H NEXT DAY 03/15/2006 3:00pm CST R2
HH254 60654804-000050 For: JAASM
VINSON & ELKINS LLP
1001 FANNIN STREET
SUITE 2240
FLOOR 22
HOUSTON, TX 77002-6760
RECORDS MGMT RECORDS MGMT B06157018
JULIE AASMYR-RECORDS DEPT SR
2Z0865766075
0865766075
HHY00534803-00004 Return To IRON MOUNTAIN

HHY00534803-00004 Return To IRON MOUNTAIN

CAUSE NO. 359,805

THE STATE OF TEXAS Vs.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

OF HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

RICARDO ALDAPE GUERRA 248TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

VOLUME XVIII STATEMENT OF FACTS VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION CONTINUED SEPTEMBER 30, 1982

> FILED IN COURT OF GRIMINAL APPEALS

> > DEC 12 1883

Thomas Lowe, Clerk

# I N D E X

2		Page
3	VOLUME XVIII	
4	September 30, 1982	
5	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION, CONTINUED	
6	NEW JURY PANEL EXAMINED BY THE COURT	3133
7	Joanna Guernsey	
8	Examination by the State (Bax)	3147
9	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3171
10	Charles R. Gougenheim, II	
11	Examination by the State (Moen)	3178
12	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	3214
13	Tommy Ray Smith	
14	Examination by the State (Bax)	3232
15	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3264
16	Examination by the State (Bax)	3286
17	Bobby Jean Foreman	
18	Examination by the State (Moen)	3291
19	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	3329
20	Examination by the State (Moen)	3337
21	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3351
22	James Andrew Chopp	
23	Examination by the State (Bax)	3363
24	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3389
25	Examination by the State (Bax)	3397

1		Page
2	Examination by the Court	3419
3	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3421
4	Examination by the Court	3423
5	Examination by the State (Bax)	3424
6	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3434
7	Susan Bench Bentley	
8	Examination by the State (Moen)	3,436
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
- 11		

خ∠

# I N D E X

2		77.55
3	VOLUME XVIII	Page
4	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION, CONTINUED	
5	Susan Bench Bentley	
6	Examination by the State (Moen)	3436
7	James Andrew Chopp	
8	Examination by the State (Bax)	3363
9	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3389
10	Examination by the State (Bax)	3397
11	Examination by the Court	3419
12	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3421
13	Examination by the Court	3423
14	Examination by the State (Bax)	3424
16	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3434
10	Bobby Jean Foreman	
17	Examination by the State (Moen)	3291
18	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	3329
19	Examination by the State (Moen)	3337
20	Examination by the Defense (Elizondo)	3351
21	Charles R. Gougenheim, II	
22	Examination by the State (Moen)	3178
23	Examination by the Defense (Hernandez)	3214
24	Joanna Guernsey	
25	Examination by the State (Bax)	3147

Page

THE COURT: Bring them out, please, sir.

J

(A panel of six prospective jurors were brought into the courtroom, and in their presence and hearing, the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Henry Oncken. I am the judge of this court, the 248th District Court, and what we are doing, we are in the process of picking a jury to try a capital murder case.

Capital murder, of course, is punishable by either death or life in the penitentiary.

The Defendant in this case is Ricardo Aldape Guerra, who is seated at the table in the khaki-colored shirt, and the lady speaking with him is Linda Hernandez, who is an interpreter. We are providing him with an interpreter to interpret for him from English to Spanish.

He is represented by two attorneys, Mr. Candelario Elizondo and Mr. Joe Hernandez.

Mr. Joe Hernandez is no kin to Linda Hernandez.

The State is represented by Mr. Bob

Moen and Mr. Dick Bax.

The lady in front of you is Cindy
Layne, and she is the court reporter, and she will
take down every word we say in these proceedings,
so when it comes your time to be a juror, remember
she cannot take a nod of the head. Remember to
speak out or whatever the case may be.

It is alleged in the indictment that on July 13th of this year, 1982, that this Defendant, Ricardo Aldape Guerra, took the life of one James D. Harris.

Mr. Harris was a Houston Police officer, and it is also alleged that Mr. Harris was in the performance of his official duties at the time he was killed.

This offense occurred out on Edgewood and Walker streets, out in the close eastern part of the city, the Harrisburg-Dumble area, if you are familiar with that.

Just to briefly recite some of the facts to see whether you know anything about the particular case, Officer Harris was shot three times in the face, and about a minute or a minute and a half later, there was a citizen who was this car with two small children who was also

shot and killed, and about an hour later, the Houston Police Department had information as to where the suspects in the case may be located and went to that location, and there was another Houston Police officer shot five times, and he managed to return the fire of the individual who shot him, and he killed that individual.

კ

'1

.22

With that brief recitation of the facts, do any of you know anything about this particular case? It is not wrong if you do. We just need to know about it.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS}}$  . GUERNSEY: Basically, what was on the news.

THE COURT: Did you form any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of anyone?

MS. GUERNSEY: No, sir.

THE COURT: They will examine you more closely about that when they talk with you individually, but we need to make that inquiry at this point.

Now, a capital murder case is tried a little differently than a normal case will be tried. All cases of a criminal nature are bifurcated trials. What that means is they are tried in two stages.

The first part of any criminal trial is the guilt-or-innocence stage, and at that stage of the trial, the jury hears facts about an event which occurred to make a determination whether the individual charged with that offense is actually guilty of that offense.

If the jury finds that Defendant guilty of that offense, then there is a second stage of the trial, and that is the punishment stage, and at that stage, the jury hears facts about the individual who has committed the event that he has been convicted for.

And in a case -- let's use the case of murder as opposed to capital murder -- the jury on the punishment stage will go back into the jury room and consider the evidence that they have heard in the whole case, and they will have a range of punishment to consider. That range of punishment will be not less than five years nor more than ninety-nine years or life in the penitentiary, and in addition to any penitentiary time, the Defendant could be assessed a fine of up to ten thousand dollars. So, the jury could go back in there and consider what they felt would be the proper number of years to be assessed in

that case, and they could come out and say, "Having found the Defendant guilty, we assess his punishment at, say, twenty-five years in the Texas Department of Corrections."

In a capital murder case, on the punishment stage, the jury goes back into the jury room and they don't consider how long a term the Defendant is going to serve. They answer in this case the two questions that are up there on the board, and if you will, take just a moment to glance through those and we will talk about that in a little more detail later.

and considers all the evidence they have heard and answers those questions. If the jury comes back and says yes to No. 1 and yes to No. 2 -- that is all they have to do, is say yes or no -- if they say yes to both questions, it becomes my duty under the law to assess the punishment of this Defendant at death.

If the jury says yes to one question and no to another question, it becomes my duty to assess his punishment at life in the penitentiary.

Death or life in the penitentiary,

those are the only two punishments. There are no terms of years as in an ordinary murder case.

I don't mean to say "ordinary." No murder is ordinary, but as opposed to capital murder.

Now, when both sides have finished the evidence in this case, I will give you what is called, in legal terms, the charge of the Court. All that means is that I will prepare all the law applicable to the case you have heard, based upon the evidence that is submitted, and it will be given to you in writing and you will take it back into the jury room to read and to study and to apply to the facts that you have heard. It is called the charge of the Court, and you will hear that term, I am sure, mentioned throughout the examination, and exactly what all will be in that instrument I can't tell you at this point, because it depends on what is raised in the trial.

But there are certain basic things
that will be in every charge, for any offense
and any case, and those are the basic things I
want to talk with you about and let the lawyers
visit with you about when they talk to you about

some other things.

First of all, every person charged with a criminal offense is presumed to be innocent. The fact that he has been indicted for, arrested for -- or let me reverse that -- arrested for, indicted for, and charged with an offense is absolutely no evidence of guilt. He is presumed to be innocent until such time as his guilt is established beyond a reasonable doubt, and I will tell you about that presumption of innocence in the charge.

The State has the burden of proof.

No Defendant in a criminal case has any burden to prove anything. The State has brought the charges, and it is up to the State to prove those charges.

A Defendant in any case, this one, any other case you can imagine, has the right to remain silent. He doesn't have to say a word. His attorneys don't have to ask any questions. He can sit there absolutely mute, and if he does that, I will tell you in the charge you are not to take that as any circumstance of his guilt.

Again, the State must prove his guilt. He does not have to prove his innocence.

Now, there will be a lot of terms defined for you in the charge. I have used one several times now that will not be defined for you. I can only define things the legislature has defined for me, and they have not defined the term "beyond a reasonable doubt," even though that is the burden of proof the State has. They have not defined what that means.

To me, it means common sense, if you are convinced, after you have heard all the evidence the Defendant committed the crime, you find him guilty.

If you are not convinced, you find him not guilty. It is that simple to me.

Some others have different interpretations of it, but suffice it to say it will not be defined for you. You will have to make up your own minds if selected on this jury whether the State has proven to your satisfaction that the Defendant committed the crime.

I will likewise tell you in the charge that the indictment, which is another legal term, it is a pleading, a piece of paper on which are typed certain words which bring the charges against this individual which the court will try,

and the first thing the jury will hear, I will tell the State to present the indictment to the jury, and they will get up and read it to you, and that is the pleading.

I will tell you that pleading is absolutely no evidence of guilt. It is simply a pleading just like if you receive a traffic ticket.

A lot of folks consider that traffic ticket to be evidence of guilt, but it is only a pleading that the police officer has to prove in court, and he has to prove that just like the State has to prove what they bring against an individual in one of these courts.

Because the State has the burden of proof, they go first in everything. When we get to the actual interview of each juror, the State will ask you questions first, and then the Defense will follow. They will present evidence first. They have the right to open and close the arguments after all the evidence is in, and that is because they have that burden of proof.

Now, in any criminal case, in this one as well, there are thirteen -- any felony criminal case -- there are thirteen judges in the courtroom,

and I, in this case, will be the judge of the law, give you the law, rule upon objections, rule upon the admissibility of evidence, and that sort of thing. But I have no function in the determination of the facts involved in this case. That is the jury's function.

We serve on an equal basis, but we have entirely separate functions. I tell you what you can listen to and give you the law applicable to it, but you tell me and the Defendant what that means. You listen to the facts and you determine the facts.

You have the power to believe all, part of, or none of what a witness tells you. You judge their credibility and make up your minds based on all that, whether you find the Defendant guilty or not guilty.

Just a couple of other things, and one is that a jury during the course of a trial cannot ask questions. You cannot examine or cross-examine any witness.

You may have a question you would like to have an answer to, but it is up to the lawyers to answer that and not up to me or the jurors to develop the case. You may have a big question

in your mind, but unless they ask this question, you are not allowed to ask it.

კ

In this stage of the trial, if you have questions about anything, when you are examined, we certainly want you to ask those questions.

We want you to go into this with as much knowledge as you can about what is going on.

If you have a question about procedures and what is going on, please don't hesitate to discuss it.

The jury selection in a capital case is very informal, though very important.

In a normal case, we bring over thirtysix or forty jurors and they sit in these pews
and we talk to them at one time. In a capital
case, we bring over six at a time and the judge
goes through what I am now doing, and then we
talk to you individually, bring you in one at a
time to examine you concerning your qualifications
to serve on a capital jury, and it takes a long
time.

We are in the fifth week of this, and have been at this a long time. We have ten jurors selected, and we need two more, and, hopefully, we will begin evidence in this case

Monday or Tuesday, but that remains to be seen.

Please, when you are examined as a juror, understand that it is informal, although it is extremely important, and we want you to relax and just visit with us, and none of these lawyers are going to try to embarrass you or lord over you the fact they know something about the law, and it is more than likely they don't know anything about what you do, and we don't expect you to know anything about what we do. Please don't get the idea anybody is trying to look down on you or anything else. We simply want to know how you feel about certain things and pose certain questions to you.

Please visit with us. We will be drinking coffee or Cokes, whatever, so please keep that in mind.

Okay. If you are selected today to serve on this jury, you will obviously not be required to spend the rest of the time with us until we complete the remainder of the jury selection. You will be allowed to go about your normal activities until we do complete the selection of the jury.

There may be a time, if you are on the

jury, where it would be necessary to have you stay overnight downtown in a hotel somewhere, but once the jury has the case for consideration, they cannot separate, so you may be required to spend a night or two with us at that time.

I anticipate the actual case will last somewhere between four and six actual trial days, maybe shorter than that. It could be a little longer, but that is about an average. I would say five days you will actually be in trial, so I need for you to be thinking about several things. First of all, how you feel about death as a punishment for a criminal offense — and we are not going to argue with you, however you feel about it. If you are opposed to the capital punishment, to death as a punishment for crime, simply tell us that. Nobody is going to argue with you. You are entitled and have the right to have your own opinions.

These lawyers and this Defendant are entitled to know how you feel about it. They are not going to argue with you about any way you feel about any subject, and so please bear that in mind.

Now, our experience has shown that it

takes about, generally, on an average, about an hour to examine each juror. Some are shorter. Some may last a bit longer than that, but it generally takes about an hour, so I am going to excuse three of you until 1:30 this afternoon, and that will be Bobby Jean Foreman, James Andrew Chopp, and Susan Bentley.

There is no need for me -- I can almost bet you the last dollar I have in my pocket we will not get to you before this afternoon, so I don't want to make you sit around all morning. You may, if you would like to, if you would like to go shopping or go to work or go home until 1:30, that will be fine, and Joanna Guernsey will be the first juror we examine. Then Mr. Gougenheim and then Mr. Smith.

So, do any of you have any questions of me at this point with the limited knowledge that you have of what is going on at this time?

Okay. These three that I said could be excused until 1:30 may now go wherever they want to go until that time, and, Ms. Guernsey, if you would, come up and have this chair, please, ma'am.

Mr. Gougenheim and Mr. Smith, if you

would like, you may go down to the basement and have a cup of coffee, and, Mr. Goughnheim, be available in twenty to twenty-five minutes just in case. Go back and have a seat in the hallway.

## JOANNA GUERNSEY,

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

### EXAMINATION

### QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:

1

2.

4

, 5

6

7

8

9

.10

.1

13

i.

5

16

17

8

19

20

1

23

THE COURT: Please, as I said, just relax and visit with us.

- Q. (By Mr. Bax) Is it Ms. Guernsey? Is that correct?
- A. Uh-huh. That's right.
- Q. As the judge told you earlier, my name is Dick Bax.

Seated behind me is Bob Moen. We are both Assistant District Attorneys, and we will be representing the State of Texas and the family of Officer James Harris in this case.

The judge had mentioned briefly in sort of outline form some of the facts about this case to determine whether or not any of the jurors had, in fact, read something in the newspapers or seen something on the TV.

Do you recall anything about this case at all?

- A. No, not really.
- Of course, there is nothing wrong with having heard something about a particular case. It is almost impossible sometimes in this community anyway not to have heard a lot of things that go on as far as crime is concerned.

We ask that question to determine whether or not a juror or prospective juror would have already created some type of opinion in their mind as to the guilt or innocence, and I take it

- A. If I heard it, I don't remember.
- As the judge mentioned earlier, it usually takes two hours to pick a jury in every criminal case, but because this a capital case where the Defendant if convicted will receive one of two possible punishments, if convicted, life or death, the law requires we talk to jurors individually.

..

I prefer it that way, even though it is timeconsuming. It makes people more comfortable.

No one here is going to try to change your opinion on anything. We are not here to debate issues on capital punishment, but here to find out how you feel and whether your feelings and beliefs and scruples would allow you to serve on this type of jury. Okay?

We get a lot of people that come through

-- I believe you are the eighty-fifth person we
have interviewed -- out of the eighty-five, we
have gotten ten jurors. We have many different
opinions of people that come through. Some
people say, "I believe in the death penalty if
the facts call for it."

Some people come through and say, "I could never participate in that type of decision because of my religious and philosophical upbringing," or whatever -- "I could not participate due to my beliefs in a capital case. There are no circumstances where I feel I could be a party to the taking of a life of another person." That is fine. No one is going to quarrel with anyone that has that belief. Okay?

We are not going to try to change your

opinion if that is the way you feel. But, you see, the only way a person becomes a juror in a case like this is by the answers to the questions we are going to ask you, and based on those answers -- it's really, the honesty has to be to yourself because you are the one, although talking in hypothetical terms today, may be faced with the very issue we are talking about, the taking of a life of another human being.

Okay?

A. I have been thinking about it all the way over here. I have never had it put to me where I had to make a decision right then and there. I think giving the death penalty doesn't bother me, but I would have to be sure in my mind that that was the person that -- there would have to be no doubt, absolutely no doubt, and a lot of proof that said it was him --

- Q Let me --
- A. -- or her.
- I don't think there is anything wrong with that.

  I would hope people wouldn't come in here and

  say, "If I had a hunch somebody did something --"
- A. I mean, like circumstantial evidence, that type

of thing, would not convince me.

- Q So would you --
- A It would have to be like somebody saw him do it before I would give the death penalty.
- You know, some people have come in and told us because of the death penalty, because it is such a final judgment -- and it is. I mean, there is no way to reverse the death penalty once it has been carried out -- and some people have told us, "On any other type of case, I can understand the burden of proof being beyond a reasonable doubt, and I can understand if it's an automobile case where the jury had some doubt, but they can go ahead and find a person guilty."

Under the law, the burden of proof in a capital murder case is the same as if trying an auto theft case or a driving while intoxicated case, but again, a lot of people don't agree with that. They say, "Wait a minute. If you are asking me about taking the life of soneone, I would hold you to a higher burden of proof."

- A. That is what I am saying.
- Q. What you are saying: beyond all doubt? Not any doubt in my mind?
- A. That's right.

A. Yes.

- Q There was some gentleman that told us, I think quite honestly, he said what would bother him if he participated in a death penalty verdict, what would happen if fifteen or twenty years down the road it turned up someone else confesses to that crime or somehow the person found guilty fifteen years earlier were found innocent.
- A. That happens.
- Q. Because of his personal feelings, he said, "You would have to prove it to me beyond all doubt," and to be honest, there is no way you could honestly prove something beyond all doubt unless you saw it yourself. You see what I am saying?
- A. Well, no. I think I would trust someone like an eyewitness account type thing. I mean, they are in the courtroom. I mean --
- Q. How about -- can you imagine a situation where you had two sides, where you had, say, five, four or five witnesses come in and say the Defendant on trial, "I saw him commit this crime. I was

there, and I saw it," and you had four or five witnesses come in and say, "I saw somebody else do it."

You would have a conflict in testimony. Both sides cannot be correct.

A. Uh-huh.

Q As a juror, you, along with eleven other people, your job would be to resolve that conflict.

Let me ask you this: If you had two sides where you had, say, more than one eyewitness to an event and you had some saying the Defendant did it and some saying he didn't do it, would that automatically create some type of doubt in your mind that you would never be able to resolve in that type of conflict because you had two people who saw the same thing and different versions?

A. I know they told us not to answer --

MR. ELIZONDO: I object to the prosecutor trying to stake the juror out to find a certain set of facts.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. I know you are supposed to answer yes or no, but at this point, I don't know.
- Q. The reason we tell you you have to know, pin you down to yes or no answers, this lady is taking

I am supposed to be honest.

And I appreciate what you are telling me.

A.

24

I am going to ask you a few more questions and see if you follow me.

You have heard people use the terms

"bias" and "prejudice" for people that, say,
cannot be impartial in certain situations.

Usually when we hear those terms and say those
terms about one another, usually we take it as
defensive. "Wait a minute. I am not a biased
person, not a prejudiced person." But, I think
we do know we have certain biases and certain
prejudices.

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. You have indicated at this point you feel some type of sympathy for the Defendant.
- A. When you mentioned -- this is informal?
- Q. Just whatever.
- A. When you mentioned it would be like so many people saying they saw one thing and so many people saying they saw something else, the first thing that came into my mind would be two police officers saying one thing and two of his friends maybe in the house saying the other.
- Q. Or you could have just --
- A. And I don't think I could decide that. I am sorry.

- Q And basically, because of your feelings --
- A That may be -- I know there would always be a question as to whether he understood what was going on. I don't know the facts of the case yet. Maybe the facts would be just so blatant, right there, there wouldn't be a question in your mind, but I don't know.
- Q Do you think -- you are the only one that can tell us this -- both sides in a criminal trial have the right to a fair trial?

There is no question we always talk about the Defendant's right to a fair trial.

- A. Uh-huh.
- I am not going to downplay that. He is entitled to every constitutional right, the right to have the jury selected as we are doing, to have a judge here and make sure everything is done properly according to the law, but, you know, the other side, the officer's family has the right to the same fair trial and the State has the same right, and when we say this, we have to have twelve people not slanted one way or the other.

You see, it would be wrong to have twelve police officers on a case such as this for a jury. Okay?

A. Yes.

Q. Because they may come before us and say they can be fair, and subconsciously, because they are police officers and work in that area every day, they would perhaps be impartial (sic), wouldn't judge the facts the same way as someone not involved in that type of situation would. Okay?

I get the feeling from you, because of your association with your husband, the fact that the Defendant does not speak English, the fact that he has a Spanish origin, that those things might sway you a little bit or make you perhaps not completely impartial -- and I don't mean that consciously -- I don't think you would go to the jury room --

- A. I don't think I would do that --
- Q -- and say I would find --
- A. -- for that reason.
- Q. But subconsciously, it might affect you in listening to the facts, where you might hear something and subconsciously say I am going to make that bend this way so it will be different.

Do you understand where I am coming

24 from?

A. No.

Q Okay.

- A But I know what you are trying to get at.
- Q I am not trying to put words in your mouth.
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Because you volunteered to me that fact about the Defendant's status and what not.

You see, you are the only one who can tell us if that would prevent you from being impartial to the facts.

- A. I don't think that would prevent me from being impartial to the facts, but the facts would have to be clear-cut facts for me to do a death penalty.
- Do you think you could ever even assess the death penalty or participate in it when it comes down to it? We are talking now hypothetically, and I know you haven't had time to think about it.
- A. There have been cases I have heard on the news.

  I have thought to myself: If I were on that case,
  the person would get the death penalty.
- Of course, what do you think would happen if you were in that situation, though? I have done that a lot, too, thought if I had a chance --
- A. Correct. Yes.
- Q. When you finally get in that box and they finally

say, "Okay. It is your turn," some people say,
"Gosh, I can't do it."

- A. Probably not.
- Q. Let me explain to you how the system works and see if you could. Okay?
- A. Okay.
  - Would you have any problem, or do you believe -
    There are different ways you commit

    capital murder. Let me give you a brief rundown

    on the types of crimes.

A person can subject themselves to the death penalty if he kills someone during a robbery, go into a Utotem, and while taking the person's money at gunpoint, you shoot and kill someone. That is capital murder.

If you kill someone while breaking into their home or business, that is capital murder.

If a rapist kills his rape victim or a kidnapper kills his kidnap victim, or someone kills during the course of arson, any one of those situations, if you kill, it is capital murder.

