	What was your immediate reaction to that?
14	A.	It made me mad. I didn't agree with it.
15	Q	Why didn't you agree with it?
16	A.	It may be selfish, but I feel we have enough
17		of our own people, even here in Texas and other
18		communities and welfare projects we could put
19		our money into, and there are problems with
20		teachers and everything else. I just felt they
21		could have done much
22	Ď.	Right.
23		Again, there are no right or wrong
24	-	answers. We just want to know how you feel about

1		Would it be fair to say you have some
2	,	kind of bias, for lack of a better word, towards
3		these illegal aliens?
4	A.	I don't think so.
5	Q	Do you in any way dislike them as a class, let's
6		say?
7	A.	No.
8	Q.	Let's assume that you are on a jury panel, and
9		again, I am trying to find out how you feel, and
10		it comes to your knowledge that the Defendant
11		here is an illegal alien and he was an illegal
12		alien when this crime was committed and you find
13		out also he has been indicted by the Grand Jury,
l 4		is represented by two lawyers.
15		Would that be a strike against him in
16		your own mind?
17	A.	No.
18	Q	So you would afford him all the rights that a
19		regular citizen of this country has in the trial
20		of this case?
21	A.	I think so.
22	Q	Okay. Now, when you say the words "I think," it
23		worries me.
24		To quote an example Mr. Bax gave, if
25		you had a mallet or a hammer in your hand and I

go and say, "You have a hammer. Are you going to hit me," and you say, "I think not," I would 3 be leery. We will need a yes or no answer. 5 Again, there are no right or wrong 6 answers of how you feel. 7 I don't think I will be biased, no. 8 That still doesn't work. I just worry when you say "think." 10 I think when I came in and you said he was an 11 illegal alien, that would not influence me. 12 At all? 13 No. 14 Let's say the word --15 In particular cases it might. 16 Pardon? 17 I mean, the children that it directly -- well, 18 more or less directly affected me, my tax money 19. and everything, so that bothered me about that, 20 but I don't think I am biased against them because 21 it made me mad about that. 22 So you can tell us you would give Ricardo Guerra Q. 23 a fair trial if you are selected on the jury? 24 Yes. 25 You can promise us that? Q

1		And if the evidence shows the State
2.		has not met its burden of proof, you can find
3		him not guilty?
4	A.	Yes.
5	ð	You can promise us that?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	I will give you a brief description of the facts
8		just so you can find out if you have an opinion
9		about this case.
10		Just from what I have told you, it is
11		a pretty emotional case. A police officer gets
12		killed, and an innocent bystander gets killed,
13		and the other police officer gets five bullets.
14		Will you promise you will separate
15		emotion from fact and try Ricardo Guerra solely
16		on the facts as you see them?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q	You worked at St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital? What
19		were your duties there?
20	A.	At St. Luke's, I was a charge nurse on a medical
21		floor.
22	Q	And at Baylor College of Medicine, you are a staff
23		nurse?
24	A.	Staff nurse.
25	a	Where does your husband work?

1 A. Where does he work? 2 a Where, location wise. 3 A. Greenway Plaza. You have been the victim of a minor theft you a 5 say. What was that about? 6 Jewelry in a motel room. 7 You left the motel room and when you came back, 8 the jewelry was gone and you assumed --9 A. Somebody took it. 10 -- somebody took it? 11 And you probably assumed the maid took 12 it? 13 Right. 14 Did you ever bring any charges on that? 15 A No. 16 Did you ever complain about it? 17 No. 18 Is there anything about that that might prejudice 19 you or bias you in any way against this man in 20 the trial of this case? 21 A. No. 22 You know, Ms. Cook, when I was growing up, I was 23 told to listen to police officers, to always pay 24 attention to whatever they say and do. 25 Did you grow up the same way?

ı	A.	Yes.
2	Q	I am sure you did.
3		I suspect in this case there will be
4		a lot of police officers testifying. Would you
5		give a police officer more credibility solely
6		because he is a police officer even before you
7		heard him testify?
8	A.	No, because I believe there is good and bad in
9		everything, and just because he is a police
0		officer may not mean he is a good cop or a good
1		person.
2	Q.	They are humans just like you and I?
13	A.	Right.
4	Q.	They have the same human frailties that the
5	:	juror has?
6	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	And they can make mistakes?
18	A.	Uh-huh.
19	Q.	How do you feel about eyewitness testimony? Have
20		you ever gone after somebody and said, "Hey, Joe,"
21		and they turn around and it wasn't Joe? Do you
22		think that eyewitnesses can ever be mistaken?
23	A.	Yes.
24	Ď.	Let me ask you what your feelings are on the
25		Cullen Davis case.

A. I put that down mainly because my husband was from Fort Worth and he talked a lot about it. 3 I guess I did form an opinion. 4 What was your opinion? 5 That he probably did it, that he probably shot 6 her. 7 Of course, you didn't hear all the evidence the jurors heard? No. 10 You just heard what the paper said? 11 Right, and there is a book out on it. 12 How long have you been married? 13 Three years in November. 14 What part of town do you live in? 15 A. Alief. 16 Alief? Q. 17 Yes. 18 How big is McPherson, Kansas? I haven t been back for a while. It is tiny. 19 20 Farming community? 21 Yes, sir. 22 Q. Hold on for a second. 23 Again, Ms. Cook, and I hate to belabor 24 the point, but if you were on this jury panel, 25 can you promise us one thing, and that is if the

F2068 1815 1769

1		State does not prove its case to you beyond
2		a reasonable doubt, you will have the courage to
3		say, "Mr. Bax and Mr. Moen, you didn't prove the
4		case to me, and therefore, I will have to go and
5		say not guilty"?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	Can you make them prove it to you?
8	A.	Right.
9		MR. ELIZONDO: Pass the juror.
10		MR. BAX: We will excuse this juror.
11		THE COURT: Ms. Cook, it will not be
12		necessary for you to get a relief nurse for your
13		employee. You may be excused. Thank you very
14		much.
15		THE JUROR: Thank you.
16		(At this time court recessed for the
17		day.)
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		