If you kill a police officer or a fireman, that is elevated to capital murder if they knew they were a police officer or

fireman and they were in the official discharge of their duties.

If you are a prisoner and you kill an employee of the penal institution or kill anyone in an attempt to escape from the penal institution, that is capital murder, and the last set of circumstances, if you kill for money or if you hire someone to kill for you and the murder actually takes place, those are the only areas in which a person is subjected to the possibility of a life or death sentence.

Do you follow me so far?

A. Yes.

- Q. Knowing how you feel, we want to know whether Ms. Guernsey could participate in that type of case. Do you think you could find someone guilty of the offense of capital murder if it were proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt, knowing if you did find him guilty, he would receive either life or death, or would your personal opinions and beliefs prevent you from even participating in a guilty verdict?
- A. No, it wouldn't bother me there.
- Q. You would be able to get by that, if it were proven to you, be able to find the person guilty

of capital murder?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. We go to a second trial.

Assume with me you are on a jury and have gotten over that first hump, have found a person guilty based on the evidence.

These two questions are then submitted to the jury. Okay?

Although the jury doesn't go in the back and say, "Well, let's assess the death penalty," or, "let's assess life" -- that is not the way it is done -- what is done is the way the jury answers these questions tells Judge Oncken what he must do. He's got no choice in the matter. He's got to do what your answers require him to do.

If all twelve jurors answer Question

l yes and all twelve jurors agree that the answer

Question 2 is yes and that is the verdict

returned, the judge must assess the death penalty

even if the judge were of the opinion that, "No,

this not a death penalty case." He would still

have to do it if the jury answers the questions

yes.

Do you follow me so far?

A. Yes.

Q If either Question 1 or 2 is answered no, then the judge must assess life imprisonment. Okay?

A. Yes.

I think you will agree life imprisonment is also very severe punishment. It is not as severe as the death penalty, but even if the jury were to answer one of these no, the man doesn't go home free. He is still going to do time in the penitentiary.

Do you follow me?

A. Yes.

Assume you were on the jury and you have heard all the evidence concerning the Defendant's conduct and you believe that, "Yes, his conduct was deliberate and yes, it was done with the reasonable expectation that someone would die."

Would you answer that question yes knowing what your feelings are, or would it prevent you from perhaps answering it, knowing if you did answer it yes, it would only take one more yes answer by the jury to bring, in effect, the death penalty?

- A. I think I could answer that yes.
- Q. All right. Assume with me now you have found

4

5

6 7

8

10

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

him guilty and answered the first question yes with eleven other jurors. Now we get down to the second question. Do you know what happens if you answer this second question yes?

- Yes. Α. Uh-huh.
- You will be participating more or less in the death penalty by your verdict if you answer that The judge will assess the death penalty.

Could you ever answer Question No. 2 yes or do you feel just because of your feelings -- and there is nothing wrong with this -- you would either answer it no to assure a life sentence or just refuse to answer it?

You see -- and before you answer that, remember that, you know, you are the person --I can't tell you what to do in a situation like I am sitting out here. I am never going to have to make that decision.

- Uh-huh.
- I won't be a juror. I know what I will be doing as a prosecutor. I will be asking the jury to answer these questions yes, actively seeking the death penalty, but I am not going to be the one back there deciding that, and you are the one that is going to be back there with eleven other

people: and you will have to live with your verdict from that day forward if you can do it.

If you: can do it.

If you feel you are not the type of person who could ever answer both questions yes knowing the death penalty would result, that is fine, but we need to know now so you won't be put into that position, to have to come into conflict with your personal beliefs and oath as a juror.

- A. No, I can't do it I think.
- Q. And that is fine. It takes more courage --
- A. I feel one way, but when it got down to it, I would have to live with that the rest of my life.

  I don't want to live with that.
- It takes more courage for a citizen to come before us at this point in time and say, "I can't do it. I can see it's necessary. I can see where I read in the newspapers where someone else could do it, and I can see where someone in the newspaper should receive the death penalty, but as far as myself, the way I have been brought up and believe, I could not look at myself in the mirror day after day after it's over," and that is fine.

We are not going to grab you by the scruff of the neck and make you sit on the jury. Our law doesn't require a person to sit on a jury where it would violate their beliefs and cause them such a conflict between their personal beliefs and what the evidence would be. That is just not right.

- A. I don't think I could do that, no.
- In a moment, Mr. Elizondo or Mr. Hernandez are going to talk to you and come up with some pretty gory fact situations and ask you to imagine some guy who kidnaps a busload of five and six-year-old school children and takes them out and demands a ransom, and after the ransom is paid, shoots and kills them all indiscriminately.

They are going to be asking you if
you could say yes, it was deliberate, and yes,
it was with a reasonable expectation someone would
die, and yes, that person probably would commit
criminal types of violence in the future.

I think you could answer those questions.

- A. Yes, I could.
- Q. But if you were answering those questions knowing the death penalty would result, you don't think

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you could answer the questions, no matter what the facts were, knowing the answers would result in the death penalty? Some facts in your mind might call for the death penalty, but Ms. Guernsey could not personally do that?

- I wouldn't want to do it. A.
- And if you wouldn't want to do it --
- More than likely, I would answer no when it got A. to the second question.
- We talk in terms of will you automatically answer one of the questions no to avoid the death penalty.

I take it that is what you are basically saying?

- A. I probably would.
- Even if you wouldn't automatically answer it, because of your feelings, would you be impartial as to what the facts were in deciding the answers?

I can't look at you and think you are the type of person that would disregard your oath as a juror.

- No, I wouldn't. A.
- And when I use the word "impartial," it is an example like this: You know, the Sunday Blue

laws, where they say you can't sell certain items on Sundays, it is a ridiculous law to me. I went to the store and wanted to buy a utensil. I was going to make some food, which is unusual. Okay? They said, "We can't sell you this spatula." I have a bias against that law. I don't agree with it. I've got to follow it, but I don't agree with it.

If I was on a jury with a man charged with violating the Blue Laws, I could be fair, but I know because of my views, my opposition to that, my personal beliefs, I would try to distort the facts a little bit and try to come around so I could convince myself the man was not guilty. I don't think I would be impartial in that type of case. In an auto theft case or some other type of case, I think I probably could.

Do you see what I am saying?

- A. Yes.
- And I think you are telling me you don't want to do it. You don't think you could do it, no matter what the facts were.
- A. Right.
- Q. Those seem to be pretty strong feelings.
- A. I mean, when it gets down to somebody's life,

that is where I begin to get a little shaky, and I don't think I could do it.

Q Okay.

5

7

3

)

10

13

16

17

19

20

00

23 |

) ⊏

A. I have to say no, don't I?

No, I can't do it.

- Q. Okay, then. No matter what the facts are, how convinced you are -- that is what he is going to ask --
- A. You are trying to make me think maybe I will change my mind if the facts were bad enough, which I probably might do. I am very wishywashy, but I know I have to say yes or no, and I am getting very confused.

I probably better read those questions and answer them now.

- You can't do that. There is no evidence before us. I can't go into the facts. That wouldn't be fair to either side. It would be as if we were trying the case while picking a juror.
- A. I have always told myself I could do this, assess the death penalty, but the more you say and the more I think about it, the answer is no, because I was on a jury in a federal case in February, and I felt -- after I had made the decision and the way the thing was settled, it was three months

later before I could sleep good. I was still 1 2 mulling over it in my mind. That was not even a death penalty case. 3 No, it was not, so I don't think I could. 4 In a case like that, in a federal case, the judge 5 is going to be the one --6 What I want to say, it is not that I don't believe 7 in the death penalty. It is that I can't assess 8 9 it. You believe in the death penalty? 10 Q. Α. Yes. 11 And you can see where it aids society? Q. 12 But don't ask me to do it. A. 13 Do you think you could live with yourself? 14 A. No. 15 And do you think you would be comfortable with 16 yourself? 17 No. A. 18 That is probably the strongest feeling you will 19 have, to be able to participate in a death penalty 20 Nothing would prey on your mind more than 21 that one. That would probably be the heaviest 22 decision you would ever have to make. 23 Α. Right. 24 And what I think you are telling me is, no matter 25

what the facts are -- I am not trying to put words in your mouth, but the reason I do this, the law makes the question.

A. Why can't I make the statement I could not do it?

THE COURT: The law requires we have other facts.

THE JUROR: Can I smoke?

THE COURT: Yes.

THE JUROR: I want to smoke. I think clearer when I smoke.

MR. BAX: I can give you the name of a doctor who gives shots in the nose to make you stop. I am not reformed yet, though.

- (By Mr. Bax) If you tell me there is no case under any fact situation where you could return two no answers under any circumstances, that would satisfy me and everybody else at this point in time.
- A. Where I could not answer -- right?
- On If you were to tell me. I think what you just mentioned to the judge, in no fact situation, no matter what the facts were and how awful the facts were, in no situation could you personally answer both of these questions yes, that you would also answer one or the other no to avoid

1	the death penalty and assure a life sentence,
2	which would make you sleep better at night, that
3	is fine, and if that is what you are telling us
4	
5	A I could not answer both of those questions
	No
6	is the answer to that question.
7	Q I am not going to try to change your mind.
8	MR. BAX: Your Honor, at this time,
9	the State would have a challenge.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Elizondo?
11	MR. ELIZONDO: May I have a few moments?
12	
13	EXAMINATION
14	
	OUFSTIONS BY MR. BLISONDO
15	QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:
16	Q. Ms. Guernsey, how are you doing?
17	A. Beginning to feel I am on trial.
18	THE COURT: Don't feel that way.
19	Q. (By Mr. Elizondo) I hope you don't feel that
20	way.
21	In a capital murder case, we pick
22	twelve jurors, and we can strike persons for
	whatever reasons we want.
23	
24	Yesterday, for example, we had a
25	police officer as a juror, thirty-two years on

the force --

MR. BAX: Judge, I am going to object to this line of questioning. It has nothing to do with this challenge at this point in time as to how many peremptory challenges we have, whether we can strike people for whatever reason, had a police officer here yesterday.

THE COURT: Sustained.

(By Mr. Elizondo) Let me go ahead and go into the facts -- I am sorry, not the facts -- but how jurors are selected on a capital murder case.

Every trial in Texas is divided into two parts. The first part is the guilt-or-innocence stage. The second part is the punishment stage.

If he is found guilty, if twelve jurors believe beyond a reasonable doubt that he should be found guilty, then he will be found guilty, and then we go to the punishment phase.

At that point in time, the jurors are to answer these two questions, and if they believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to Question No. 1 should be yes, then they should answer that yes, and if they believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to Question No.

2 should be yes, they should also answer yes.

There are many types of cases, many types of criminal cases in Harris County alone, much less the state of Texas. There are many, many different types of gruesome situations, and I hate to even go into them, but I have to, because it is the proper question to ask you.

It is almost unfair to ask you can you give the death penalty period, point-blank, with-out giving you any situations, fact situations, where I know you have talked with your husband before over other situations and said, "This guy should die for what he has done."

Let me give you an example of a guy going all over the country, Canada, Michigan, Beaumont, Houston, killing women, and he finally gets caught, and he gives a confession and he confesses to killing nineteen women, confesses to kidnapping them, sexually molesting them, and choking and killing them.

He goes on trial, and when he goes on trial, you find out later he has done this on two different occasions, aside and apart from these other nineteen times, and he's been convicted on these two other occasions.

You can see in that hypothetical situation a jury, if they believe beyond a reasonable doubt, should find him guilty, and you can also see where a jury, in that hypothetical situation, if they believe beyond a reasonable doubt that his conduct was committed deliberately and with the reasonable expectation that death would result, you can see that a juror in that hypothetical situation would answer the question yes, and you can also see where a juror in that hypothetical would answer Question 2 yes, because by that time, the juror in that hypothetical 12 would have found out he had done this on two different occasions, aside and apart from the He's done this on two other occasions, nineteen. 15 and the jury in that hypothetical would probably 16 see there was a probability he would commit 17 criminal acts of violence in the future because 18

Would you agree with that?

of the crimes he has committed in the past.

Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me give you another hypothetical. A school bus full of children gets kidnapped. get kidnapped by the kidnapper out here in the Sharpstown Mall, and they call the Houston Police

station and say, "I need a million dollars in ransom, or I will kill all these thirty children."

The parents get their money together and scrounge it up, somehow get the money together within twelve hours, and the kidnapper puts money in his pocket, gets a machine gun and blows those thirty children away. He gets caught. He gives a confession, and you find out he has done this on two other occasions.

You can see in that hypothetical where a juror would probably answer --

MR. BAX: Your Honor, I object to what a juror would or would not do in those situations.

MR. ELIZONDO: I am just giving a hypothetical situation.

THE COURT: I will allow you to do the hypothetical.

Sustained on the form of the question.

(By Mr. Elizondo) You can see in that hypothetical situation if the juror believed beyond a reasonable doubt he killed those thirty children, you can see where a juror in that hypothetical would answer the question yes -- excuse me -- guilty?

 ${\tt MR.}$  BAX: I object to his saying what a juror would or would not do. The question is

like you are trying to bring out these cases. I

24

know I would feel strongly about them, and hope somebody else did it. Okay?

But I hope I don't ever have to do it. Please don't pick me.

Q. Okay. I've got to ask you this question one more time.

Would you automatically vote against the death penalty in any fact situation?

A. Yes.

MR. ELIZONDO: We pass her, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do y'all want to agree?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. BAX: Yes, Judge, on the last response when asked if she would vote against the death penalty regardless of the facts, and a very definite yes answer.

THE COURT: You want to agree?

MR. ELIZONDO: I object to it as a violation of Witherspoon.

THE COURT: I accept the State's challenge.

CHARLES R. GOUGENHEIM, II,

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

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:

THE COURT: Are you ready?

MR. MOEN: May I proceed, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

- Q. (By Mr. Moen) Is it Gougenheim? Is that how you pronounce your last name?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Mr. Gougenheim, my name is Bob Moen. I am with the District Attorney's Office here in town.

Seated behind me is Dick Bax, also with the District Attorney's Office, and it will be the duty of Mr. Bax and myself to represent the District Attorney's Office and the family of J. D. Harris who was killed back on July 13th of 1982. Mr. Bax and myself will represent those people in the prosecution of the individual who is charged with having committed the crime, and that will be our function in the case, to represent not only the District Attorney's Office

but the family of Officer Harris.

The judge asked earlier if you had read anything about the case and you indicated you were familiar with it, perhaps from something on television or something heard on the radio.

- A. Yes, sir. That is all.
- The reason we ask, there is absolutely nothing wrong with having gained information of about a case from television or newspapers, a case in which you may ultimately serve as a juror, but the only reason we ask is to make sure jurors haven't formed conclusions or opinions based on what they have read or heard, and I think the judge may have asked you whether or not you formed conclusions or opinions about the guilt or innocence of anyone and I think you indicated you have not?
- A. Yes, sir. That is right.
- What I want to do is ask you some questions in the next thirty minutes, and also, I want to explain some things to you.

The reason, I guess, we bring jurors in individually, like yourself, rather than do it all at once like we do in most of the cases in the courthouse is because of how serious a case of this nature is.

No jurors are required to serve on this type of case, a capital murder case, unless he or she knows what would be required of them, and then he or she voluntarily agrees to be a juror. Basically, you agree to be a juror by answering the questions we ask, and if serving on such a jury would not violate any of your opinions, beliefs, or scruples you have held dear to yourself all of your life, you can be qualified to serve.

The only way we know that, obviously, is by getting feedback from you and asking the questions in the first place. There are absolutely no right or wrong answers.

The only thing we ask is for the juror to give us those answers that most accurately and truthfully reflect his or her particular feelings on the questions that we ask. Okay -- and topics that we cover.

- A. Okay.
- Q. Keeping that in mind, can you tell me what your feelings or opinions are concerning the death penalty for someone who has committed a particular type of murder?
- A. Well, I do believe there are times when it is

indicated.

- Okay. Would your feelings concerning the death penalty allow you to be a juror on such a case, a capital murder case, and would your feelings allow you to return a verdict that you know would result in someone receiving the death penalty?

  Would your feelings and opinions allow you to serve on this type of case?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Okay. Some people tell us that they are believers in the death penalty, but when it came right down to them returning a verdict and actually serving on a jury where someone would receive the death penalty, they actually couldn't do it and would rather that responsibility be passed on to, you know, some other member of the community, and I don't mean that to slight people who feel like that. I just want to check with you to see if your opinions or feelings or religious scruples that you might have would be violated by your jury service.

I take it from what you are telling me, they won't be?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Is that pretty much the way you have felt all

9 ||

your life about the death penalty, or have you ever been opposed to the death penalty, and because of some event in your life or conversations or things that you have read, reached the opposite conclusion?

- A No, sir. I would say I have pretty much always felt that way.
- Q. Okay.
- A. As far back as I can remember.
- Q. Okay. Is that pretty much the product of your own thought processes as an adult, or perhaps not only that being part of the process, but perhaps the way you were brought up by your mother and father that has brought you to the frame of mind that you are in today concerning the death penalty?
- A. I would say it is pretty much the way I have been raised, and also believe on my own as an individual.
- Q. Okay. I am going to ask you to put yourself in some categories, if you would, as best you can.

If you can't fit yourself into one of the three categories, describe yourself to me as best you can, your feelings concerning the death penalty.

Mould you say you were strongly, moderately, or reluctantly in favor of the death penalty for the commission of certain crimes? Can you put yourself in one of those three categories? And we are just talking about the death penalty in general terms, not talking about a specific case or specific evidence you might hear.

Just given your feelings concerning the death penalty, can you put yourself in one of those three categories?

- A. I can easily say I would be moderately.
- Q. Okay. Now, I want you to categorize your political leanings for me, if you would.

How would you categorize yourself politically speaking, as either conservative, moderate, or liberal? Fit yourself into one of those, or if you can't, describe your political leanings, if you can.

- A. Well, basically, I don't have any leanings one way or the other.
- Pretty much independent in your voting process?
- A. Best man gets your vote. That's the way I feel.
- Q. Okay. Is your dad still actively employed, or is he retired?

- Q. What was his occupation during the course of his lifetime? What type of job did he do?
- A. He worked for Humble Oil and Refining and also was a captain in the auxiliary police department here in the city of Houston.
- I see that on the back. I didn't know that back in the forties and fifties that they had an auxiliary police department here in the city of Houston.
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. That is kind of interesting. I didn't realize how that worked.

How about your mom? Did she ever work outside the home, or would she be pretty much a housewife and mother all her life?

- A. I would say pretty much eighty percent of the time she was a housewife.
- Not to slight that. That is a full-time job, obviously, particularly if you have a large family.

Do you have brothers and sisters in your family?

- A. I have a half sister.
- Q. What is her occupation, if you know?

- A. She is a sales clerk. 1 And is she married or single? 2 Married. A. 3 Do you know what her husband does for a living? 4 He is self-employed. 5 What type of job or occupation? Q. Mainly machining. A. 7 Machinist? Q. 8 Yes. 9 Now, you are the technical director of the 10 Pulmonary Disease Section of the Veterans 11 Administration Hospital? 12 Yes, sir. 13 What type of training or education have you had 14 to have to get you into that line of work? 15 A lot of it has been basically on-the-job, also 16 some college background into the scientific, 17 biological aspects of the field. 18 Okay. What was your branch of study when you were 19 in college? 20

  - Science. Biology.

22

23

24

- Now, I know you were in the Army for three years from '70 to '72. What was your highest rank and where were you stationed, sir?
- My highest rank was Specialist 5, and I was

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

stationed at Fort Polk in San Antonio, spent a year in Vietnam, and got reassigned to the Pentagon for two months, and the last year, they released me to go to another reserve unit.

- Q. Where were you stationed in Vietnam?
- A. Bien Hoa and also Ty Ninh.
- Q. When were you with the service? What was your specialty when you were with the service? branch of the Army were you in?
- A. I was originally trained as a combat medic, also was an operations N.C.O.
- Did you see any combat or service in Vietnam?
- Not directly, no. We were assigned as an advisory group to the Vietnamese Army, and our advisory group went to Cambodia, so we had to remain in Vietnam.
- Q. I noticed just recently your house was burglarized. Were there any suspects apprehended in that and any property returned to you as a result of the burglary?
- No.
- Is there anything about the way the police handled the case that left a bad taste in your mouth or the District Attorney's Office, if they gave you assistance on the case at all?

3

- Q. Okay. Now, back here it says 1955, something, and I can't make out your handwriting.
- 4
- A. That was the year my father was murdered.
- 5
- Q. I am sorry. I can't make that out.
- 6
- I know earlier you said your father was deceased. What happened in 1955?
- 7
- A. He was an auxiliary police officer and was killed in the line of duty.
- 9

10

Q I am sorry to bring it up. I wouldn't have asked

you earlier what your father did if I had known

- 11
- that.
- 12

13

- A. That's okay.
- 14
- What happened to the man that killed your father?
  Was he apprehended? Do you know?
- 15 16
- A. He was killed by my father.
- 17
- Q. What were the circumstances of that? Did your father catch him in the act of committing
- 19

18

- some crime? What happened in that?
- 20

A.

- my father and the regular officer he was riding
- 2122
- with that night had picked up some guy on a drunk

and intoxicated charge, and when they were going

From what I have been told and in the clippings,

- 23
- in, they were also required to stop at some of
- 2425
- the local bars and check to make sure they had a

valid license. My father stayed in the patrol car with the prisoner, and another officer went in and was bent down checking the license behind the bar, and the gentleman in the bar reached over and shot the officer in the head and ran out the door, and my father responded to the gunshots and jumped out of the car and there was an exchange of gunfire and they both went down.

- Now, I see that you are a member -- I see one of your hobbies -- it looks like flying remote control aircraft?
- A. No, sir. Regular experimental home-built aircraft.
- Actually flying your own home-built airplane then?
- A. Yes.
- I give you credit for having a lot more nerve than I would ever have, for flying anything I built in my house.
- A. I would say the standards we have to go by are probably a little bit better than the planes you ride in every day.
- I've got a friend of mine who flies small aircraft, and it's a real learning experience to get up in one of those things, if you have never been up before.

- A. I agree with you on that.
- Q. What type of hunting do you like to do? Bird hunting or deer?
- A. Mainly deer, turkey.

Q Okay. Let me talk to you, Mr. Gougenheim, a little more about the procedure involved in the case, the way that --

First of all, there are ten categories of murders that our legislature has said that if a person commits one of these ten types of murders, he can be punished by the jury for the offense of capital murder and will receive, if found guilty, only the life sentence or the death sentence, depending on the jurors' answers to these questions that appear to my left.

The legislature has said to kill a police officer or fireman during the course of their official duties, to murder the employee of a penal institution, someone we ask to run the penal institution, if a convict kills one of those individuals, that is capital murder.

If a convict kills any person while trying to escape, in the course of escaping or trying to escape, if he kills a person, that is capital murder, and then murder for hire.

murder takes place during the course of committing one of five particular felonies, that is going to be capital murder as well. For instance, to break into another man's home and kill the man or woman or anyone else in the course of breaking into their home, robbery-murder; rape-murder; kidnapping-murder; and arson-murder.

Those are all examples of murders that take place during the course of those felonies, and because the murders occur during the course of those crimes, the murders then become defined as capital murder.

The range of punishment, as the judge mentioned earlier, for the offense of murder is five to ninety-nine years or life, but if a person is guilty of capital murder, they can only receive life in the Texas Department of Corrections or the death penalty.

Now, at the first stage of the trial, capital trial, it doesn't differ from any misdemeanor or felony trial, but all you hear in the first part is testimony about whether the man is guilty or not guilty of the crime, and you retire with the other jurors and decide whether

the man is guilty or not guilty.

back out and the foreman will hand a verdict to the clerk and the clerk will read the verdict, and if it is a guilty verdict, we will proceed to the second phase of the trial and the jurors will take their seats and we will hear evidence again to help them answer these questions on my left, because depending on the answers to those questions, the man on trial will receive either the death sentence or the life sentence in the Texas Department of Corrections.

No one tries to hide anything from you. You know, when you are going in to deliberate on those questions, what your answers will be doing. If both questions are answered yes, the Defendant receives the death penalty. If a no answer appears to either one, the man receives life rather than the death penalty.

It takes all twelve jurors, unanimously in agreement, before a question can be answered yes; however, only ten before the jurors can agree to unanimously answer no. There is a slight distinction: twelve for a yes answer, ten for a no answer.

I want to go over the language or some of the words we've got underlined in some of these questions with you, but before we do that, have you had a chance to read these to yourself?

A. Yes.

Let me direct your attention to this first question here. Question I asks you to make a determination about the man on trial, asks you to make a determination, based on the evidence you have heard which leads you to the conclusion that the man was guilty of murder; based on that evidence at the trial, you make a determination about the conduct of the man in the trial and the part he played: Was that conduct that caused the death of the deceased, was it committed deliberately and was it done with the reasonable expectation the deceased or another would die?

Now, let me give you an example or hypothetical example as to how the first question comes into play. Imagine a robbery-murder, which would be capital murder, where a man goes into a convenience store in the early morning hours, confronts the lady working behind the counter, points a loaded gun at her and demands the money, and, of course, she is frightened as anyone

would be. He snatches the money up, fires two bullets in her body, and she dies.

Unbeknownst to him, she steps on some type of alarm that notifies the police and they are waiting for him outside as he flees, and they arrest him.

At that man's trial, after they have found him guilty of capital murder -- that is what he has done, robbery-murder -- they will decide this question: Was the conduct of that man that caused his death, was the firing of the gun that he brought into the store, the firing of the bullets into her body, in the portion he struck, the head and chest area, was that deliberate conduct on his part and done with the reasonable expectation she would die?

Is it reasonable to expect, when you take a loaded pistol and fire it into another's body that she would die as a result of those wounds?

Do you see how that question is a common sense question based on the facts you heard that led you to believe the man was guilty of capital murder? It is a pretty straightforward common sense question based on the evidence.

I think you will agree with that.

A. Yes, sir.

You will have to use your definition for the word "deliberately" that appears, and your own definition for the word "reasonable," and the reason for that is because the legislature drew these up for jurors to use on capital murder cases, and if you are selected to serve as a juror in this case, you will be doing the same thing other jurors have done -- we have some two hundred men on death row -- what jurors have done, they have had to answer these questions based on the evidence presented in the case.

You will have to use your own definitions for the words in Question 1.

Question 2 is a different question.

It asks you to make a determination about the man on trial. Is the man the type of person where there exists the probability that that man would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society? In other words, is he that kind of person that would do these kinds of acts that would be a continuing threat to society?

Now, the word or the first part of the

question, and the first word we have underlined is the word "probability." You will have to use your own common sense working definition for that word, but I think you realize the word is probability and not certainty, and the reason it is not, whether there is a certainty the man is that type of person, as you realize, the only person in the entire universe that can tell us to a certainty what he will do is God Almighty himself, and he is not going to testify in this case, and the jurors are not expected to play God. They make the best judgment they can based on what they have heard.

What does the crime tell us about the man in front of us? Is there a probability he is the type of man that would do these acts, criminal acts of violence?

Now, the phrase criminal acts of violence is all-inclusive and includes all types of criminal violence. You don't have to believe the man would commit certain types, but all types, whether burglaries, robberies, rapes, or assaults, or any other type of criminal violence we can think of. Only is there a probability he can do those kinds of acts, and would those acts, once

done, constitute a continuing threat to society, and that brings me to the last word, "society," and the reason I direct your attention to that word is, once again, for that word, you will have to use your own definition. But I think you realize from the discussion we have had so far, just using your common sense, that the portion of society this man would find himself in if he were convicted of capital murder is going to be the prison society.

The only thing I wanted you to agree or disagree with me on, and I encourage you to do either one, would you agree or disagree there are people in the penitentiary that we ask to work in the penitentiary to keep the place running for us and to keep the people sent by jurors to the penitentiary away from the general members of society who aren't in the penitentiary, lawabiding members of our community, that we ask these people to work in the penitentiary for us, and they have a right to expect to go to their jobs and be free of danger, to be free of threats and to be basically safe from individuals who are sent to the penitentiary?

Would you agree or disagree with me

those people have the right to expect that, when sent to the penitentiary?

A. I agree.

- Would you agree or disagree with me there are even convicts in the penitentiary who are serving out there debt to society who have a right to be free of fear and danger from other convicts who may be sent to the penitentiary?
- A. I would agree also.
- Q. Okay. So, that is basically what that question will be asking you to do, is to make the best judgment call you can based on all the facts and evidence you have heard about what kind of person is on trial.

Do you feel like, since we have had a chance to go over Questions 1 and 2, those are the type of questions you could answer? Not whether you would answer them yes or no, that will be for you to decide based on the evidence, but is there anything about the wording that makes you feel you could not answer them based on the wording, or do you feel you could, based on the evidence you will hear?

- A. I feel I could.
- Q. I wanted to point something out to you about the

2 que:
3 ans:
4 case
5 hea:

questions. The law says that the jury can answer both of these questions yes in a proper case just based on the crime that the jurors heard about itself. The crime itself can be emough evidence for the jury in a proper case to answer both questions yes, but in the second phase of the trial, the jury is entitled to hear evidence about what type of man is on trial, what type of past record, if any, he has.

about whether the man has committed other crimes that might be relevant to these questions, even crimes he's not yet been tried for or convicted of. That is a peculiar aspect of our law that applies only to capital murder cases, that they allow those to come in.

Normally, in a felony case, you wouldn't be able to hear about other crimes he hasn't been tried and convicted of. Only in capital murder cases can you hear that type of evidence.

So basically, you will have all the evidence with you. You may hear of only the crime itself, but there may be other evidence that is known, and you will go back and answer

these questions as best you can.

Do you follow me on how that portion of the trial works?

A. Yes.

Q. I want to point this out to you, because jurors cannot do this: The judge will tell you that the jurors are not to discuss among themselves or consider how long a man would have to serve in the penitentiary if he received a life sentence rather than the death penalty. That is left within the discretion of the Board of Pardons and Paroles.

If any of the jurors were to ask you that before they reached their answers, whatever they were, we would have to do the whole trial all over again, all five weeks we have worked so far to get a jury for the trial, all of those five or six weeks would be wasted, and we would have to start all over again.

So I ask you, if you are selected -and I know you will do what the judge tells you
to -- but if anyone brings it up, tell them to
shut up and do what the judge tells you on that.
Okay?

A. Yes, sir.

Let me tell you about some of the things the judge is going to tell you you have to do as a juror on a capital murder case.

He will tell you as a juror, you will have to presume the Defendant to be innocent.

That is a legal presumption. That is not to insult your intelligence.

I think you realize in a hypothetical case we are talking about, any criminals who commit crimes, they are just as guilty the day they are caught as when they come to the courthouse to answer for that crime, but nonetheless, the law asks jurors who don't know anything about the case to go ahead and presume him innocent, to wait until the evidence comes in and then to make their decision, reach their verdict, on what comes in from the witness stand.

Don't, because he has been indicted by a Grand Jury, is represented by attorneys, and is inside a courtroom, but instead, base your verdict on what the witnesses tell you about what happened from the witness stand.

Do you feel you could do that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Now, the judge will also tell you that the

Defendant does not have to testify if he doesn't want to in a criminal case. A Defendant, if he chooses, can remain totally silent at his trial. That is his right, to either get on the stand and testify or sit at the counsel table and not testify. He can do that.

The only thing the judge will tell you in that regard is this: You are not to hold the Defendant's failure to testify as any evidence of his guilt. In other words, silence is not evidence. You base your verdict based on what you have been told about the offense from the witness stand, not on what you have not heard.

That doesn't mean you can't wonder what the Defendant would have said or would not have testified to. That is a natural reaction. All of us, as business people, as parents, want to hear both sides of the story before we make a type of decision.

However, in a criminal court, sometimes we or you hear one side of the story, and you don't hear from the Defendant.

If, for some reason, he doesn't get on the stand and testify, that is his right.

Do you follow me on that failure to

The judge will tell you the Grand Jury indictment is no evidence of anything. The analogy I draw is the Grand Jury indictment is kind of like a starter's pistol in a footrace. Until the pistol goes off and we have an indictment from a Grand Jury, you can't have the trial, and the trial can't start.

That is not evidence of anything. That is the only significance.

The judge will also tell you the burden of proof in a criminal case always rests with Mr. Bax and myself, and the burden of proof means before you can say by your verdict any man is guilty of a crime, lawyers like Mr. Bax and myself have to prove it to you.

A trial is a wide-open proceeding, however. In a criminal trial, both sides have an opportunity to put on whatever witnesses they want, call whatever witnesses down here to the courthouse they want, at no expense. It doesn't cost anything to get people to the courthouse except the taxpayers. He can give a subpoena to the clerk who forwards that to the Sheriff's

Department, and they mail that request to the witness, and if the witness doesn't show, the Sheriff's Office will come and pick up the witness and bring him down here.

The only person who bears that expense

The only person who bears that expense is the taxpayers. You make a request, then come down here. That is why I say both sides have an opportunity to do that, prove or disprove what they want.

Only one side has the burden of proving anything, and that is Mr. Bax and myself. We have to prove to you and the jurors the man, in fact, is guilty, and your answers to both questions should be yes.

That burden is to proof beyond a reasonable doubt. So often on the lawyer shows, we hear "beyond all doubt," "any doubt," or "a shadow of a doubt," and you can leave those phrases where they belong, on the lawyer shows.

The test is beyond a reasonable doubt, not all doubt, or a shadow of a doubt.

I particularly draw your attention to Question 2, because I think you realize the only person that I know of that could convince you beyond all doubt, a shadow of a doubt, as to

Question No. 2, is God Almighty himself. Jurors are not asked to play God, but make their decisions beyond a reasonable doubt, not any, all, or a shadow of a doubt.

Do you follow me on that?

A. Yes.

ن۔

Q. Finally, the judge will tell you when you are judging the credibility of a witness, you are not to give a witness more belief or less belief just because of a witness' job. That is before a witness testifies.

Once a witness gets on the stand, if his job enters into his testimony, it is perfectly permissible for a juror to consider a witness' occupation, such a doctor testifying about medical evidence, experiences. He would be crazy not to consider his training and medical experience in considering what he is telling the jury. He would be nuts not to consider his job and the experience he might have, or a police officer who might have twenty-one or twenty-two years of experience investigating some particular type of crime telling you what he's found as a result of his investigation. He would be crazy to tell you not to consider that.

All the law asks you to do is not give a witness more or less belief before they get on the stand to testify, because of his or her job. After they testify, if the job enters into it, it is perfectly all right to consider the job.

Do you follow me on how that works?

- A. Yes.
- Finally -- the judge won't tell you this -- but

  I tell the jurors this that haven't been on a jury
  before. As a juror, you will be the decider of
  the facts along with other members of the jury
  panel. You will decide what took place on July
  13th, 1982. Jurors do that from the testimony or
  make that decision from the testimony they hear
  from the witness stand, and when you are listening
  to someone who is testifying, you have the ability,
  and other jurors do, too, to believe or disbelieve
  everything a witness tells you, even though the
  witness is saying what they are saying under
  oath.

Now, it sounds crazy, doesn't it, to think you might disbelieve what someone told you on the witness stand under oath? I think you realize from common sense, Mr. Gougenheim, like everybody else does, we don't live in a

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

perfect society. There are people who live in our community, who live in our state, who live in our world, who will, even though they have taken an oath to God, walk right up to the witness stand and tell lies. That is why the obligation falls on jurors to decide how much of a witness' testimony they are going to believe and how much they are going to disbelieve, and when they are making that decision, they can consider and discuss among themselves what biases, motive, or prejudices a witness might have for testifying the way they are. What does a witness have to gain; what does a witness have to lose, et cetera. Those are questions you can ask yourselves and probably will ask yourselves when judging the believability or credibility of a witness.

Do you follow me on that?

- A. Yes.
- Now, one final thing I want to talk to you about and that is the range of punishment for murder. We mentioned that was five to ninety-nine years or life.

The reason I talk about the range of punishment for murder is because murder is what is defined as a lesser included offense of

capital murder. Now, what that means is basically this: Let's use the hypothetical we talked about earlier where the man goes into the convenience store and shot the teller.

Let's say there were witnesses present who thought the man was robbing the woman and reported that information to the police after he ran outside and was caught, and the police did a shaky investigation and didn't check to see if money was missing, and the man gets indicted for capital murder.

This is a hypothetical case, and you are a juror on the case, and you find what really happened was this was a girl friend-boyfriend dispute. The man that killed the cashier had been living with her for a couple of years and she was ready to move out and he was extremely angry about it, and they had had an argument. He followed her to the store with a pistol, argued about the same thing again, and he took the gun and killed her.

You see, under the facts of that hypothetical, he was not guilty of capital murder. We don't have another felony. But he is guilty of murder, and the jury in that case should say

not guilty of capital murder, but guilty of the offense of murder, and the jury would decide where that murder fits within the range of punishment of five to ninety-nine years or life.

Even that man would have a right, if he is proven he's never been convicted before of a felony in this state or any other state or the United States, and never been granted probation, he would have the right to ask the jury to give him probation, even though he had killed that woman, and the jury could consider and discuss among themselves whether they could give him probation, and they could either reject the idea or give him probation instead of sending him to the penitentiary.

Have you heard of probation before?

- A. Yes.
  - Let me explain a little bit technically about how it works at the courthouse. If a man hasn't been convicted in a state before, if he hasn't gotten probation for a felony, he can ask the jury for probation.

Now, the way a jury gives probation is this: If the jury finds a man guilty of a felony, even the crime of murder, if they decide

that the range of punishment should be ten years or less.

If the jury feels like it is a crime where the man deserves twenty, thirty, forty years in the penitentiary, they don't consider probation. It is only in those cases where the jury unanimously agrees the punishment should be ten years or less; the jury should consider if it is a proper case for probation, and if the man is a proper candidate for probation, if they feel he is and it fits that type of case, they can recommend it to the judge, and if the jury does recommend it, the man can, in fact, receive probation.

I am not trying to imply to you in any capital murder case or any type of murder case is one where the man receives probation.

I am trying to explain to you general aspects and principles of law.

What I wanted to ask you ultimately is this: Can you conceive, in your own mind, where you might be a juror on a case and return a verdict and find someone guilty of the offense of murder where you would be able to consider if you felt like it was a proper case, would

A.

Yes.

be able to consider the question of probation as a possible form or range of punishment, even though the person had been found guilty of the offense of murder?

Can you conceive of some facts in your mind where probation might be proper, even though a person has been found guilty of murder?

I was going to give you some examples, but I think from what you have read in the paper, battered wife syndrome, I think from those, like the man in Amarillo who shot his brother three or four times, was dying, I believe, and he was a vegetable, and there was conversation about the brother asking him to do that, and he went in the car and got his gun and shot his brother, no financial gain or anything else involved, basically put him out of his misery --

There are other things in the paper, but

I think from things you have read and heard, you

can conceive of cases where probation would be

proper for someone convicted of murder.

I want to point something out, and I swear this will be the last thing I will talk about.

In answer to these questions, your answers should not be automatically yes or no just because you have found someone guilty of capital murder. You should base your answers to these questions on what the evidence tells you your answers should be.

At first blush, it seems kind of funny, if I found someone guilty of intentionally and knowingly killing someone, a police officer, if I find someone guilty of committing capital murder, that seems to indicate to me his conduct was deliberate. At first blush it does.

But what I am getting at is this: There are fact situations where someone is found guilty of capital murder where the jurors' answer to the first question would probably be no.

Let me give you an example of what
we are talking about. Take the hypothetical
we used where a man goes into a convenience store
and kills a cashier. Let's say he's thirty or
thirty-five years old, been in the penitentiary
before, and he recruits a seventeen-year-old -he has to be seventeen or older under our law
-- and he recruits him to go with him, and it
can be shown by the testimony he has fallen under

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

the influence of this fellow, and he puts a gun in his hand and tells him, "I want you to be a lookout."

The boy goes over knowing a robbery is going to take place and participates to that The seventeen-year-old doesn't know extent. what has happened when the woman is shot, and he flees. He is arrested along with the thirty-fiveyear-old, and under our law of parties, even though the seventeen-year-old was outside as a lookout, he would be held equally responsible for the death inside, because under our law of parties, the persons acting together can be equally held guilty of the offense. You can't claim surprise, the law says. If you are going to do an aggravated robbery and take pistols, you can't claim surprise in the shooting of someone.

I think in that case when it came to the question of answering the question on the seventeen-year-old, you can see how the answer in this case should be no.

- A. That is correct.
- Q. Because there was no conduct on his part -- sure, he assisted in the aggravated robbery -- but there was no conduct on his part, and if there

was conduct, it wasn't done with the reasonable expectation someone would die.

I think what I am trying to point out is, based on the evidence, that question can be answered yes or no, even though that person has been found guilty of capital murder.

Do you follow me on how these questions can be based on evidence? Do you follow me on that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you have any questions of me at all so far?
- A. No. You have covered everything pretty well.
- I appreciate your saying that. I know we have to go over it kind of quick, and the last thing I want to do is leave you with any questions in your mind or leave you with anything we have talked about that might confuse you.

Do you feel like there is any reason, now that we have had a chance to talk, you would not be impartial to both sides in the case, both the family and Officer Harris?

- A. No. I think I could be very fair.
- I lied. I said that was the last thing. There will be one other thing.

I think the evidence will show the

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

Defendant is an illegal alien. The only thing I would like to point out in that regard -- if you disagree, that is fine, too -- the Defendant should not be found guilty or not guilty just because he is an illegal alien.

Do you agree or disagree?

- I agree. A.
- You could consider that evidence as to what type of person the Defendant is when you answer Question No. 2, but as far as the guilt or innocence is concerned, any Defendant should not be found guilty of a crime just because he is not lawfully in our country, and I take it you have told me you believe that?
- I do. A.
- I appreciate your visiting with us, and I will pass you to the Defense, and they will have questions.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HERNANDEZ:

- Good morning, Mr. Gougenheim. Q.
- Hi. A.
- I guess it is my time to ask you more questions,

like Mr. Moen asked you.

Before I do that, let me say we ask
you these questions, basically, in good faith.
We ask you in good faith in order that we might
be able to select or give you some indication
we would be able to select the best possible
twelve jurors that could be fair and impartial
and honest.

That is why we ask the questions. It is not to embarrass you or humiliate you in any way. These questions don't have right or wrong answers.

It is how you feel. How you yourself feel about it today, how you feel about this man and how you feel about the death penalty. That is the most important thing.

- A. Okay.
- So what I am seeking is not an answer that right satisfy me, but I am seeking an answer that might satisfy yourself, whether you can, in all honesty, judge this man, once you are over here, because once you are over here, we can't ask you any questions. We can't talk to you.

So bear with me. It is not that I want to get into your personal life, but bear with me

and you will understand why I have to ask you some questions.

A. Okay.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. You know how leery Mr. Elizondo and I are, the simple fact that it happened to your father.

This is a capital case. My client has been indicted by the Grand Jury for intentionally and knowingly causing the death of a police officer while the police officer was in the line of duty, as your father was, so you can understand how leery we are, and you can understand why I have to ask you these questions, because what I am doing, I want to search or have you search into yourself, deep down, and tell yourself and ask yourself, "Can I judge this man? Will I be able to do that," and, of course, it is all relating back to your background. "Can I go home and tell my wife, or can I go home and tell my mother that I placed myself here?" And, let's take it a step further. "Can I go home and tell my mother that I found somebody" -- whoever it might be -- "not guilty of intentionally and knowingly causing the death of a police officer?"

That is why I am asking you these questions, because it is important to us, and,

S

of course, you know it is very important to him, literally life or death.

So I am asking you, can you judge this man with feelings or inner feelings set aside, and if you cannot, like I said, there is no right or wrong answers. Nobody's going to harp on you. We live in the type of society where nobody is going to require you to be a juror because of your feelings or religious beliefs. You might be able to -- although you might not be able to serve on this jury or this particular case, that doesn't detract from the fact you are a good citizen.

You can serve on other juries and be a good juror and a good citizen, but it doesn't detract or take away from anything if you say, "No, I don't think I can," or maybe you can. I don't know.

What is your feeling?

Well, I feel like I can be very objective about the whole case. I agree from my past, I can see where y'all would be very hesitant to accept me. However, his case and my father's case are two completely separate things, where I see there is no feeling or bearing on what happened in the

past in my life with his particular case.

- Well, you know, you understand that this case will probably be very emotional. You know that the wife of Officer J. D. Harris will probably testify, and I don't know if the children will testify. We are very hesitant. We are very leery of the fact that you may sit here and listen to the trial, and in listening to the emotions that might come out of this trial, you may sympathize subconsciously with that family and say, "I grew up without a father, and she will grow up without a father." So, that is why I am asking if in any way, whether that would affect you in any way, shape, form, or fashion, and you can understand my reasoning, or Mr. Elizondo -- our reasoning?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What I am trying to get at --
- A. I believe I do, and in that regard, growing up with or without a father, in my particular case, I feel like I have to try to extrapolate any other type of case from my own beliefs and happenings. It wouldn't have any bearing on it.

  I have had a stepfather. I feel like he did a good job of raising me just as my real father would have

done.

ند

Q How old were you when your father died?

- A. I was about four and a half.
- Let me go one step further and ask you whether,
  listening to the evidence and finding out in your
  own heart that he was not guilty, and hypothetically
  speaking, you presented or you with the other
  eleven jurors presented a verdict of not guilty,
  would you be able to face your family and your
  mother? Would it be a hardship or would it
  affect you in any way being over here and saying,
  "I don't think I could look at my mother in the
  face and tell her that after what's happened"?
- A. I feel I could separate the two, the main reason being having been in the medical field, oh, for, well, since I have been in the service, I feel very adequately -- I get my subjective feelings out of anything from just listening to the bare, basic facts and formulate my answers and opinions from fact and not from my personal feelings.
- Q. Were you in a Medivac Unit in Vietnam?
- A. No, I was in the advisory unit.
- Q. Where were you stationed?
- A. Bien Hoa.
- Q. That was an I-Corps?

1 A. Yes.

Q I was I-Corps, and we had to pick up an Evac.

Y'all went into Cambodia?

- A Ourself Vietnamese counterparts did, but that was after they had prevented me from going across the border.
- Q Let me then go ahead and be more specific on what Mr. Moen would explain to you of what would be required of you as a juror.

There are three basic concepts: the presumption of innocence, the burden of proof, and reasonable doubt, and let me go and be more specific on each one of them.

Excuse me.

The law requires that any citizen, any
Defendant brought before a criminal trial is
presumed to be innocent until that presumption of
innocence can be overcome beyond a reasonable
doubt by the State.

Can you give, or would you agree with me that that presumption of innocence will stay with this Defendant in this trial?

Could you give my client that presumption of innocence as he sits here today?

A. Yes.

Of course, you know that he has been indicted by the Harris County Grand Jury for intentionally and knowingly causing the death of a police officer, J. D. Harris, while in the line of duty.

That indictment itself and Mr. Guerra's sitting here represented by Mr. Elizondo and I, 'ould that be a strike against him as he sits ere today?

No, it would not be.

so you can grant him that benefit?

/≥s, I can.

And that presumption?

is correct.

e other concept is the burden of proof. The law clearly states that a Defendant or any fendant or any citizen that charges have been ld against him, does not have the burden to prove his innocence. The burden is always on the burden. They have brought the charges. They have burden to prove the charges to you.

Can you follow that rule? Can you callow that law?

, sir.

ly client have to prove his innocence to

fore you could return a verdict?

nderstand that the burden never shifts hout the whole trial?

Correct.

in both stages, the guilt-and-innocence and in the punishment stage.

n never shifts.

in this country to testify. It does t gives him the right either to testify

He does not have to present any evidence not have to get up on the witness stand.

3-LC there and let the State prove the case yond a reasonable doubt. That burden has to be with the State.

Would the mere fact that my client does y, would you hold that against him?

ract that we might not present evidence, trary of what the State has presented, d that against him?

A. No.

Now, the burden that is placed upon the State is the burden of beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, in the civil system or in the civil courtroom across the street, it is by a preponderance of evidence. That is the burden. In other words, the greater weight of the credible evidence, however slight the scale tips, that side wins.

Do you agree with me there? Okay.

Now, the burden becomes much heavier in the criminal system. Beyond a reasonable doubt.

It tilts much, much more to the other side.

Reasonable doubt will not be defined for you. That definition has to come from you. The judge cannot define it for you, and we cannot define reasonable doubt for you. Mr. Moen cannot define reasonable doubt for you.

Simply put, it is doubt founded within reason, or whatever your definition might be, but it is not beyond any doubt or all doubt, but a reasonable doubt.

Do you follow me there? Do you agree

with me?

Yes. .

you think that that would be a heavy burden for the State?

I would say it would be a fairly heavy one. Would you be able to follow it, that law? Yes, I believe I could.

So, do you agree or disagree with it? I agree.

All right. Now, there is no doubt you will be in a position where you would have to judge the predibility of the witnesses. There will be witnesses for the State's side saying one thing, of course, there will be our witnesses aging completely the other.

You are the judge of the facts. You are he judge to unscramble all the conflict. There ill be police officers testifying.

Would the mere fact that a police officer is a police officer, that per se, without estifying, would you give him more credibility than any citizen testifying before you?

you will agree with me, then, that a police er can make mistakes just like any other

A That is correct.

3

Q. And he is subject to the same human frailties as

4

any other citizen? Would you agree with me there?

5

Yes.

A.

7

8

6

Q. So you wouldn't give, say, one class of people more credibility because of whatever reasons,

say, because they were police officers?

- 9
- A. No.

11

Or a doctor more credibility than a normal citizen?

12 13

A. I feel like their word would be just as good as mine.

14

15

Q All right, then. I go back to the situation where in the witness before you, or witnesses, they

17

16

might be emotional. For example, Ms. J. D. Harris.

18

Can you separate the emotions from the facts of

19

20

A. Yes. I believe I could.

what happened July 13th, 1982?

21

Q. And separate that and take that, take only the facts, and judge it by the facts and the facts

2223

A. Yes, sir.

alone?

24

25

Q. All right. Now, as Mr. Moen mentioned earlier,

it will be known in the trial that my client, Mr. Guerra, is an illegal alien.

His being part of a class, say, of illegal aliens, how would that affect you in this case?

- A. Not at all. I feel like anybody here has the same rights that we all do.
- Q So the fact he is here illegally in this country would not affect your judgment in this case whatsoever?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. So, are you saying that he is entitled to the same rights that any citizen has?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Well, let me go one step further on that.

Several months ago, the U. S. Supreme

Court came out with a decision saying the children

of illegal aliens were entitled to a free

education.

Did you hear about that?

- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. What was your initial reaction?
- A. Well, I guess, like a lot of people, I thought, gosh, where are we going to come up with the money to provide for all of these educations.

After sitting back and thinking about it, basically where was our country -- the people that founded our country, where did they come from? The other countries.

So I feel like there is nothing basically wrong at all with it, that they could provide and help build an even better and stronger United States in the future.

You know, initially, yes, we might have some funding problems.

Now, there will be two stages of this trial:

the guilt-and-innocence stage and, of course, the

punishment stage, and in each one, the same

concept continues. It doesn't stop. Say, for

example, if you found my client guilty, it still

continues in those two questions.

Would you make the State prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt -- because, believe me, they will be asking you to answer these two questions yes -- would you make them prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt before you would make a decision?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Would you make them prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Can you promise me that you can keep an open mind until you have heard all the evidence?
- A. Yes, I can.

Yes.

- Q. And give that presumption to Mr. Guerra throughout the whole trial?
- A. Yes, I could.
- Q. And place the burden on the State and demand that they prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt?
- A. Yes. I could.
- Mr. Elizondo noticed that you went to Stephen
  F. Austin.
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And I don't know if you are aware that the incident took place close to Stephen F. Austin, and as a matter of fact, it took place maybe less than eight blocks from Stephen F. Austin.

Are you familiar with that area?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Did you grow up in that area?
- A. Yes. I still live in the same zip code I was born in.
- Q. Is that Glenmore?
- A. Glenmore.

A. No, sir. It is off back on the other side of the freeway.

Q Off Polk?

A. Off of Wayside on the freeway. Originally, I grew up off Lawndale and near Wayside. Villa De Matel, just right next to that convent.

Q I guess you could understand why we are very leery, although you promised to us that you can be fair.

MR. MOEN: Repetitious. That's been asked and answered three times, Judge.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q (By Mr. Hernandez) Let me ask you this question:
Say you go into the deliberation room and scratch
your head and say, "Damn. I think he is guilty.
I think he did it, but the State didn't prove it

beyond a reasonable doubt, and that is the law,"

 and, for example, if he didn't testify, and you say to yourself, "Well, he didn't testify," and

then subconsciously, because of what happened

to your father, would you give the State that

extra help to get them over the hump and find him quilty?

.5

A. No, I wouldn't.

Q Let's go a step further.

Say you get in there and scratch your head and say, "Damn. I think he did it. He might have done it. He could have done it. It is possible, but they didn't prove it to me, didn't prove it to me beyond a reasonable doubt."

What would your answer be?

A. Well, I would be actually having to say they didn't do their job. He would be innocent. Unless I could be sure in my own mind that if I was in the same position I could convict myself, I wouldn't be able to convict anybody else. Unless I am sure enough I would be willing to put myself on the line, I am not going to put anybody else on the line.

I know in my case, like I said earlier,
I agree, and I would be very hesitant to accept
myself, but being myself, I would say I would try
a lot harder to be very objective about it.

- You know, Mr. Gougenheim, you don't have to put yourself in his position, and we are going to ask you, or I will ask you one more time: Can you be fair to us as well as the State?
- A. Yes, I can.
- Q. And set aside any ill feelings of past history?

1	MR. ELIZONDO: We will excuse him,
2	Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Gougenheim, thank you
4	very much. You will be excused.
5	
6	
7	
8	TOMMY RAY SMITH,
9	was called as a prospective juror and responded to
10	questions propounded as follows:
11	
12	EXAMINATION
13	
14	QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:
15	THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Bax.
16	MR. BAX: Thank you.
17	Q. (By Mr. Bax) Good afternoon, Mr. Smith.
18	A. Hello.
19	Q. How are you doing today?
20	A. Fine.
21	Q. Did you stick around here all morning long and
22	everything?
23	A. Uh-huh.
24	Q. We are in the process of selecting twelve people
25	to sit on a jury. It is a capital murder jury.

Usually, we can pick a jury in two
to three hours and start testimony the same day
we select a jury. We started selecting this
jury back on August 30th. This is the middle
of our fifth week, I guess.

We need two more jurors, but you can see it is a long and drawn-out process, as you can see. You had to wait around all morning until we reached you.

We do this primarily because of the punishment involved in a capital murder case. The law requires we do it individually, and, quite frankly, that is the only way to do it.

If a person is convicted of capital murder, he receives one of two sentences, the life sentence or the death penalty. That is all. There is nothing in between, nothing less than that.

Because there are so many different viewpoints in our community on the death penalty, the law allows us to talk to you individually so you are not influenced by what other people might think, and, hopefully, you will feel more comfortable about the way you feel.

You are number eighty-seven, the

eighty-seventh person we have talked to, and probably eighty-seven opinions have been before us.

Some people come before us and say,

"Yes, I believe in the death penalty, and I believe
in the proper case, I could carry through with
a verdict that would result in the death penalty."

Others say, "I couldn't do it because of my personal beliefs, religious background, et cetera. I could never partake in the taking of a life, no matter what the evidence was."

Either side is fine. We are not going to have a debate on the pros and cons of capital punishment.

I am trying to find out what your beliefs are, and certainly no one is going to try to change your opinions. Okay?

- A. Okay.
- Q. There are no right or wrong answers. Okay?
- A. Okay.
  - The only answers that would be wrong would be answers not true to yourself. Our law does not require someone to become a juror where that jury service would violate their conscientious, religious, or moral scruples. No one is going

A. Okay.

- Q Can you tell us about your feelings about the death penalty, whether you believe in it, and whether you would be able to participate in that type of trial, or because of your religious beliefs, personal beliefs, it would preclude you from being in such a case?
- A. I do believe in it. I believe I could participate in it.
- Q. Have you been of that opinion all of your adult life?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. There is nothing of personal experience that came along and changed your opinion?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. Let me go over with you, if I could, the certain types of cases where the death penalty is a possible punishment.

First of all, there always has to be an intentional or knowing taking of a life, which is a murder.

A murder, in and of itself, does not become a capital murder. There has to be something

coupled with the murder to make it capital murder.

If you kill a person during the course of a robbery, if you go into a Utotem and you are robbing the clerk in the Utotem and during the course of that robbery, you shoot and kill the clerk or another customer, that is elevated to capital murder.

If you kill someone during the break-in of their home or business, that is capital murder.

For the rapist to kill the rape victim; for the kidnapper to kill the kidnap victim, that is capital murder.

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

If you commit a felony offense plus a murder, one of those felony offenses plus a murder, that is capital murder.

Our law also protects certain individuals, policemen and firemen and people employed by our prison system. If you kill a fireman or policeman knowing they are such a person and they are carrying out their lawful duties, that is elevated then to capital murder.

If you kill an employee of the prison

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

system and you are an inmate, or if you kill anyone in an attempt to escape from a penal institution, that is raised to capital murder.

Finally, the last area is where a person either hires someone to kill for him or a person is hired to kill by another person and the murder actually takes place.

Those are the only ten areas where the death penalty becomes a possible punishment.

Do you feel those are the proper types of cases for the death penalty?

- Yes, sir.
- Where it can be an appropriate punishment if the facts call for it?
- Yes, sir.
- Up until around 1967 in Texas, a person could get the death penalty for any number of cases, any type of murder case where a death resulted, or you could get it where there was a rape with no death, or a robbery where no death resulted or came about as a result of that criminal conduct.

But that law was struck down by the Supreme Court of the United States. You see, what happened back in 1967, a jury heard all the facts of a case and went in the back and

deliberated, and if they found a Defendant guilty, they continued to deliberate as to punishment and the punishment range would be anywhere from two years to a maximum of life or death, so a jury basically decided should this man get death.

the jury was allowed to give the death penalty, the Supreme Court struck that down. In 1974, our Supreme Court came up with a different method of determining whether a person should get the death penalty. First of all, they had to be convicted of one of those offenses, and if he is found guilty, these questions are submitted to the jury. If the jury answered Questions 1 and 2 yes, the judge would give the death penalty. If Question 1 or 2 is answered no, the judge assesses life imprisonment.

The jury doesn't say, "Does he deserve it," but they base their answers on the evidence, and it attempts to be more clinical, to make it more objective when the jury is deciding on the punishment. Okay?

- A. Okay.
- These two questions are not particular to this

case. As I said, the legislature created them back in 1974. Every death penalty case that has reached the punishment stage since that time, these two questions have had to be answered by the jury.

Just taking the two questions and looking at the first one, have you had a chance to read these over?

A. This morning I haven't.

7

10

11

12

14

17

20

23

Q. Take a few seconds and read them over and we will go through them.

Okay. There are a few words in both of these questions that are underlined, and the reason these words are underlined -- they won't be underlined at the end of the trial -- they are there for your discussion purposes. Those terms won't be defined for you by the judge. The jury will have to use their everyday common meaning for those terms and phrases when deciding what their answers should be.

Question No. 1, though, calls for a yes or no answer and is really two questions in one. Two parts.

Number one, was the conduct of the Defendant deliberate, and, number two, was that

conduct done with a reasonable expectation someone would die as a result of that conduct.

Question No. 1 calls upon the jury to really reevaluate the evidence they have already heard in deciding if a person is guilty. Okay? Assuming you are on a jury where a person is found guilty at the punishment stage.

Do you follow me so far?

A. Yes.

Q. You are asked this question --

To get to the punishment stage, you have had to find that a person intentionally caused the death of another person. All right? To some people, the word "deliberately" means the same as the word "intentionally." I don't know if it does to you or doesn't.

To me, deliberately means on purpose or willfully. Okay?

- A. Okay.
- Q. You may, after you have heard the evidence and found the person guilty, based on that same evidence, you may have already answered this question in your mind.

Do you follow me?

A. Yes.

- Q. Simply because you have found a person guilty of intentionally causing the death of someone doesn't mean this question is automatically answered yes at the punishment stage.
- A. Right.

10

11

17

20

23

Q. You see, if that were the case, we wouldn't need to submit this question to the jury.

Let me give you an example of where you could have found a person guilty of intentionally taking the life of another person but you could have a no answer to these two parts.

Suppose two people get together and decide they are going to do a robbery. There is a thirty-five-year-old man who is an ex-convict, and he enlists and solicits a seventeen-year-old boy to go along as a lookout. He has an influence on the boy and he gives him a pistol and tells him, "Your job in the robbery is going to be to stand out in the front and keep watch and run the car." The seventeen-year-old says, "Fine."

The thirty-five-year-old says, "I will go inside and get the money," and the thirty-five-year-old goes inside and sees the only person in the store is the clerk, and in an effort, so

his crime will never be detected, he shoots and kills the clerk.

There is no question that the thirty-fiveyear-old man has committed capital murder. He has
killed an employee of the store during the course
of a robbery.

Okay. Under our law, if two people conspire to commit a felony, two people commit the felony of robbery, if one of the coconspirators, one of the people commits another felony during the course of that murder, both people are guilty of murder if the murder should have been anticipated as a possibility of their actions together. I think you will understand that anytime two people plan on doing a robbery and they both have loaded weapons, it should be anticipated if something goes wrong, someone may get shot.

Under the law, someone is guilty of murder even though he didn't pull the trigger. All right?

As to answering the question, 1, on the thirty-five-year-old, you may say, "Yes, his conduct was deliberate, and he acted with a reasonable expectation someone would die," but

in answering the question of the seventeen-yearold out front, you might say he didn't have a reasonable expectation someone would die.

You can see, depending on the facts, this person, though you found this person guilty, the answer could be yes or no, but the seventeen-year-old, let's say that the evidence showed that the seventeen-year-old agreed with the thirty-five-year-old that, "Yes, we will kill anyone around," in that case, your answer may be different to the seventeen-year-old.

What I am trying to get across, there is no automatic answers to the questions simply because you found someone caused the death. Wait and make your answers based on the evidence and not on the guilty finding.

Is there anything about the first question, the way it is phrased or written, that you feel would cause you difficulty in answering it? I am not saying how you would answer it, but could you answer it yes or no based on the evidence?

A. Yes.

Q. The second question is a little bit different.

It is asking about the person on trial, what type

of person is on trial. Is he the type of person who is probably going to commit criminal acts of violence in the future that will be a threat to society. Okay?

The term probability will not be defined.

To me, it means more likely than not, chances

are, something more than fifty percent, more than

a possibility. Anything is possible, but less,

would you agree, than a certainty?

You see, the law doesn't require I prove to you something is certain in the future but likely to happen.

- A. Less than a certainty.
- Q Less than a certainty and more than a possibility.

There is no way I can prove beyond a reasonable doubt that something is certain.

- A. Right. Nothing is certain.
- And the law doesn't require me to prove something to a certainty. That is physicallly impossible to do. The law requires me to prove it to a probability.

Criminal acts of violence include other capital murders, other murders, but are not just limited to murders or capital murders.

Criminal acts of violence include burglaries, robberies, rapes, beating up on people, assault-type cases. I don't have to prove he will go out and kill another policeman or kill someone during the course of a robbery, but just commit criminal acts of violence or that he is likely to commit those acts.

Likewise, there is no way I can predict
he is likely to commit certain crimes, but just
that he is a continuing threat to society,
whichever society he finds himself in, be it back
on our street someday or even within the
penitentiary where there is society, not only of
the inmates but also of wardens, guards,
librarians, medical people there to aid the
prisoners.

Are there any questions about this Question No. 2? Do you feel you would be able to answer that based on the evidence?

- A. Based on the evidence, yes, if it is proved.
  - At the punishment stage, the first question can be answered by just the evidence in the case itself, but other evidence can be introduced as to Question 2, aside from the crime the person is on trial for, to aid the jury in answering

that question. It is not required that additional evidence be offered. If it is available, it would be offered to the jury to help you in answering that question.

The law, however, says if the jury is satisfied that the evidence in a particular case is so cold-blooded or what not, it may be able to satisfy the jury just on the facts alone.

Do you follow me there?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Is there anything up to this point, any questions about anything we have gone over?
- A. No.
- You will not have to remember any of this. If you are selected on the jury, it will be next week before you hear the case, and then if the jury found the Defendant guilty, it would be at least the end of the next week before these questions come up. The judge will give you this in your instructions prior to deliberations.

  Okay?
- A. Okay.
- Q. Let me go over some of your obligations as a juror, and they would be the same instructions that the judge would give you and the eleven

-

other jurors. This would be true whether it was a driving while intoxicated case or capital case. These rights belong to all Defendants.

First of all, a Defendant is by law believed to be innocent until proven he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

The fact a Grand Jury has indicted him, the fact he is represented by attorneys and finds himself here today, the judge will tell you gives rise to no inference of quilt.

Can you afford this Defendant the presumption of innocence at this time?

- A. Yes.
- And simply, that means, you know, the jury has to take the box with an open mind. It would be wrong for someone to go and say he is indicted, and where there is smoke, there is fire. He must have done something.

I am not going to insult your intelligence and say we picked him up off the street. The law requires there be something there, but the law requires you give no significance to that and make the State prove its case to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

Can you do that?

A. Yes.

Okay.

- Of course, if he was guilty back on the date this happened, he is guilty today and he will be guilty until the day he dies, but say you are of the right frame of mind, you must assume he is innocent, and if I prove he is guilty, fine. If I don't, you will have to acquit him. Okay?
- Q. A Defendant in a criminal trial does not have to
  - give testimony, does not have to testify himself. He does not have to call witnesses in his behalf.

The burden in a criminal trial is always on the State. We have the burden of proving to the jury a person is guilty. The Defense has no burden. They do not have to prove their client is innocent. They do not have to ask one question throughout the whole trial, and if they choose to do that, choose not to ask questions, choose not to put the witness on the stand, that cannot be considered as any type of evidence by the jury.

The jury can only consider evidence from the witness stand where you are seated now and must base their verdict of guilty or not guilty based on what they have heard and not what they don't hear, and I guess the best

illustration is we put on our case, and Mr.

Hernandez and Mr. Elizondo rest after our

testimony. Y'all decide, "Well, Bax and Moen did

a good job. They put on a pretty good case, but,

you know, they didn't convince us beyond a

reasonable doubt. The Defendant didn't testify,

though, so we just add that as evidence and get

the State over the hump and find the man guilty."

You can see that would be wrong, and I don't think you would do that.

- A. No.
- Q. So if the Defendant does not testify, you will not hold that against him?
- A. No. No.
- If he did testify, and I assume in this trial he will testify, he is like any other witness, and as a juror, your main function will be to decide the credibility of the witnesses.

When a witness testifies, they will take an oath to tell the truth. They don't always do that. If they did, I guess I would be out of a job and the judge would be out of a job if every witness told the truth on the stand.

You will have to decide who is telling the truth, to decide conflicts in testimony, if

one side says this happened and the other side says it didn\*t.

You will be looking at the witness, judging their demeanor, their motives, and asking yourself is it reasonable? Does it fit in with the evidence from other sources? And you will decide if you believe all, part, or nothing of what a witness says, and that goes for the Defendant or a police officer. It doesn't matter who is testifying. Everybody takes the stand with an equal footing, no believability or disbelievability, and either can gain credibility or lose it in the eyes of the jury as they testify.

No witness, be it a police officer, a doctor, a plumber, no matter what occupation the person has, they don't have automatic believability. The jury is required to listen to their testimony and make their decision.

A. Uh-huh.

- Q. I have to -- and I am going rather quickly. I end up doing a lot of talking. Stop me if there are questions.
- A. Okay.
- Q. I have to prove my case to a jury by what we

call "reasonable doubt." I don't know what this is. I have never been on a jury. I doubt I will be, because I am a lawyer. I am sure one side or the other will cross my name off the list.

I guess it is something that is individual to each juror. I guess, as the judge said, you use your common sense, and after hearing the evidence if you are satisfied, if you are convinced in your own mind the person did it, it has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

If you are not satisfied, not convinced, I am sure you would have a reasonable doubt in that case and you should find the Defendant not guilty.

I can tell you that proof beyond a reasonable doubt is not proof beyond all doubt. It is not proof beyond a shadow of a doubt or any doubt. The only way I could ever prove anything to twelve people beyond any doubt or beyond a shadow of a doubt would be if they all were witnesses and they all saw each and every transaction from the same and exact vantage point, and even then, those twelve people would probably have twelve different stories as to what happened.

A. Right.

Q. The law doesn't require I prove a case beyond all doubt, and, of course, there won't be a videotape replay or anything to aid the jury.

Do you feel that is a fair burden of proof, beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

- Q. Do you have any question about that at all?
- A. No.
- Q. Do you feel that you will be able to listen to two sides that may be diametrically opposed and go through it, analyze it, and make a determination as to which side was correct or which side was maybe lying and incorrect?
- A. Yes, I do.
- Q Of course, you do some umpiring and everything -I guess that is basically what a jury does -- see
  the evidence and make a judgment call on the
  evidence as they see it, and they just judge it.

It is not going to be a split decision like you sometimes have to do being an umpire.

You have time to think about it and talk about it.

Have you ever umpired games -- we've got a couple of teams at the District Attorney's Office called the Indictments and Re-indictments.

- A. No, ours is strictly called "Girls' Fast Pitch."
- Q. "Girls' Fast Pitch"?
- A. In South Houston.
- Q Do you ever do any slow pitch softball? Do you play fast pitch yourself?
- A. Slow pitch.

- Q. I don't think I could stand in and hit a fast pitch.
- A. The girls can throw them and sock the guys.
- Q. I imagine.
- A. I don't know why they call it softball.
- Q. I don't either.

A couple of more things: You can see
that the Defendant has an interpreter here. He
does not speak the English language, or he may have
some understanding, but not enough to converse
openly in English. He, I believe the evidence
will show, is not in this country lawfully.

You can tell me whether you agree or disagree, but because a person is not here lawfully, is an illegal alien, he should not be found guilty or not guilty on that fact?

- A. Right.
- Q. That has nothing to do with whether or not he committed this offense.

2 |

A.

- Q. That may have something to do -- you may find that benefits you or doesn't benefit you as far as answering these questions, but as far as whether he did or didn't do it, that has nothing to do with this case. Okay?
- A. Right.

I agree.

Q. The judge will also instruct you that as a juror, on deciding the issues of punishment, you are not to discuss, allude to, or mention at all how long a person would have to serve on any particular sentence.

For example, if you are trying to decide should we answer this one yes or no based on the evidence, that is, 1 and 2, it would be wrong for someone to say, "We'd better answer it yes so he will get the death penalty. If he gets the life sentence, he will get out in twenty years."

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection to stressing the law of pardons and paroles, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

(By Mr. Bax) You must base your sentence on the evidence, and the judge will tell you discussing how long a person would have to serve would be

strictly in the discretion of the Board of Pardons and Paroles, and he will stress if someone has to talk about it, the other jurors are under an obligation to stop that immediately, and you need to knock on the door and tell the bailiff so the judge can do something about it. And the reason I mention it and say something about it is if it is discussed by a jury, it is back to square one. It is automatic reversal, and we have to start all over again selecting a new jury and going through five or six weeks of selection plus new testimony. Correct?

- A. Right.
  - We talked about murder plus another element to make it capital murder. I think you can see where you would have a situation where a jury may say, after hearing the evidence, "Yes, he killed James Harris. There is no question he intentionally caused that person's death," but you may have a reasonable doubt, after hearing the evidence that the person who did the killing, the Defendant, whether he knew the fellow was a police officer. Okay?

Let's say it was a situation where the police officer was an undercover narcotics

dressed in street clothes, you know, with

nd long hair and everything, so he

ne in and no evidence was presented to

y the man ever identified himself as a

ficer. There was no question he shot

d the person. The jury could not return

ct of capital murder. You would only have

half of it, as to the intentional taking

in life. You couldn't find him guilty of

murder, but could find him guilty of

che lesser included offense, included

there is a lesser punishment range.

So you can see it is still a wide range hment, still goes up to life. The reason a wide range of punishment, of course are committed under many, many different tuations by many, many people with different counds for many, many different reasons.

You could have cold-blooded people

people as they drive by in their cars,

alling for punishment at the top of the

scale, but there are also women who have been the victims of abuse by their husbands over many, many years, and finally they shoot and kill their husbands in self-protection, or mercy killings, which would probably fall at the lower end of the range of punishment.

There are some in between.

7

10

16

19

ZU

22

23

Ç.

The law says the jury, after hearing the evidence, after finding a person guilty of the offense of murder, if that jury believes that the punishment range for that case is somewhere between five years and ten years, if the jury feels it is proper, they can recommend probation for that offense.

Probation, of course, is the release under conditions imposed by the Court.

Can you see where there could be cases where you think you could consider probation if the facts called for it for the taking of a life?

This person has taken a life?

Let me give you a couple of examples. It is hard

-- we deal with this stuff day in and day out, and
we bring you down here, and we are not trying to

commit you to this fact situation, but are just

trying to give you an idea of what happens.

Let me take you through a hypothetical capital murder, reduce it to murder, and to where a jury would consider probation.

Assume a man and wife have been married for fifty years, raised children, have grandchildren, and the wife becomes terminally ill. She is placed in the hospital and put on a life-support system.

There is no question, all the doctors agree within six months she will be dead. She's in a lot of pain and all the savings of that couple saved up over the years for their happy retirement has been expended day by day to keep her alive.

She discusses this with her husband and says, "Honey, pull the plug. I have lived a happy life. We have raised a family. I hurt. I want to go. I don't want to leave you with nothing but food stamps and welfare."

He finally reaches over and pulls the plug. He has done an intentional act to cause her death.

Family members on her side of the family feel that is not right, he didn't do that for that reason, but she owned property in Conroe he

wanted to sell to some construction man and she never wanted to sell that. They feel the only reason he pulled that plug was to get control of that property and sell it for money, and somehow the Grand Jury gets ahold of it for capital murder.

The case is tried and the jury hears that evidence and says, "It is B.S., just ridiculous. That man didn't kill her for that property. He killed her for an act of love." They don't find him guilty of capital murder, but follow their oath as a juror and find him guilty of murder.

They go back and say, "What do we do? What is the range of punishment?"

The jury could -- I am not saying what you would do in that situation -- but it may be the type of case where the jury thinks probation is proper.

Do you see there are cases, though there may be only a few, where you could envision probation? Can you see where there may be a case where probation would be proper for the taking of a life?

A. I do.

- Q. Capital murder, murder, and ultimately a probation as a result of that?Right.
- Q. I think that is about everything as far as -- let me look over my list here.

Do you have any questions on any of the law or anything we have talked about up to this point in time?

- A. No.
- Q Let me take a look at your -- is that a lieutenant?
- A. I believe he is. I am not sure if he is a lieutenant.

There is a lieutenant named Bill Edison, I think, at H.P.D. How well do you know him?

I know him from church. My wife knows his wife probably better than I know Bill.

- Q Okay.
- A. We are friends.
- The question they always ask, and, of course, if you were on this jury and no matter what you do, people are going to ask you about your verdict when it's all over, and I don't think you are the type of person that would vote one way or the other just to satisfy someone you were going to

Would you find it difficult or have
a problem going to him if you found the Defendant
not guilty, and saying, "I did what I thought I
was required to do under the evidence and the
law"?

A. No.

- Q. Is there anything about your relationship that would cause a problem in being a juror in this case?
- A. No.
  - Q. Did you recall anything about the facts of this case when the judge mentioned it?
  - A. Just a little bit, that, you know, maybe we saw on the news or something, but not very much.
  - Q. Okay.
  - A. Other than the fact I recognized the name when they said Officer Harris. I recognized the name.
  - Q. There is nothing wrong with having read or heard something. It would probably be impossible not to hear things like that if that happened in our community.

The only reason that question is asked of the jurors is to find out if they have formed an opinion or conclusion as to the Defendant's

that is something more serious than a lot of other cases, even the killing of a clerk during a robbery, and I don't think people mean it is more serious because a police officer's life per se is more valuable than anybody else's life, but a person who is trying to protect us as a whole, I guess, makes it that much more serious, but even talking about the murder of a police officer, under the eyes of the law, it is the same as far as evidence is concerned as any other category of capital murder.

The State still must prove at the punishment stage that the answers should be yes, and they are not automatically yes because a person took the life of a police officer.

Do you follow me there?

A. Uh-huh.

Well, if you have no questions of me, I think

I have pretty much covered everything I need to

talk with you about.

Is there anything whatsoever we need to say?

- A. No.
- Q. Mr. Smith, I have enjoyed talking with you, and if you are selected as a juror in this case, I

look forward to serving with you.

EXAMINATION

MR. BAX: I will pass the juror.

: []

QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:

- Q. Mr. Smith, how are you doing?
- A. Fine.
- Q. It has been a long day.
- A. Yes, it has.
- It is already 2:30. I believe you are eighty-seven, the eighty-seventh juror we have interviewed in the last ten (sic) weeks. We've got ten jurors so far. We need two more.

This is a capital murder case, and as in every criminal case in Texas, it is divided into two parts, the guilt-or-innocence stage and the punishment stage.

Just as actively as the State is going to be seeking the death penalty in this case, we are going to be actively seeking a not guilty in this case, and that is why I want to ask you a few questions and see how you honestly feel about certain things and see if you can give this man a fair and impartial trial.

A. Okay.

In a capital murder case, the State must prove its case to you beyond a reasonable doubt. They must prove to you that on a particular day in Harris County, Texas, this man 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 must prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

The term reasonable doubt will not be defined for you. The judge will not give you a definition. The prosecutor can't. I can't, because there is no legal definition of the term reasonable doubt.

All I can do is give you a comparison or analogy that across the street at 301 Fannin in the civil courthouse where they try lawsuits over contract disputes, over workmen's compensation cases, over property disputes, sometimes for millions of dollars, the burden of proof over there is by a preponderance of the evidence, the greater weight of the credible evidence, the greater weight.

Over here in the criminal courthouse,

the legislature said before somebody can be found guilty of a criminal case or capital murder, as in this case, the State will have a higher burden, a heavier burden, and that burden will be to prove their case to twelve jurors' satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt. So you can see that there is a heavier burden, and rightfully so, because before you can find somebody guilty of a crime such as this and then kill him, we'd. better be sure they have the right man.

- A. Right.
- Q Do you agree or disagree?
- A I agree.
  - So, basically, the way they go about their proof, they go ahead and read the indictment to the jury and the Defendant will plead not guilty, and they will present witnesses, and after they get through presenting witnesses, the Defendant can, if he chooses, he can rest his case, not put on any evidence whatsoever, because you've got to remember one thing. They brought the charges and now they've got to prove them.
- A. Okay.
- Q. So let's assume for one minute in a hypothetical situation that the State goes ahead and rests

their case and we rest our case, too, don't put on one bit of evidence.

You go in the jury deliberation room and you are thinking to yourself, you are thinking, "I think he did it. He might have done it, maybe he did, but they haven't proven this case to my satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt."

In that situation, what would your verdict be?

- A. If I am saying to myself, "I think. I am not sure"?
- Q. But it hasn't been proven beyond a reasonable doubt that he did it.
- A. If I had doubt, like you are saying, I could not find him guilty, if I had doubt.
- Q. Okay.
- A. And in my mind, I was not sure.
- Q. You can see where you might get in a switch where you might say to yourself, "I think he did it. He might have done it, but it hasn't been proven beyond a reasonable doubt." Do you see where you might get put in a switch? Where it is possible?
- A. Yes. I think anything is possible.
- Q. Sure. Anything.

But do you see where you could get

could do it.

4

5

1

2

3

The person can, if he chooses, he can testify. He can present witnesses. I suspect that he

Personally, myself, yes. I can see where I

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will in this case. If the Defendant testifies, he can be

impeached or discredited by proof of any prior felony convictions within the last ten years, let's say, and you can base that, base that, or the lack of any, and by using that, you can more or less judge a person's credibility.

You can judge their credibility by other ways, by their biases or any motives or any reason that a person may have for saying something.

You have been an umpire and you have seen people say two diametrically opposed things, and you have to make a decision, right?

- Yes. A.
- You have been around, and it will be your job as a juror to base your verdict and base it upon what you hear what the witness stand, and I think you can do that.
- Right. Α.

If the Defendant -- you as a juror will be the judge of the facts. There will be twelve judges of the facts and one judge of the law. He will judge on the objections and the admissibility of evidence, et cetera.

You, as the juror, will have the final say on the facts. You can believe some of, all of, or none of what a person testifies to.

That is your prerogative.

You as the judge of the facts, for whatever reason, can believe none of what a witness says or all of or some of it. Okay?

- A. Okay.
- Q. If the Defendant testifies and if we present evidence, I suspect there will be two diametrically opposed stories, and then again, it will be your job under your oath, under the law, to resolve those conflicts.

Do you think you can do that?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. How long have you been an umpire?
- A. Just one year.
  - Q. How many games have you umpired?
- A. Last year, I imagine I called about thirty games.

2

3

5

6

assess the death penalty, or would you consider those two questions?

- A. Well, we would be charged to consider the two questions, right.
- Q Sure. Sure.
- A. I would consider the two questions.
- Q Okay. The word "deliberately" in Question 1 is underlined and is asking you 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 is underlined.

There is no legal definition of the word

deliberately. The judge can't give you one. The

prosecutor can't give you one. I can't give you

one.

All I can do, by reason of analogy, again, is give you an example that you will go to the jury deliberation room to deliberate, first of all, on guilt or innocence. At that point in time, you will think about with measurable consideration whether or not this person committed the offense as alleged, and if the State proved their case to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

3

means?

5

Purposefully.

6

Q. Purposefully?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

I knew I was going to do it. A.

might mean premeditated.

Question No. 2 is asking you more or less to foretell or forecast the future. It is asking you if there is a probability that the Defendant would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society.

Some people say the word deliberately

What do you think the word deliberately

Probability to some people means more likely than not, chances are.

What do you think it means?

- I don't know. Α.
- The reason I am asking is because a minute ago you said anything is possible, and the reason I am going into that, would you answer anything yes because of what you said, that anything is possible?
- There is a probability -- to me, it just means, in my opinion, later on, do I think later on in his life is there any chance that he might commit another crime, is what it means to me.

- Q Criminal acts of violence?
- A Criminal acts of violence.
- Q. More than one crime.
- A. Okay.

- Description Let's assume the State has now proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to Question No. 2 should be yes. Would you then answer that question no?
- A. Would you repeat that, please?
- Q. Let's see if I can.

Let's assume that the State has not proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to Question No. 2 should be yes. Would you then, or could you then answer that question no?

- A. If they hadn't proven it beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer --
- Q. That the answer to Question No. 2 should be yes.

  Would you or could you then answer it

  no?
- A. Yes. I could answer it no.
- Okay. Both of those questions, before they can be answered yes, the State must prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to those two questions should be yes, and if they don't

prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to those two questions should be yes, then you should -- it will be your duty under your oath -- to answer both of those questions no.

### Do you follow me?

- Yes.
- How long have you been a Sunday school director?
- My first year.
- Is that right? This time?
- I just started this month.
  - And how often do you do that, or what do your duties entail? Is that an everyday operation?
  - No.

20

21

22

24

- Just on Sundays?
- Just on Sundays, strictly to see that each class and each department had a teacher there for that Sunday and find substitutes and set program goals. 19
  - And if you can't find substitutes, you go and take their place?
    - Yes, if I can't find anybody. Α.
- How long did you live in Brownsville? Q. 23
  - A. I was just born there. I really don't know. think two years. I think we moved here when I

Thrown him out in a baseball game?

A.

- Q. Have you ever called a shot and then later, after you called that shot, said, "Maybe I shouldn't have called that shot"?
  - A. I think sometimes I have been umpiring and you have maybe when it was a close call, you go home thinking about it, but I always think in my mind, I always think in my mind I called it like I saw it and made the best call.
  - You know, about five or six months ago, a Supreme Court decision came down and said the children of illegal aliens had the right to a free education.

    Do you remember that? What was your initial reaction when you heard that?
  - A. Immediately, it was that they did not -- did not have the right to a free education.
  - Q. A free education?
- 17 A. Here.

- Q. And do you still feel that way?
- 19 A. I am a little divided on how I feel.
- 20 \Q Why do you feel that way?
- 21 A. Well --
  - Again, I am not quarreling with you. I just want to know how you feel, because it may come to your knowledge that he is an illegal alien, and I am trying to find out how you feel.

A.

- I want to ask myself a question: Who am I to decide these children could not have the right to a free education? I was a child once, and, you know, they are children, and our lives are molded as children, and if these children are denied the opportunity maybe for an education, then it may affect how they grow up and what they become later in life, and sometimes I wonder who am I to say whether or not they should or should not have the right to an education here in the United States.
- Q. But your initial reaction was you were against it?
- A. Yes, when I first heard it on the news, because I felt like that is my tax money.
- Q. I guess so.

Did you form any kind of opinions about illegal aliens as a class of people, let's say?

- A. No.
- Q. Can you give Ricardo Aldape Guerra a fair and impartial trial?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Regardless of whether he has been indicted, represented by two lawyers, comes to you as an illegal alien, would you and could you give him a fair and impartial trial?

A. Yes.

- And if the evidence or lack of evidence showed that he wasn't guilty of the offense, if the State didn't prove to you he was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, could you come back and tell anybody and everybody not guilty?
- A. If he was not proven guilty, I could come back and say that.
- You know, this is going to be a very emotional trial. I suspect that Officer J. D. Harris' wife will testify. I suspect that some of his children will testify. I don't know.

Can you, in the trial of this case, separate emotion from fact and try him on the facts of the case and base your verdict and base it upon the facts and the law in this case?

- A. Yes.
- Q. That is a pretty powerful thing.
- A. It is a tough question.
- Q. It is a tough question.

Let me give you an example: The Hinckley case, where the guy was charged with trying to kill President Reagan.

Did you ever form an opinion on that case?

- A. Well, I would have to say yes; you know, I saw it on the news.
  - Q. You saw it?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

20

24

25

- A. I formed my opinion from my living room, didn't form it from the jury room.
- You can see where those jurors in that case had a pretty tough decision to make, probably a lot of phone calls and letters, but they formed their decision from what they heard on the witness stand. They followed their oaths as jurors and came back with what they thought was a proper verdict. I am not going to quarrel with their verdict.

Do you see what I am saying?

- A. I see it.
- Q. Now, you know Lieutenant Edison?
- 17 A. Yes.
  - Q How well do you know him?
- 19 A. Friends.
  - Q Very good friends, or how often do you see him?
- A. I guess once a week. I see Bill once a week. I

  don't see Bill very often. He works evenings,

  and when I get off, he is gone.
  - Q. Do they live in the same neighborhood as you?
  - A. Two or three miles from us.

Q That gets me a little scared also.

Let's assume you come back, or you are back in the jury deliberation room and you say,
"I am not sure the State has proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt. He might have done it. He said he did, but I am not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt, but if I go back and say not guilty, I am afraid to talk to Bill Edison or tell him I voted not guilty."

What do you think about that?

- A. I wouldn't be afraid to talk to Bill.
- 12 0 Or his wife?

- A. Or his wife.
- 14 Q. Or your wife?
- 15 A. Or my wife.
  - Q. Let me backtrack a little bit. I don't recall what your answer was a little while ago when Mr. Bax asked you if your brother felt the same way about the death penalty, and I think you said you didn't know.
  - A. My brother and I have never talked about that.
- Q. Have you talked to Bill about this case, by any chance?
- 24 A. No.
  - Q. You know, if you were selected as a juror, you

Why do you feel that way?

- I feel like that the taking of a human life is wrong, and I feel like in our world we need to understand that, and until we do that, until people believe that way and people realize when you take someone else's life that yours can be taken, that our world will never improve at all.
- Q Your answer to the last question brought up more questions.
- A. Oh.
- Q. Do you believe in an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth?
- A. An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.
- Q Explain that.
- A. Punishment for revenge's sake.
- Q. Revenge because he killed somebody?
  - A. Uh-huh. I am not a revengeful person, if that is what you are asking. I am just saying in a case where the facts are given and a man took another man's life and it is without doubt, reasonable doubt, or whatever you call it, if he took another man's life, I believe in the death penalty.
  - Q. Okay. Well, I can see where, you know, where you are coming from. I need to find out.

How do you feel about the State's

upon the fact he feels strongly for the death penalty. We are out of strikes, peremptory strikes, and the juror is unacceptable to us.

MR. BAX: Judge, we plead he is qualified in the same way the law doesn't preclude people simply because they are opposed to the death penalty. It doesn't preclude people simply because they are in favor of the death penalty, and the juror said although he had a preference, he would consider life, and his answer showed he would consider evidence before him, and would not automatically answer any questions.

MR. MOEN: We find him acceptable, too.

THE COURT: The challenge will be denied.

MR. ELIZONDO: We will ask for additional peremptory strikes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That also will be denied.

MR. BAX: Do you want him brought back?

THE COURT: Do you want to ask him additional questions?

MR. BAX: I may just ask one or two based upon his challenge, to make sure the record is clear on that.

\_

\_\_ ||

(Whereupon the prospective juror returned to the courtroom, and in his presence and hearing, the following proceedings were had.)

MR. ELIZONDO: Thank you, Mr. Smith. That is all the questions I have.

#### **EXAMINATION**

QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:

MR. BAX: Your Honor, just one or two more questions.

- Q. (By Mr. Bax) Mr. Smith, you have voiced here a preference for the death penalty if a person is found guilty of capital murder. Would that perference override the facts or would you base your answers to Questions 1 and 2 on the evidence?
- A. I would base it -- would you repeat that?
- Q Would you base your answers to these questions on the evidence, or automatically answer them yes because you have a preference for the death penalty?
- A. No, I would base my answers on the evidence.
- Q. On the evidence?
- A On the evidence, deliberate.

THE COURT: You may be seated just a moment, and I will give you a few instructions.

As I told you earlier today, it will probably be Monday or Tuesday when we start the evidence in this case. You will be allowed to go home during that interim period of time. There may or may not be any publicity in the newspaper or on the radio or TV about this case between now and then. Should there be, I will caution you and admonish you to avoid reading, watching, or listening to any publicity concerning this case.

Your verdict must be by evidence that you hear from the chair where you now sit and nothing else.

Now, during the course of the trial,

I anticipate there will be media coverage in all
three of these forums, and I will strongly
admonish the jury at that time to scrupulously
avoid reading or watching any publicity concerning
this case.

As I told you earlier, it probably will take four or five days to try the case once we get started, and it may be necessary for you to be sequestered or locked up in a hotel room one,

perhaps two nights. I don't know. So please make whatever arrangements you need to with your employment and that sort of thing.

Do you have any questions of me at this time?

THE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything further?

MR. BAX: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.

MR. ELIZONDO: Nothing from the Defense, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Smith, you may now be excused and we will notify you perhaps tomorrow as to exactly when to report, but do not report until we notify you when to come down. Okay?

THE JUROR: All right.

MR. ELIZONDO: For the record, after the selection of Tommy Ray Smith, I again voice an objection to Mr. Smith as totally unacceptable to us, and viewing it now, we probably, if we had now challenges for cause, would probably have chosen Cynthia Matthews instead of Tommy Ray Smith.

THE COURT: It was a challenge.

Your objection is overruled.

Please note that the objection is noted and denied.

MR. ELIZONDO: I think I said it wrong, ge.

For clarification purposes, if we had been allowed a challenge for cause on Cynthia Matthews, we would not have used a peremptory strike on Cynthia Matthews and, therefore, had an additional peremptory challenge to strike Tommy Ray Smith.

THE COURT: Are you asking for a ruling on that?

MR. ELIZONDO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Overruled.

# BOBBY JEAN FOREMAN,

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

## EXAMINATION

# QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:

TI TIME

THE COURT: Mr. Foreman, they are going to ask you questions, and please bear in mind what I told you earlier today.

(By Mr. Moen) Mr. Foreman, you have been waiting around all day, and I think you are entitled to an explanation as to why.

The law requires we talk to individuals individually in a capital case. We have to. It is not a case of whether we want to or not, but we have to interview the jurors individually, and it takes almost forty-five minutes to an hour, as you are aware of by now, to talk to a prospective juror on cases like this.

I think there are a couple of reasons. One, we have to do it by law, and, two, it's the serious nature of the case and other things we have to explain to a jury that we have to do in a criminal case, and they have to understand

what will be required of them by their jury service, and also a person isn't required to do anything where a person would violate his religious beliefs or moral scruples, et cetera.

We want to make sure or absolutely sure that a juror's convictions or beliefs will not be violated by being a juror on a case such as this.

I think you realize the issue of the death penalty is such an issue, many people have different ideas about it. Some people are in favor of it. Some people are opposed to it, and they tell us that, and, of course, no one grabs those jurors by the back of the neck and throws them in the jury box and says, "You don't have a choice. You've got to be a juror even though your service would violate your conscientious beliefs." That is not the type of country we live in.

But the only way we have to tell is to have them come up individually, explain to them individually, and see how they feel.

Frankly, by your answers, you will qualify yourself or excuse yourself on a jury like this, so what we are asking for are not

answers you think we want to hear.

We don't want to hear any answers except the way you honestly feel about the questions you have to ask, and there are no right or wrong answers. Because you feel one way or the other doesn't detract one way or the other in a case like this from the fact that you are a good citizen. We don't want anyone to come over here and say they could be a juror on a case like this if their feelings would not let them or opinions would not let them. If they can, that is fine; if they couldn't be, that is fine.

The only thing we ask is how you feel.

Keeping that in mind, tell us what your feelings or convictions are concerning the death penalty. Would your opinions and feelings allow you to be a juror in such a case and return a verdict knowing someone might be put to death, or would your feelings or opinions keep you from being a juror on such a case?

- A. Well, I believe in it, but it is hard for me -it is hard for me to sit here and say I can
  actually do it.
- Q. Okay.

A. It is not that I don't believe in it, because

0. Okay.

- A. And I can't really say I don't believe in it, because I do.
- Q We are not trying to -- obviously, at this time,
  I can't tell you what the facts are. The facts
  are what you learn from the witness stand. It
  wouldn't be right for me to stay here and tell you,
  "Mr. Foreman, here is my version of the facts.
  What would you do in a case like that?" And
  for Mr. Elizondo to say what are his versions
  of the facts. That is not right for us to stake
  you out.

The only set of facts that count are what you hear from the witness stand, not what the lawyers tell you they are.

We are speaking strictly in general terms. The only thing I want to know is, strictly speaking, would your feelings allow you to be on a capital case, and based on the evidence you hear, could you return a verdict you know would result in someone getting the death penalty?

- A. Yes, I think I could.
- I take it what you are telling me is your feelings are basically one of being in favor of the death penalty for a person who commits certain crimes?

  Is that a correct statement as to the way you feel about the death penalty?
- A. Yes.

Q I want you to put yourself in a category for me, if you can, and tell me by way of explaining to me your feelings concerning the death penalty.

Would you say that you are strongly in favor of the death penalty, reluctantly in favor of the death penalty, or moderately in favor of the death penalty? Can you put yourself in one of those three categories for me?

- A. I would put it at reluctantly.
- Q. How would you -- and I want you to classify yourself for me -- you see, it's easier for me to ask you questions like this and have you respond than say, "Mr. Foreman, tell me about yourself in fifteen minutes or less."

If someone asked me that question, I would say, "Go jump in a river."

So, I ask you by asking you questions and having you respond. Okay?

Politically, how would you list
yourself: conservative, moderate, liberal, or
describe yourself some other way than that, or
can you put yourself into one of those categories,
politically speaking, talking about your
political philosophies and ideologies?

- A. Well, I am really not that much into politics as far as that goes. I vote Democrat is about all I can tell you.
- Q. That is good. That tells me enough.

Let me explain a little about the procedure in a capital murder case by way of telling you what happens in a trial like this.

First of all, not all murders that take place in our state are punished as capital murders.
Only certain murders are.

You see, it has nothing to do with how many people are killed or how awful they might be killed, in what horrible fashion they might be killed.

Our legislature has said if someone takes another human being's life in the course of breaking into someone's home or while they are robbing someone or raping someone or kidnapping someone or burning someone's

6

5

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

24

property, if a man commits a murder during the course of committing one of those crimes, he has committed a higher form of murder, if you He has committed capital murder.

If a man murders a police officer or fireman or someone who is employed -- if a convict murders an employee at a penal institution, someone we ask to keep our prisons running for us, or if a convict kills anyone during escape or if anyone kills for money, money for hire, those are the only instances, if a person commits one of those ten crimes, those ten murders, that person can only receive a life sentence or the death penalty from the jury once he is found guilty.

Now, the way that punishment is assessed is by the jury answering these two questions that appear over here on my left. one tries to hide anything from you. questions are answered yes, you know what the effect of your answers will be. The man will receive the death penalty.

If a no answer appears to either one of the questions, then instead of the death penalty, the man will receive the life sentence.

5

These are the questions that are to be answered by the jury based on the evidence that they hear. They are to put their personal feelings aside as to any type of outcome they might want to have in a case.

Let me tell you how difficult your 6 decisions might be in a capital murder case. 7 might hear the facts in any capital murder case 8 and be convinced in your mind the man is guilty 9 and say so by your verdict. You might hear the 10 evidence, and have no question in your mind that 11 the answer to both questions should be yes, and 12 yet you are personally convinced this is the type 13 of case where a man should receive a life sentence 14 rather than the death penalty. Because of his 15 age or status in life, you are convinced from 16 the evidence your answers should be yes, but 17 your personal feelings tell you the man should 18 receive a life sentence rather than the death 19 penalty.

> Under those circumstances, what the jurors must do is answer the questions yes. The law would require you as a juror to answer those questions based strictly on the evidence rather than your personal like or dislike for a

24 25

20

21

22

2 | 3 |

range of punishment, for either one of the punishments, either a life sentence or the death penalty.

Now, I am not trying to scare you.

I don't mean to do that. What I am trying to apprise Mr. Foreman of is this. We are speaking in hypothetical terms when we talk about the death penalty, but we are really past the hypothetical. We are talking about reality and practicality.

- A. Uh-huh.
- I expect at the end of next week -- we will be starting testimony probably Monday -- to be standing in front of the jury and asking you to answer yes based on the evidence. The questions would be given them and if they do so, the man whom they have found guilty, if they answer those questions yes, he will be put to death at some point in the future.

We are not talking about hypotheticals, but talking about realities right now.

You might find yourself in the position as a juror on this case of having some personal feelings about what outcome or punishment the man might receive, that he should receive a life sentence rather than the death sentence, and yet,

because of the evidence, have to answer both of these questions yes.

The only time a juror has to be in that position is if his or her personal feelings would allow them to be on a capital murder jury, and the only way we know that is to ask each person to tell us those things and see if their feelings would allow them to do that.

Do you feel if you were called upon to perform that task you could voluntarily do that?

Some jurors say they can; some jurors say they could not. That is why we ask.

Q. Yes. I think I could, you know.

Don't -- all I am telling you is this: Is that

-- think about it. Take all the time you need to
think about it, and I am not trying to say you
haven't thought about it. I am trying to say it
is a decision you have to live with. We are
the lawyers on the case, and we have our
respective sides we have to present in a trial
like this. We are not the people who have to get
in the jury box and make the hard decisions the
jurors do.

We take our positions and ask the jurors to do things, but ultimately, the jurors

are the ones who have to live with their decisions in the case.

I think you would see how you would feel if, because of your feelings on the evidence, you found yourself in the position of being able to answer the questions about the man on trial. You know how bad you would feel about the family of the deceased, just as I think you know how bad you would feel if you made a mistake and answered the questions yes, sentencing a man to death, where you felt your answers should be no.

Those are the type of questions you will be confronted with, and I want to be sure your feelings would allow you to serve as a juror on the case.

- A. I think they would as long as -- as long as I could be sure without a doubt.
- Q. Okay. Well, a lot of people say that.

Let me explain something --

- A. But without a doubt, I mean, that I don't have to have no kind of feelings, I guess, no personal conscience bothering or nothing like that.
- That is what you mean when you say without a doubt?
- A. Yes.

 $\mathfrak Q$  Let me explain something to you.

The burden of proof in a criminal case

-- the phrase "burden of proof" is a legal phrase,
and what that phrase means is basically this. When
a man commits a crime in Harris County, the

District Attorneys have the burden of proving
to other members of the community that that man,
in fact, did that crime he is accused of. That
burden falls on people like yourself. Citizens
do that to prove to other citizens.

We don't snatch people off the street and bring them into the courthouse and say, "Now, you prove it. You have had no legal training. You are not a lawyer, but go ahead and prove that man is a liar. Go ahead and use the rules of procedure."

You don't throw people in the frying pan like that. Basically, that is performed by the District Attorney's Office. When someone is accused of a crime, they have a right to a trial by jury, and our burden is to prove to members of the jury that this man committed the crime he is accused of in this county, not some other town, but right here. That burden is to prove to the jurors beyond a reasonable doubt, not all

doubt -- and I'm not quarreling with you -if you say you have a doubt, a lot of jurors
say that. I understand what you are saying. The
burden is beyond a reasonable doubt, not all
doubt, not beyond all or a shadow of a doubt.

A. Yet on a capital murder case, before I could return a verdict that might result in someone's life being taken, you are going to have to convince me beyond all doubt. If I had any doubts in my mind, I would have to go ahead and answer those questions no or say not guilty by my verdict.

You may convince me beyond a reasonable doubt, but my personal verdict on a case like this, where a man's life is at stake, literally, you will have to convince me beyond all doubt.

Do you feel that way, or can you abide by the reasonable doubt proof?

Once again, there are no right or wrong answers, but how do you feel?

A. Me personally, I think it would be all doubt.

### My conscience --

Q. Don't shake your head. You haven't done a darn thing wrong except to say how you feel. So that is not something to be ashamed of, but something to be proud of. That is why I don't want you

thinking I am picking at you.

- A. I understand.
- I want to make sure how you feel so you don't wind up over here in the position of being a juror and say, "I can't do this. I wish I had told them how I felt. If they had asked me questions, I could have told them how I felt. Because of my personal tests or whatever or something wasn't explained to me."

Your response is not different from a lot of responses by other jurors who find themselves in your position. You see, particularly in regard to Question 2, it is the type of question where you will always have questions in your mind. That asks you about the type of person on trial, about the type of person he is and asks you to make an answer based on the evidence as to whether there was a probability that the man on trial was the type of person that would commit criminal acts of violence in the future that would constitute a continuing threat to society. That asks you to make a judgment call about the man on trial as to what type of person he is and does the probability exist that he would commit criminal acts of violence

25

3304

4

3

1

2

5

6

7

8

\_

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

in the future that would constitute a continuing threat to society.

So you might hear evidence, and you would always have doubts in your mind about what kind of person is on trial, but that is the type of difficult questions jurors are confronted with in a capital murder case, and they are to make the best judgment they can based on the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, not beyond all doubt, any doubt, or a shadow of a doubt.

Do you feel like that second question is the type of question you could ever answer, given your feelings concerning needing to be convinced in your own mind as to where there wasn't any doubt left, or do you feel the second question is the type of question you would need to answer no, regardless of the facts that you would hear?

- A. That would be really hard for me to answer. That is like forming a personal opinion to me.
- Q. It really is.
- A. It is a hard question for me to answer.
- Some people tell us they just couldn't do it because of the way the question is answered.

  That question has caused many jurors, prospective

jurors, almost ninety now, caused many people problems, and over the years in a number of capital murder cases I have tried.

You are not alone. It has caused many people problems.

Some people immediately told me they couldn't answer it. That is what I am getting at. It is the type of question, I think you would agree with me, you would probably always have some doubt in your mind, no matter what the evidence was about your answer to that question.

I think there is a chance a person could change, and, of course, that might be a nagging type of thing you might have in your mind when you are answering that question, no matter what the evidence you heard concerning what the man had done. You might always have some question in your mind.

- A. I would definitely have a question about it. There is no doubt about it. I would have to question myself real hard on it.
- Q. Yes.

Do you feel like it is the type of question that you could ever answer or do you feel like your feelings concernig a case like this,

9 i

where literally a man's life is at stake, that is just an unfair question to ask a juror to make a conclusion or judgment like that?

- A. I really don't think I could answer it.
- I appreciate your telling me that. I think you realize literally the situation you could find yourself in on Question No. 2. It is the type of question that asks you to make a judgment call.

You might literally find yourself in the position of hearing the evidence and believing from the evidence that your answer should be yes, but knowing if you answer the question, the man would receive the death penalty if the first question is answered yes, and given your personal feelings about the type of punishment the man would receive on the case, et cetera, I think you can see the dilemma you might find yourself in, and making a prediction about the type of person on trial and because of that prediction, the man might receive the death penalty, I think you can see the type of weight that would put on your shoulders as a juror in a case like this.

A. Uh-huh. That is the reason I think I will have a hard time answering that second question.

Q. Okay.

A. I think -- to me, I can't see me as being the judge, standing in judgment of that.

That is not an uncommon response. We have heard that from many people, and certainly you should not feel the least bit ashamed for feeling that way. I know you don't. I just want to tell you this is an informal portion of the trial.

Although you come and sit with a lot of strangers, we know these people, work with them on a day-to-day basis. They are not strangers to us, but you find yourself literally on the hot seat confronted with strangers.

That is exactly what the second question does, asks you to make a prediction, and if the prediction is yes, the man will receive the death penalty. Many people have told us they can't answer the question, and that is what I wanted to ask you.

Given your feelings about everything so far, the type of case it is, the death penalty being involved, the type of question No. 2 is, can you ever imagine being able to answer that question yes regardless of what the evidence would be?

A. If it come down to yes or no, I am sure I could say yes, if I could, you know, if it could be proven, but I am not saying, you know, I can't say that because --

Do you feel like it could ever be proven to you, though? That is kind of what I am getting at.

When you ask a juror imagine now you are on the jury panel and now you've got to answer that question and the evidence looks to you like your answer should be yes, what would you do, any law-abiding citizen, any person who registers to vote tries to abide by the law. What are they going to say? They will say I will do what I have to do. That is the type of situation we have now, where you say, "Yes, if I go to the jury box, I will do what the law requires me to do," but you don't have to go involuntarily.

This is not the type of situation where the bailiff grabs you by the scruff of the neck and says, "Mr. Foreman, go over there whether you believe in it or not. Get over there. Violate your moral, religious, and personal convictions." That is not what we want.

That is why in a case like this, we

- A. I wouldn't feel bad about answering the question, but like I said, if it come down to yes or no, I could say yes.
- Okay, and the test that you would have to use before you could answer the question yes is whether or not you have been convinced by the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. Not beyond all doubt or any doubt, but using that test, could you then still answer the question? Not all doubt, any doubt, or a shadow of a doubt, but put these personal proofs out of your mind, if you could.

Could you answer the question if you were convinced from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt and not all doubt? You might still have nagging doubts in your mind about the kind of person on trial, but as long as you were convinced from the evidence beyond a reasonable

doubt you should answer the question yes, unless Mr. Foreman is the type of person that would need more proof than that, would have to have all doubt removed or any doubt removed before he could answer that question.

Do you feel you could abide by that beyond a reasonable doubt burden or test, or do you feel like you would need to have all doubt removed from your mind or any nagging doubts removed from your mind before you would be able to answer that second question yes?

- A. I think I could do it beyond a reasonable doubt.
- Q. You think you could stick by it? I know when you think something, you are probably like I am when someone asks me something new and novel. I will say, I think this is the way I feel, or probably the way I feel," that way, and that is fine.

  Those are natural responses.

The only thing we need to have from you, though, on a case like this -- we have been at this for five weeks, and we have another week's worth of testimony, have roughly six weeks invested -- the one thing I live in deadly fear of is that a juror or prospective juror will wind up serving on a case without having made a

definite commitment that he or she could do it.

When you say "think," don't put yourself in the position of saying a week down the road you could not do it. When you say "think," are you telling me you could and you could abide by that instruction given by the Court or are you telling me you couldn't?

- A. I could abide by the rule reasonable doubt.
- Good. I needed that commitment from you, because when you go to the jury panel a week from now, that might be exactly the position you find yourself in.

Now, can you tell me you would answer these questions just based on the evidence without letting the life sentence or death penalty punishments affect what your answers are?

You see, that is another thing the jurors have. That is another oath the jurors have to take. They have to say that, "I will render a true verdict according to the evidence and the law given to me, so help me God," and also jurors have to state that their answers to those questions will not be affected by the mandatory punishments the man might receive, that being either the life sentence or the death penalty.

Could you give me an opinion as well?
Would your feelings let you do that?

Don't get me wrong. I am not trying to scare you again or talk you into something.

I am trying to tell you you will have to let the cards fall where they may, so to speak.

If the evidence indicated your answers should be yes, even though you had a preference at the end of the evidence that the man receive the life sentence rather than the death penalty, you would have to answer yes and put your personal preferences aside and answer those questions strictly on the evidence.

Do you feel you could do that?

- A. Yes. I feel I could do that.
- $\Omega$  I take it when you say, "I think I could" --
- A. Yes. I could do it.

This first question, which we only talked about briefly, that is a common sense question. That asks you to make a determination about the conduct of the man that has been found guilty of capital murder.

Let me give you a hypothetical as to how that works. A man goes into a convenience store with a pistol and points it at the cashier

and says, "Give me your money."

She is frightened, and she turns the money over to him. It is early in the morning. This is the only witness to the robbery, so he shoots her twice and she dies. He shoots her once in the chest and once in the head.

Unbeknownst to him, she steps on some type of alarm and alerts the police and he is arrested as he exits the store. He is convicted and indicted for capital murder, murder during the course of robbery. That is capital murder, one of the crimes we talked about earlier.

After the jury found that man guilty, they would have to answer the first question, and the question asks you to make a determination about the conduct of the man on trial that has been found guilty of capital murder.

Was the conduct on his part that caused the death of the deceased, was it deliberate conduct, and was it done with the reasonable expectation that the deceased would die? In other words, when you take a loaded pistol into a convenience store to rob someone and you point it at a person and you fire bullets from that weapon into that person's body, into their chest

and head, is that a deliberate act? Is that
deliberate conduct, and is it reasonable to
expect someone would die when you shoot him in the
head with a loaded gun or shoot him in the chest
area with a loaded gun?

You see where that is a rather straightforward question that the juror is given, based on the evidence they have heard to find the man guilty, the evidence they have heard to find him guilty of capital murder?

Do you follow me on that first question?

- A. Yes, I follow it.
- Q. You will have to use your own definition for the word "deliberately." You have to use your own definition.

Do you feel those are the types of questions you would be able to answer based on the evidence you would hear?

- A. I know I could answer that one.
- And, of course, if you answer the first question yes, we pass to the second question and try to make a determination about the type of person on trial and try to make that determination to a probability.

The question doesn't ask you to make a

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

finding of certainty that the man would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society, because I think you realize that the only person in the entire world who could state what a person would do in the future is God Almighty himself, and you, as a juror, are not to put yourself in that position. You are to put yourself in the position of being a human being, and base your verdict on the evidence which will be heard.

Do you follow me on what that question would ask you to do?

- Yes.
- We talked about the first question.
  - Do you feel the second question is the type of question you could answer depending upon the evidence you would hear?
- Yes.
- Let me ask you this: Can you tell me what your definition for the word "deliberately" is? do you think deliberately means to you, in your own words?
- He meant to do it.
- Okay. That is kind of what it means to me: Q. purpose, he meant it.

A. Uh-huh.

- Do you feel like if the evidence convinced you in your mind that a person had intentionally taken another human being's life under the facts and circumstances we have mentioned, that would amount to capital murder, whether it be robbery or rape or kidnapping or murder of a police officer or fireman? If you feel a person has intentionally committed that crime and you heard from the evidence he was guilty of that, what do you think your answer to the first question would be?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What do you think that type of evidence tells you about the type of person who had done that, someone who would intentionally take another human being's life in the course of committing one of those crimes or setting a fire just to have the firemen put it out and then shoot one of them down because that is his particular definition of good, nice fun?

Do you think that tells you something about an individual as to what type of person he is?

A. Uh-huh.

Do you have or can you tell me what your own personal definition is for the word "probability"?

If you can, put it into your own words.

If not, I will give you some help.

- A. I really haven't thought much about it.
- Q More likely than not, chances are?
- A. Yes. That pretty well defines it.
- Q. Do you have any questions of me now about Questions

  1 and 2, before we get off of those? Is there

  anything that I can clear up for you at this

  time?
- A. No. They seem to be pretty well covered.
- Q. Okay. The judge will give you one admonition in writing, just something he will tell the jurors about in writing. He will tell you you are not to consider how long the Defendant would have to serve on thelife sentence. That is just not a discussion that is to take place among the jurors. It will not take place. The jury will not discuss how long the person will serve a life sentence. That is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Board of Pardons and Paroles. They will decide that. Jurors can't even discuss that.
- A. Uh-huh.

Q It seems like there was something I wanted to talk to you about, and I have lost my train of thought.

I expect the evidence in the trial will show the Defendant is not legally here in our country, that he is an illegal alien. I think it is at least partially apparent to you by the fact there is an interpreter telling him about these proceedings in English. Things that I say are being interpreted from English to Spanish for him.

Do you feel that would cause you difficulties as to being fair and impartial, the fact that man is illegally in our country and has taken the life of a police officer, and had he not been here like he should have been, the man would still be alive? Do you feel that would cause difficulties in being impartial during the course of the trial, and if it does, fine, and if not, that is fine, too.

- A. No. I don't believe that would keep me from being fair.
- Q. Okay. Let me tell you, cover a few other things with you.

Let me talk about this first.

Het me tark about this first

I think the judge mentioned it. I don't think I did. I meant to.

The range of punishment for murder is five to ninety-nine years or life. It is a different range of punishment from capital murder. It is a different punishment range for someone to intentionally or knowingly take another life. He can only receive a minimum of five years to a maximum of ninety-nine years or life, and in addition, he can ask the jury to consider giving him probation even though he has been found guilty of killing another human being.

Are you familiar with that term,

"probation"? Have you ever heard that in

connection with what goes on down here at the

courthouse?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Let me explain a little bit technically about how probation works.

A man can only receive probation for having committed a felony offense if, first of all, the jury unanimously agrees he should receive only ten years or less in the penitentiary.

You see, if the jury hears the facts

in the case and decides the man ought to be sent to the penitentiary for a very long time, that is where he will go. He doesn't get probation.

Only where the jury unanimously agrees the man should not go to the penitentiary for more than ten years, then the jury can discuss and consider among themselves whether or not they are going to recommend probation to the judge, and if the jury does recommend probation, the judge has to follow that recommendation. He will give the man probation. Okay?

Do you see how probation works?

A. Uh-huh.

Probation is release by the Court. The person doesn't have to go to the penitentiary and he is placed on the terms and conditions of probation.

The only reason I wanted to explain that to you is to ask you: If you were a juror on a murder case, had found someone guilty of murder, which is to intentionally and knowingly end another human being's life, can you think of a fact or circumstance where you could consider probation for someone committing that type of crime if you felt it was proper, or do you feel

like probation should never be a possible punishment for someone taking another human being's life?

- A. No. I don't believe probation would be fitting.
- Q Well, you are entitled to your feelings and I am not going to try to change your mind.

I am really not going to try to change your mind, but I want to be sure I haven't asked you that question unfairly. I want to give you examples of specific types of homicides and see if you feel those would be proper cases for probation, or if there are proper cases for probation in taking another person's life.

Imagine a battered wife type of case where a husband comes home every Saturday night and his idea of a good time is to beat her up in front of the kids and blacken her eyes, and she has been working hard and trying to keep her family together and has been working hard and getting the children off the school like a good housewife does and trying to get him straightened out with his drinking problem, and he refuses all help and this goes on for a long period of time.

She takes the gun out from the bed

J

table and shoots him one night and he dies. She has intentionally and knowingly taken his life, gets fed up and kills him, takes his life.

Let me give you another example of what might be in your mind the sympathetic type of homicide case where --

THE COURT: Mr. Moen, hold up just a minute.

## (Brief interruption.)

(By Mr. Moen) Let's just, by way of explaining to you, the cases that fall within the definition of murder -- of course, you are entitled to feel the way you do about probation for someone who has taken another person's life and many people come and tell us what you have stated, that where someone has taken another human being's life, no matter what type of case it is, mercy killing, battered wife, anything else, they don't feel any person should receive probation for having ended another person's life. That is fine. There is nothing wrong with feeling that way.

The only thing I need to clear up is exactly how you do feel.

Can you think of any circumstances in your mind where probation could be considered by

you for someone who has intentionally taken another's life, or do you feel like someone who has committed that type of crime should at least have to spend some time in the penitentiary to answer for having taken another life?

- A. I believe that he should --
- Q You are entitled to that belief.
- A. -- at least spend time.

I am not arguing with you. Many people feel that way, and you are entitled to feel that way, and I am not going to try to change your mind and give you an example of a mercy killing, and say what would you do in this mercy killing when a couple was fifty or sixty years old, and we could go on and on and on, and you are entitled to the way you feel, and I don't want you to worry about the way you feel.

Let me pass on to something else.

The Defendant in this trial is presumed to be innocent. That is a legal presumption. If jurors can do it, they are to keep an open mind and not presume where there is smoke, there is fire.

Of course, he wasn't snatched up off the street because he was walking down the street at the wrong time and wrong place. The Grand

Jury must have heard some evidence, and here he is in the courthouse answering a capital murder indictment. He is represented by two lawyers. Those are thoughts the jury is to put out of their minds if they can, and presume the Defendant be innocent and base their verdict on the evidence they may hear, if they can do that.

Of course, that is kind of like saying,
"Look at that pink elephant walking down the
sidewalk," and we go to the window, and sure
enough, there is a pink elephant, and then the
judge is saying, "Forget about the pink elephant.
Disregard it." It is kind of hard to get it out
of your mind. You saw it.

Presumption of innocence is kind of like that. In a way, it goes contrary to your common sense, after the Defendant finds himself in the courtroom.

The only thing I want to ask you is:

Do you feel you could abide by that presumption
of innocence, or based on the circumstances,
there must be some evidence he did something or
some testimony of someone somewhere, or otherwise
he wouldn't find himself here in one of these
courtrooms?

case, if he doesn't want to. I don't know if they told you that, or if you had that type of legal advice back when you were accused by Ohio police of a D.W.I., but he can, if he chooses, remain silent at his trial.

Do you feel you could abide by that admonition and base your decision on what you have heard rather than on what you did not hear from the Defendant, or do you feel like you would want to hear his side of it, hear what he had to say?

- I could abide by it, but wouldn't it -- you know, it would be a little fairer if he, you know, gave his side of the story.
  - How do you think you would feel if you didn't hear from the Defendant when it came to answer both of these questions yes or if you felt from the evidence your answers to both these questions should be yes, but you hadn't heard from the Defendant? How do you think you would feel or might feel if you found yourself in that position?

Do you feel like you might hold it against him if he didn't get on the stand and tell you what his version of the facts were, or

- A. I wouldn't hold it against him, but I would, you know, I would expect him to at least try to defend himself.
- Q What if he didn't?
- A. Well, I would just -- I would have to go by what was said and all that.
- Q Okay.

- A. I couldn't -- I say I couldn't --
- O you think a Defendant ought to, at least when he is accused of such a serious crime as capital murder, much less some lesser type of crime, do you think he should be required almost to put forth some type of evidence in his behalf, call some witnesses on, or get on the stand himself?
- A. I don't think he ought to be required. I think it would be to his benefit.
- Do you think it would be a good idea if he tried to do something like that?
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. If he doesn't you will have to decide the case based on what you heard from the witness stand.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Mr. Foreman, I appreciate your letting me visit with you.

Because of your feeling concerning probation, I am going to ask the judge if you can be excused, so that is what I am getting ready to talk to him about.

MR. MOEN: Judge, pursuant to my conversation to Mr. Foreman concerning probation and his feelings with regard to probation concerning someone committing the offense of murder, we would respectfully ask that he be excused.

THE COURT: Mr. Elizondo or Mr. Hernandez?

## EXAMINATION

## QUESTIONS BY MR. HERNANDEZ:

Mr. Foreman, let me see if I can clear this up a little bit.

In a capital murder case, along with it, comes lesser included offenses.

Say, for example, you don't find someone guilty of capital murder but find him guilty of murder, he or she, find him guilty of murder, whoever it might be, the Defendant.

The punishment for murder is five to

A. Yes.

Now, in a situation where the specific Defendant, say, in a hypothetical, has not been convicted of any crime or had any prior record before, then the jury can consider what they call probation.

Okay?

MR. MOEN: The onliest slight objection

I would have, Judge, is that a person can be

convicted of a crime and ask the jury for

probation, and the only thing they would have

to prove is they haven't been convicted of a

felony in this state or any other state of the

United States. That is a slight misstatement,

to which I object.

THE COURT: Yes.

Q. (By Mr. Hernandez) Now, let me give some examples of some hypotheticals where, in certain cases, there is a probability -- where probation might come into play.

Say in the hypothetical of an elderly couple who have been married for thirty-five years

- A. Yes.
- Q. He's got an illness, terminal illness. He is not expected to live, and the only way he is living

now in the hospital is through life-saving machinery.

The wife is there. He is there. They talk about how their financial assets that they have gathered throughout the thirty-five years of marriage is draining, and that he knows that slowly but surely he is going to die. The doctors have told him it is terminal. It is just a matter of time.

They have talked about perhaps it would be best if she could go ahead and pull the life-saving plug and let him die and perhaps he is in pain, and, of course, initially she refuses, but after many discussions, she finally decides or both decide on their part that it is best that way, and perhaps she could have a little left over in the savings that might be left. She pulls it and he dies.

A member or members of his family find out about it and there is a piece of property, say in the lake area in Conroe that this developer has been seeking to buy from them for many years and they have refused. He has refused. All of a sudden, she wants to erase all the memories, so she sells all this property.

Somehow she gets indicted by the Grand
Jury for capital murder, murder in that she pulled
the plug for money, in that she received money
from the property. Okay?

A. Uh-huh.

The jury hears the case and decides that it is not an act of murder for money, but it is an act of murder for love, so they find her not guilty of capital murder, but they find her guilty of murder, because actually that is what it was.

I mean, she intentionally took the life of another human being.

Do you understand now what I am trying to get at?

- A. Yes. I understand that.
- Do you see where in that hypothetical you could consider, or the jury --

MR. MOEN: Excuse me. I would ask
that he not limit the question as to what he
could do to that specific hypothetical. I think
the juror needs to be qualified on whether he could
make a general application of probation, rather
than on one specific case.

Q. (By Mr. Hernandez) Let me explain to you two more hypotheticals: the hypothetical of Mr. Moen about

Q.

the battered wife where she couldn't take it, had done everything she could, found him jobs, taken him to A.A., and he is still an alcoholic, where she couldn't take it no more and then one Saturday night, he comes in and continues to do the same thing and she decides that enough is enough, and through the heat of the argument, she pulls the trigger.

Or, to go further on --

MR. MOEN: I object to the example used because if the trigger was pulled in the heat of the argument, it may very well not be a murder case, but a lesser offense of murder if she intentionally and knowingly shot him to death. I think that should be explained. I object to that as misleading.

THE COURT: Sustained.

(By Mr. Hernandez) What I am trying to get at

-- I won't argue with you. From the initial start,
what the judge talked to you about was that we
were here to ask you personal questions, not to
pry into your personal life, but to see what your
feelings are, and I am not here to argue, so don't
think -- I am not here to embarrass or humiliate
you in any way. There are no right or wrong

answers. It is how Mr. Foreman feels.

What I am trying to get at is: Can
you think -- or think of certain situations where
a consideration of probation could come into play
in a murder case?

MR. MOEN: I object to the form of the question as to whether it could come into play. I think the proper question is whether or not he could consider probation for someone who had been found guilty of the offense of murder, not whether it could come into play or not.

THE COURT: Sustained as to the form.

- Q (By Mr. Hernandez) In other words, there are no instances whatsoever in which you could consider probation?
- A. Well, as far as I am concerned, there would only be one, and that was the way you explained it a while ago, the act of love. I can sympathize with that kind of situation.

But then again, the way I believe, I think they should be given every chance to live without pulling the plug.

Let me give one more hypothetical and see how you feel about this situation. When a husband comes home and sees his children dead and his

wife has been sexually abused, and in her dying breath, she says, "Joe Blow down the street did it." He grabs his gun, goes down there and knocks on the door, and Joe Blow answers with a smile and the husband says, "Did you do it," and he says, "Yes. So what?" And, Joe Blow blows him away.

Can you see in that certain situation

- A. Can I see me in that certain situation?
- No. Can you see probation being considered in that type of situation?

MR. MOEN: Excuse me. Once again, I object to him giving examples of a certain type of case, but the law is queer -- clear -- it is also very queer at times -- but the question is to not limit it like he is probably doing to stake the juror out, but only to generally apply the law to someone found guilty of murder.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q. (By Mr. Hernandez) You could unequivocally say you could not consider probation in any murder case? Couldn't you --
- A. You put it that way. I can't -- I can't say I wouldn't consider probation.

You would consider the facts of the case with its merits?

- But it is more than likely I wouldn't consider probation. It would have to be a real -- I don't know how to say it. It would have to be a certain -- very specific situation.
- But you could consider probation in a proper case in your own mind?
- Yes. Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I think he is qualified, Judge.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

MR. MOEN: May I talk to Mr. Foreman for just a second on that point, based on his responses?

MR. HERNANDEZ: I don't know if he has any time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I will let you have him back when they are finished.

MR. MOEN: I can do it now and pass him back rather than let them go on twenty or thirty minutes.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

24

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:

On the type of cases Mr. Hernandez was talking about, what he didn't tell you is this: Is that before you could even find the woman guilty on the case where she had killed her husband at the hospital, you would have to believe she intentionally and knowingly did that. If she was acting out of a feeling of remorse where her thought processes weren't clear, et cetera, she might not be accused of murder. She would have to intentionally and knowingly act, not out of a sense of remorse or sorrow where she was acting as a result of impulse from some sudden passion, that is not murder.

She would have to intentionally and knowingly do it with a clear mind.

Does that even strike you as being the type of case where you wouldn't be able to even find her guilty?

MR. ELIZONDO: I object to the prosecutor staking this juror out as to a certain set of facts.

THE COURT: I would have to agree with

you.

(By Mr. Moen) The examples he was giving you were not examples of murder. That is what I wanted to point out.

The situation where he talked about the old woman, it is not what you would do, but murder is to intentionally and knowingly take another's life, not to act out of a second of passion or remorse such as the examples Mr. Hernandez used about the woman who finds herself with a husband in the hospital, or the man who comes home and finds himself with the wife and daughter.

A person is only guilty of murder if they intentionally and knowingly take another's life without justification. That is our law.

If there was justification for it, such as self-defense --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Objection, Your Honor. That is not murder, Your Honor?

MR. MOEN: Self-defense is not murder.

- Q. (By Mr. Moen) Do you follow me on that?
- A. I understand that.
- On the examples he is giving you, basically, no one is trying to mislead you, but they can

•

If someone acts out of passion, with adequate cause, such as the man who goes down to the house immediately, grabs a pistol, there is no one on the face of the earth -- that is sudden passion with an adequate cause, to go down that way, and, you see, that is not murder. Murder is only where you intentionally and knowingly take another's life without justification.

Those are the types of cases I was basically asking you about. If you were a juror on a case where you had found someone guilty of intentionally and knowingly taking another's life and you believed in your mind there was no justification for it, in that type of case, would you ever be able to consider probation, or do you feel like a person who takes another person's life and there is no justification for it should spend at least some time in the penitentiary and probation should not be a form of punishment for that type of offense?

- A. Well, if there is no justification, then -- you know, you've got me trying to answer two questions here.
- Okay.

Q Okay. That is what I am getting at. Our law is exactly that.

For a person to be guilty of murder, he has to intentionally and knowingly take another person's life under facts and circumstances that do not justify taking a life. It is for a person to participate in a homicide without justification. For a person to act in self-defense, he is not guilty of murder.

A. We go back to --

Q. For a person to take another person's life from sudden passion arising from adequate cause, that is not murder. That is voluntary manslaughter. That is another crime altogehter, a form of homicide, but it is not murder for a man to come home and find his children killed, and his wife says, "Joe Blow down the street did it," and he runs down and shoots the man in the face. That is voluntary manslaughter, not murder.

Murder is where a person intentionally or knowingly ends another human's life with facts and circumstances that don't justify the taking of

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Try, if you can, to separate those voluntary manslaughter cases from the offense of murder, if you can.

- I can do that.
- And search yourself, your mind and heart, and can you think of any circumstances in your mind, any fact situations or circumstances in your mind where you would ever be able to consider probation for someone who had committed the offense of murder intentionally and knowingly, taking another's life without justification, in that type of case, murder case?
- Like I said, if there is no justification, I couldn't see it.
- Okay. I take it you could, from your early responses, where it was a case of voluntary manslaughter, where there was some type of justification such as the wife and husband at the hospital and she is acting out of feeling of remorse or overwhelmed by the situation the husband finds himself in, et cetera or the man who comes home and finds his wife and daughter, et cetera and grabs the pistol and rushes to the man's house and the man laughs in his face, I

take it in those types of cases where sudden passion was taken into consideration by the jury, it had arisen in a moment in those types of voluntary manslaughter cases, you could consider probation in those types of cases?

- A. Yes, in something like that. I would have to say yes under very specific situations like that.
- And I wanted to be absolutely clear on this point

  -- but as far as the crime of murder is concerned
  where someone intentionally or knowingly acts
  and it is not as a result of passion or not as a
  result of some adequate cause or self-defense,
  in other words, there is no justification as our
  law requires, where someone intentionally or
  knowingly takes a person's life under those
  circumstances, are you telling me you can't at
  least at this time think of circumstances where
  you could consider giving the person probation?
- A. Not at this time, not without justification I couldn't.
- Q. You would always require, rightfully so, always require justification for the taking of another's life before you could consider probation?
- A. At least. At least.

Let me try to get a little more specific. What type of thing would you like to hear?

- A. I don't know. Like I say, some man sitting there beating -- I wouldn't say that either -- some man sitting there beating me to death and all I've got is a club. To me, that is justification.
- Q You act to protect yourself?
- A. Yes. I can't put myself in that situation. I can't even imagine myself in that situation.
- In that type of case, the law would say, "Where Mr. Foreman were being attacked by someone, Mr. Foreman was trying to act to save his own life, either from the act or force against him or from the man's fear of force or danger, Mr. Foreman would have the right to respond and take a person's life," and that is not murder. That is self-defense. That is what I am getting at.

The only type of situations we are talking about is where a person intentionally and knowingly takes another human's life and there are no facts or situations that excuse it as being self-defense. In other words, there is no

justification of someone guilty of murder, and that is how our law defines murder.

Could you ever consider probation for someone who had done something like that?

- A. No, not -- like I said, not without justification.
- Q. Now, let me explain to you something about the case earlier that Mr. Hernandez was talking about.

Imagine both of those fact situations, but let's put them in the framework of murder rather than voluntary manslaughter.

Take the situation where a man comes home and finds his wife dying and she tells him,

"Joe Blow did it," and he thinks -- he doesn't rush with passion, but let's say he sits around and simmers down. He is mad like anyone would be and upset like anyone would be, but he calms down, and acting with a cool manner, he thinks, "My wife has died. My daughter is dead. What evidence is there to convict Joe Blow? Of course, my wife in her dying breath told me, but what, if we get down to the courthouse and they don't believe me and he gets off scot-free for killing my wife and daughter," and he takes the law in his own hands and he goes to the door and when Joe Blow gets to the door, he intentionally or knowingly fires

the gun and kills Joe Blow.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Doesn't that still put him back into the crime of passion?
  - The difference I have drawn for you between the example Mr. Hernandez gave and I gave is he has calmed down now. He is no longer acting out of passion as a result of what happened to his wife or daughter, or let's say it is during the course of the trial even and he doesn't like the way the trial is going, or let's say he reports it to the police and a policeman goes by and he starts thinking about what might happen at the courthouse, he starts thinking about what might happen at the trial, and he says, "It will be my word against Joe Blow's. What might happen then? What if this man gets off scot-free?" Enough time has passed, and he is no longer acting under passion. has passed, and he has cooled off and thought about it and he waits and goes to Joe Blow's house, and when Joe Blow gets home, when he gets back from work, he walks up and blows his brains out or shoots and kills him. He has intentionally and knowingly taken Joe Blow's life.

The law doesn't say you can kill someone because they kill a member of your family.

Certainly if you walked in and saw Joe Blow in the act, you would have the right, certainly if it was done to protect any member of your family, but I am talking about time's past and Joe Blow's cooled off -- or rather, the man's cooled off. Certainly he has had a sorrow from his wife's death, but he has made a rational decision, that rather than to risk a trial, he is going to take matters in his own hands and kill Joe Blow. That is to take a person's life into his own hands without justification.

- A. You put it that way and it goes back to justification, without justification.
- Q. That is right.
- A. That is no excuse.
- Q. That is exactly right. In the eyes of the law, there is no excuse for that.
- A. I am looking at it two ways, and it is hard to answer.
- Q. You see, one way would be voluntary manslaughter and not murder.

The way I have described it to you is actually an act of murder. You see, they are both homicides. Don't get me wrong. See, we have different forms of homicides in our state.

20

21

22

23

24

∴5

For a man to take a person's life under a sudden passion arising from adequate cause, that is voluntary manslaughter, not murder, and I would suggest, not to insult your intelligence, but I think you realize what would happen if you went home today and found Ms. Foreman and your threeyear-old daughter dead with your wife in her dying breath saying your daughter's been killed and sexually molested, and in her dying breath, your wife says, "Brown two houses down the street did it. Darling, I love you," and she dies, and you pick up a pistol and go down and shoot him in the face, what do you think? Don't you think a person would be acting from sudden passion arising from a cause?

- A. I think I would do it.
- Q. Hey, I would be down there with you. I would run to the house, wouldn't walk.

What I am talking about is a situation where time passes and he reports it to the police. He cools down and three, four days, or a week goes by and he decides rather than risk that jury trial or rather than come down to the situation where it is my word against his and my dying wife's word against his, I am not going

to run the risk that he will be found not guilty by a jury down there if someone doesn't believe me. I will take matters in my own hands. I'll wait for him to get home from work, and when he arrives, I will take matters in my own hands and kill him.

- A. I can't see a man coming home and seeing his wife, you know, being -- knowing who done it -- I can't see him not reporting it to the police.
- Q. He might not ever do it as a matter of fact, but

  I am speaking in hypothetical terms.
- A. I understand that.
- Q. I am trying to separate it from that voluntary manslaughter situation where he comes home --
- A. I can understand that, but it is still hard for me to see the situation.
- Q. Sure, it is because we have given you the most hypothetical example we can think of.

Do you think that man ought to be found guilty or not guilty for having done that? In your mind, does that even strike you as being a murder case?

- A. Well, I am sure it is -- you know, I would have to see it as a criminal offense, but --
- Q. Not necessarily you wouldn't have to. I am not

trying to talk you into it.

- A. I am not saying you are.
- Q. I am trying to see how that grabs you.
- A. After, you know, after seeing something like that, it wouldn't even phase me as far as that goes, you know. I mean, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't have no remorse over it. The man, if I was told a man killed my wife and all that.
- Q If you were a juror on a case like that. Take it out of the personal situation.

If you were a juror. Let's not ask what you would do in that case. What I am trying to do is give you specific examples of cases, specific examples of murder cases, to get you to thinking as to whether or not -- that is what I am doing, trying to get you to think as to whether or not in your mind you could ever consider the question of probation, in fact, consider giving someone probation who had, in fact, intentionally or knowingly taken another human being's life without justification.

Can you think of any facts or do you feel like where a person has ended another human being's life intentionally and knowingly and there is no justification for it, that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

person should go to the penitentiary and probation should not be a question?

- I still can't see it without justification. A.
- Okay. Well, I am not trying to confuse you, and Q. . I hope I have not. You are entitled to the way you feel.
- A. Well --
- That is why we take so much time to give you Q. different examples, to talk to you about it. no one is trying to trick you. We try to give you the most farfetched hypotheticals we can think of. You are entitled to the way you feel. We are not trying to change your mind.

Is there any set of facts where you would feel different, or is that the way you would feel period if a man had taken or a woman had taken another's life intentionally without justification? Is that the way you would feel?

- Not without justification.
- Okay. Thank you, Mr. Foreman.

Well, since you are clear in your mind, I am going to respectfully ask the judge again to excuse you because of your feelings on probation, and that is nothing to be ashamed of. You are entitled to the way you feel. That is

why we spent so much time, and I am sure Mr.

Hernandez and Mr. Elizondo are going to ask you

questions, maybe give you the mercy killing again,

but listen to what they say and answer as best

you can.

I will pass the juror.

## EXAMINATION

## QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:

- Q. Mr. Foreman, how are you doing?
- A. Pretty good.
- Q. I am sure you are pretty well confused now.
- A. Working on it.
  - What Mr. Moen is asking is can you consider, not necessarily give, but consider probation in the proper case in your own mind, bearing in mind all these examples?

Now, if you have justification, you don't have a murder case. Self-defense would justify a murder case.

MR. MOEN: I object to "self-defense justifying a murder case." If it occurs in self-defense, it is not a murder case.

THE COURT: If the juror believes it is

self-defense.

Q (By Mr. Elizondo) That is what I am saying: If the juror believed the man or Defendant acted in self-defense, the jurors would have to follow their oath and say not guilty.

Now, these examples we have been giving you, we are just giving these examples so we can stimulate your thought processes and see if you can consider, not necessarily give, but just consider probation in the proper case in your own mind.

There is an example about the elderly couple where the wife pulls the plug and kills her husband of thirty-five years.

Under our law, if she pulls that plug, she is guilty or if a juror believed that she did it intentionally and knowingly, pulled that plug knowingly and intentionally, and that by pulling that plug she had caused the death of her beloved husband, under our law, that is murder, intentionally and knowingly causing the death of somebody.

Now, in that hypothetical situation,
you can see where a juror might consider probation?

A. Uh-huh.

Q.

MR. MOEN: Excuse me, but I object to staking him out or attempting to stake him out or saying what a juror might do in a hypothetical.

He can ask the juror as to whether or not -- test his general qualifications, but not stake him out as to a specific set of facts.

THE COURT: As to that objection, I will overrule it.

(By Mr. Elizondo) Or in the example Mr. Moen gave you where this murderer goes in there and sexually molests his two daughters and kills them and beats up his wife and she lives and in her dying breath to her husband while he is seeing her she says, "Joe Blow down the street did it," and he calls the police and says, "Joe Blow did it. Go down and arrest him," and they arrest him and he starts thinking about it and he says, "This time he might not be found guilty. I am going to take the law in my hands. I am going to make sure this man gets what he deserves, and I am going to go and kill him," and he does, and kills him.

In that hypothetical situation, you can see where a juror might consider probation in that

MR. MOEN: Same objection. He is asking a juror to make -- asking him what he would do in a specific set of facts, or what a juror might do.

THE COURT: I did not understand him to ask the question in the way you object to it.

I overrule it.

(By Mr. Elizondo) There are many, many kinds of fact situations, and that is why murder has got a wide range of punishment of five to ninety-nine years or life.

The legislature says there are many ways a murder can be committed and a jury can consider -- not give it, but consider probation if it is a proper case in their own mind.

Now, I hope that I have given you some examples that might stimulate your thought process, and I am going to ask you this: Bearing all that in mind, can you, in the proper case in your mind, consider, just consider probation in a murder case?

- A. In a situation like y'all are giving me, I can.
- O. So you can consider probation? I am not saying give, but just consider it, even for a minute and

Q (By Mr. Elizondo) This is a capital murder case, and I am sure you know, as in all cases in Texas, it is divided into two parts. First of all is the guilt-or-innocence phase and then the punishment phase. They are two separate and distinct parts of a criminal trial.

In the first part, the jury's sole function is to determine if the man is guilty of the offense charged.

I can guarantee you one thing: As actively as they are seeking the death penalty, we will be actively seeking a not guilty in the guilt-or-innocence stage. It will be your job, as one of the prospective jurors, to determine if the State has met its burden of proof, its burden of proving its case to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

They have to prove to you, first of all, that on a particular day in Harris County, Texas, this Defendant shot and killed a police officer in the lawful discharge of an official duty knowing at the time he was a police officer. They must prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

The term reasonable doubt will not be

defined for you. The judge will not give you a definition. I can't give you one. He can't give you one, because there is no legal definition of the term reasonable doubt.

About all I can do is tell you that across the street in the civil courthouse at 301 Fannin where they try lawsuits for millions of dollars over money, over property damages, the burden of proof over there is proof by a preponderance of the evidence, the greater weight of the credible evidence.

Over here in the criminal courthouse, the legislature said before you can find anyone guilty of capital murder or any kind of crime, the State has to have a higher burden of proof than on the civil side, and that will be proof beyond a reasonable doubt, and rightfully so; that before you can find anyone guilty of this type of offense and before you can kill him, you'd better make sure we have the right man.

Do you agree with that or disagree with that?

A. I agree with that.

Q. Do you think that the burden of proof should be heavier in a civil case where they try lawsuits

- A I really couldn't tell you, because I don't know that much about civil law.
  - In a capital murder case, the way the State normally goes and proceeds on a criminal case in Texas is, first of all, they will read the indictment to the jury. The Defendant will plead not guilty. The witnesses will then be asked to come forward and come by here and take the same stand where you are sitting right now, and they will give their version of the facts.

After the State is through presenting witnesses, they will then rest their case, which means, "That is all we have and we rest our case, Your Honor."

The Defendant can, if he chooses, he can also rest his case right behind the State.

He doesn't have to, but he can.

I suggest in this case, the Defendant probably will testify and he will probably call witnesses and testify, and at that time, at that point in time, I can almost guarantee you there will be two diametrically different stories, and it will be your job as a juror to resolve the conflict of testimony, and I am sure you will

do that.

A. I am sure I can, if I can get -- or pass before y'all. I am sure I can.

Q We are not laughing at you. We are tired.

Anyway, in a capital murder case, if the Defendant is found guilty -- and I am talking of this in an abundance of caution, we go to the punishment phase where you can answer those two questions either yes or no. At that point in time, then there will only be one of two possible punishments, life or death, and, of course, life or death is determined by how you answer those two questions up there.

If you believe beyond a reasonable doubt that 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 or another would result, if you believe that beyond a reasonable doubt, then your answer should be yes. If you don't believe it beyond a reasonable doubt, then your answer should be no.

Do you agree with that?

- A. Yes.
- Q The second question is if you believe beyond a

U

reasonable doubt whether there is a probability
that the Defendant would commit criminal acts of
violence that would constitute a continuing threat
to society. Then if you believe that beyond a
reasonable doubt, that the answer to that should
be yes, then it will be your duty to say yes.

If you don't believe that beyond a reasonable doubt, then you've got to follow your oath and say no.

You can do that, correct?

- A. Yes.
- Question No. 2, and it is more or less asking you to foretell or forecast the future.

Probability to some people means chances are, more likely than not.

Do you agree with that definition?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Do you think that a person can change his mode of behavior, mode of operations, mode of conduct? Anything is possible, I guess.
- A. I am sure it could be changed, yes, but is it -you know, without that -- you know, like I said,
  without the reasonable doubt, I don't see where
  I would have any problem with the question.

Q Let me backtrack a little bit.

During the guilt-or-innocence stage, if the Defendant testifies, he can be impeached or discredited with the proof of any felony convictions within the last ten years, and you can use that to judge his credibility. I am sure you could. The law says you can.

Let me ask you a few questions, general questions about your job.

- . What do you do exactly for Merichem Chemical Company, I guess?
- A. I am an operator. I make chemicals and distill them and all that.
- Q. How long have you been doing that?
- A. Going on four years.
- Q. And before that, you worked for O & M Manufacturing Company?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And what did they do?
- A. It's a heat transfer plant. We made radiators and stuff like that for offshore rigs and diesels.
- Q. Do you have any brothers and sisters?
- A. I've got four; three brothers and one sister.
- Q. And what do your brothers do for a living?
- A. One of them is a painter. One of them is a cook.

21

22

25

We don't go into the other one, but my sister is a housewife.

Q Hold on for a second. Okay?

Let me ask you one question: If you don't want to talk about it -- I don't want to pry, but is he a police officer?

- A. No. No, he just has a hard time holding a job.

  Let's put it that way.
- Q. Okay. I just have a couple of more questions, and I want to ask you: Would you demand or want the State to prove its case to you beyond a reasonable doubt --
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- before you could find this man guilty?
- A. They would have to prove it to me beyond a reasonable doubt, definitely.
- You wouldn't expect us to put on evidence, because we don't have to. They have to put on the evidence. The burden is on them. They brought the charges, and they've got to prove them.
- A. Uh-huh.
- $23\parallel$  Q. That is what the law says.
- A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. That is all I have, Mr. Foreman.

1	Thank you for talking to us. I look
2	forward to seeing you on that jury panel.
3	MR. BAX: May we have a moment, Your
4	Honor?
5	(Discussion between attorneys.)
6	MR. MOEN: We will excuse Mr. Foreman.
7	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Foreman,
8	you will be excused. You will not be required
9	to serve on the jury.
10	Thank you very much. We appreciate
11	your time.
12	You can have a cigarette anyway.
13	MR. ELIZONDO: Thank you, Mr. Foreman.
14	
15	
16	
17	JAMES ANDREW CHOPP,
18	was called as a prospective juror and responded to
19	questions propounded as follows:
20	
21	EXAMINATION
22	
23	QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:
24	THE COURT: All right. You may
25	proceed.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BAX: May I proceed, Your Honor?

- This is Mr. -- is it Chopp? (By Mr. Bax)
- Chopp.
- I am sorry you had to wait around as long as you did. It is going to be longer, I guess.

. As you can tell, this is a long, drawnout deal that we go through. I want to put you at ease first and tell you there are no right or wrong answers to anything we are going to talk about today.

\*We do this individually so we can get to know you a little better and so you will feel more comfortable in telling us things.

Monday mornings, we usually pick a jury, and Monday afternoon, after everybody goes to lunch, we start taking testimony.

I will tell you we started picking this jury on August 30th, and it has taken us almost the entire month of September. We have interviewed ninety people now, and out of those ninety people, have now eleven jurors. We need one more.

You can see it takes a while, and the reason we do it individually and the reason it takes as long as it does is because of the nature of this case.

As the judge told you earlier this morning, should this Defendant be found guilty of capital murder, of killing a police officer, he will receive one of only two possible punishments. It will either be life imprisonment or it will be the death penalty.

In our community, no one in America is ever forced to sit on a jury where that jury service would do harm or violence to their beliefs. Okay?

We have had several different types of people that have come through that we have talked to, and like we said earlier, we are not going to try to change your opinion as to how it is. Okay?

You have an absolute right to feel however you feel, and neither Mr. Elizondo or the judge or myself will argue with you or try to change your opinion. That is not what we are here for.

We are here to see if Mr. Chopp can be a juror in this case, without doing violence to his beliefs. We don't want to put you in that position, and the only way you can become a juror is by your answers to the questions, and we don't put you on the jury by your answers; you put

yourself on the jury.

If you can do it, fine, and if you can't fine.

A lot of people say, "Gosh, I am a citizen and ought to be able to go along with what the laws are," but a lot of people say, "Wait a minute. You are talking about taking a person's life. That is not my game. I can't do that. I can see where someone else might be able to, but personally, because of my religious background, I couldn't do it, couldn't sit on that type of jury."

Okay. Let me give you a little background. Some people say, "I could do it. I could do it and return that verdict." Other people say, "No, that is God's decision who should die. I, as an individual, am equal to that person on trial. I personally could never do that."

Can you tell us how you feel? Can you tell us if you feel you could ever personally participate in a verdict that could result in the death of an individual?

A. I don't believe I could, because I don't believe one death should be the cause of another one, is

the way I feel, and it is just that I don't believe in taking a life for another life.

- Q. Is that something pretty much the way you have felt --
- A. That is just the way I feel about it. I don't feel I could take someone else's life myself, regardless of how angry I got, and if I did commit a murder or something of the sort, I wouldn't want, you know -- I would want them to be as lenient as possible, just punish me any other way but by death. That is the way I would look at it.
- Q. That is the way I would feel, too. That is the way a lot of people have felt who have come through here. They have told us in the same way you have.

The death penalty is irreversible. You give somebody the death penalty, and you can't reverse that down the line somewhere.

If a guy gets fifty years in the penitentiary, someday he could be let out. Okay?

- A. That wouldn't bring him back in any manner and wouldn't help too much as far as I could see.
- Q. And probably wouldn't stop anybody else from doing it?

Q. Is it fair to say you are opposed to the death penalty?

4

A. I don't agree with it. Not through this --

5

Q. That is fine, and you can see where it would be wrong to try and force someone to sit on a case

6

andring for the death of the second

7

asking for the death penalty if that person says

8

I couldn't do it.

9

A. Right.

10

Q. Can you think of any case, any fact situation

11

where you could be a party to the death penalty,

12

or would you be opposed to the death penalty in

13

all cases?

14

Where it's a little kid, you know, or something

15

like this.

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

If we are allowed to make an example, like the kid, his head was wedged in a commode over there in Kountze that time. I could kind of find malice within my heart and say yes, burn him or shoot him.

When you read about somebody, at that very moment, you can get very angry and say, "I can feel fine about taking that person's life," but how would you feel a month later or a year later when the tempers have cooled down? Could Mr. Chopp sit

on that jury?

After I found out all the facts about it, if I had looked into it, and then, you know, down within, just thought about it, and say, you know, well, I wonder if this could have been prevented or was it done through some kind of defense or something, you know -- but a kid, like I say, in that example I gave, a little kid couldn't help himself or do anything about it.

But in this case, he could help himself. There is no defense.

- Q. You think you would still prefer in that case, still go for a life sentence rather than the death penalty, wouldn't you?
- A. I believe so.
- Q. Let me go over the questions the judge will ask you. I have to ask you these questions. Okay?

What I think you are telling me is because of your beliefs, the way you feel, you could never be a juror in that type of case?

- A. I wouldn't like to.
- Q. And you could never return a verdict that would cause -- call for the death penalty, but would always return a verdict for a life sentence?
- A. Like I say, if I were to sit on a case and get

Q.

the details, but before I go home, don't have it in my mind for the death penalty, but if I sat on a case and found out all the facts about it, I could change my mind maybe about it.

- Q. See, I am not here -- I am not here trying to change your mind about it.
- A. I still don't believe in it.
- Q That is what I am trying to find out. A lot of people say, "I don't believe in it." Okay?
- A. Uh-huh.
  - "And I don't believe in it strong enough, and
    I don't care what the facts are, I am not going
    to try to be a party to taking someone's life.
    I can't do it. I am a strong person, but this
    is the way I believe. This is the way I was
    brought up, and I don't care if I hear the facts
    or not, I am not going to go for the death
    penalty. I can go for a life sentence. I can
    see a person needs to be punished and needs to
    be kept away from us as long as possible, but my
    religion tells us I don't have that right to take
    another person's life. You may do it in your
    courtrooms, but I can't do it."

I thought that was what you were telling me when you started off that Mr. Chopp

,

. ||

was of the opinion that, sure, maybe the death penalty was proper in some cases, but you personally could not return that verdict?

- A. No.
- Q. Is that basically what you were telling us?
- A. Right.
- Q Let me take you through the steps and see if you could serve on a jury.

I think what you are telling us, in any other case other than the death penalty, you could be a fine juror and make a decision on the evidence?

- A. After I listened to all the evidence, you know, of the case, I am pretty sure.
- Q. Let's say you heard some evidence in this case, and I can't talk to you about the facts of this case. Okay?

We are going to talk make-believe.

I want to make up some facts. Okay, and assume you heard the evidence, and after hearing all the evidence, you said to yourself, "The man is guilty. It is proven to me that he committed a capital murder." Okay? But, you know if you found him guilty of capital murder, if you returned that verdict, that the judge either is

going to sentence him to life or death. Okay?

Knowing that the judge is going to sentence him to either life or death, could you find a person guilty of capital murder? Could you sit in judgment of him, or would your feelings prevent you from participating in a verdict of guilty because you would know by that verdict he would receive either life or death?

A. Well, from the beginning, I would have to know if he had been tried for that penalty before I could really give a verdict.

Like I say, I would go for any other type of punishment, life imprisonment or whatever, but not the death penalty until I find out really what the whole situation is, you know, the details on it.

Let me tell you something right now. I am going to try to be as honest as I can. All right?

We are out here talking right now about make-believe and hypothetical cases, and what about this and what about that. Okay?

But I will tell you straightforward.

You see him sitting right there, and if the jury that is finally selected on this case finds him guilty of killing this police officer, Mr. Moen

and I will be actively seeking the death penalty.

It is not going to be make-believe, not going to be "what if." We will be before this jury, and if you are on it, I will be asking you to go against your beliefs on the death penalty and return a verdict that will call for the death penalty.

I don't want to put you in a position of being on the jury where later down the line, Mr. Chopp will say, "I know what the facts are and I believe the facts will prove to me he should receive the death penalty, but I could not do it."

You are the only one who could put yourself in that switch.

A. Like I say, if I get all the facts, but by just going on, I couldn't say, not knowing the facts that caused it and all that. I would have to say no to it:

If I am chosen to sit in on it, I would have to go along with whatever facts I gather in the case.

Can you ever imagine yourself voting for the death penalty in any case?

MR. ELIZONDO: I object. He has already answered that question, if he knows the

facts.

THE COURT: I am not satisfied in my own mind he has.

Ask him the question.

- Q. (By Mr. Bax) Can you imagine voting for the death penalty with eleven other jurors?
- A. I probably could where there was someone close to me, a member of the family or someone.
- Q. Of course, you couldn't be a juror, and the law wouldn't put you in that position.

Of course, anyone who would say, "The only time I could agree with the death penalty is if someone killed my child, my mother, my brother, or close family member." In that case, it wouldn't be fair for the person on trial to have a family member of the deceased on the jury. Okay?

- A. Okay.
- Q. Is that the only case you can think cf, where it was a personal case for you, to return the death verdict?
- A. What I feel, if I knew it wouldn't bring them back, I would like God to punish him. I would be that way.
- Q So you would go for the life sentence?

- That is right, or whatever happened there, if someone else takes his life while he is in prison or something, that would be fine with me, but as far as me saying take it, it is not anything to me.
- Q. You see these two questions here? These two questions? The first one is talking about the conduct of the Defendant on trial, and the second one is talking about committing criminal acts of violence in the future.

Those two questions, the answers to them, decide whether a man lives or dies. Okay?

If you find a person guilty of capital murder and you and eleven other jurors say yes to No. 1 and you say yes to No. 2, okay, you know what will happen. The judge automatically assesses the death penalty.

You know, the judge could be up there saying, "I don't think this man should die. I don't think he should," but he can't change what the jury will do with those two questions. If they answer yes, yes, he is going to die, and the reason he is going to die is because twelve people answered those questions yes.

A lot of people come before us and say,

"I can deal with that. If that is what the evidence called for, I can do it."

Other people say, "You are telling us I can take another's life, and I would automatically answer no which means a life sentence."

If the jury answers 1 or 2 no, it means a life sentence. Okay?

Would you automatically answer one of those no to make the death penalty, to make sure the man received the life sentence?

I think that is what you are basically telling us when you say you cannot take a life, leave that to God to decide?

- A. I would say no to No. 2. I probably would.
- Q. A lot of people say, "You could never prove No. 2 to me. You could never prove No. 2, no matter what the facts are. I would probably always answer No. 2 yes."
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. That way, he would receive a life sentence?
- A. That is what I said.
- Q. Can you ever imagine in any situation automatically answering those questions yes which would result in the death penalty, or would you answer one no,

4

11

12

13

Q.

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which would result in a life sentence?

THE JUROR: Okay.

I could answer one yes if I heard the facts, whether it were deliberately or --

THE COURT: Mr. Chopp, let me clear up one thing. Before you are asked to render a verdict on either guilt or innocence or punishment, you are going to hear all the facts. You are not going to be set down in the jury box and not hear anything and be asked to render a verdict. You are going to hear all the facts. Let's assume that right off the base. Okay?

(By Mr. Bax) This may be confusing you, and you haven't had a lot of time to consider all of this, but, you see, I think what you are telling me, deep inside and what your feelings are, is you are opposed to the death penalty, and that is fine. I am not going to sit here and say, "Mr. Chopp, don't you think there are good cases --"

That is fine. You have a right in our society to feel the way you want to under the law. That does not make you any less a citizen than anyone who's come before us, and probably has made you a lot better than the people who would withhold these feelings within themselves and not tell us how they feel. Sure.

I am trying to find out how you feel, and if your feelings are so strong -- and you appear to be a man, when he says he believes in something, he doesn't believe in it just a little bit, but all the way -- Right.

-- and when you are telling us you believe only God decides if a man lives or dies, to me, that is a strong feeling you have inside you?

That is right.

And I don't think it is a feeling anyone can change, whether these two questions are put before you or before anyone asks you could you sentence him to die. I think your answer is going to be the same:

Mr. Chopp couldn't do that?

I don't believe so.

- Are you telling me then you could probably answer

  No. 1 yes if the evidence proved No. 1 were yes?

  Yes.
  - But in no case could you ever answer No. 2 yes, because if you answered that yes along with No. 1, he is going to ask for the death penalty?

    Like I said, that is for God to decide. Like a

person, whether he tried to be a God-fearing child or just a violent-type person.

- Q. And there is no way you could tell for sure what the future was going to be?
- A. I would feel guilty. I would feel like I committed a crime myself. If he would go out -- if he would go out and do something else --
- Of course, you know he is going to be in prison the rest of his life, you see, so even if you answer it no, the chances are he is going to be in prison from that day until the day he dies.

  Okay?

Do you follow me so far?

- A. They commit crimes in prison, in the penitentiary, if they are going to be prisoners.
- They sure do, but even knowing they are going to commit crimes in the future, you could not answer that question yes, knowing he is going to get the death penalty?
- A. No.

Q. Mr. Elizondo or Mr. Hernandez are going to ask you questions in a few minutes, and may put emphasis on different words.

I think I am fairly clear in my mind there is no situation where Mr. Chopp could

answer both of these questions yes, no matter how bad the facts were, and no matter how bad the evidence was, Mr. Chopp says, "God decides those issues, not me as a juror."

Is that a fair statement?

- A. That is a fair statement.
- Q. And even if I told you about thirty children were gunned down by a man who did it for money -- and this is what they usually talk to people about -- suppose a man goes out and kidnaps thirty children, five and six-year-olds, and demands a million dollars' ransom or they will kill the children.

The people get up the million dollars, and they pay the ransom. They go and pay the money, and he kills them anyway.

- A. I have a different attitude about that.
- Q. Still, isn't your feeling still the same? You still don't have the right to take that man's life? It is still God's decision to take that man's life?
- A. It is.
- Q And even if faced with that case, when you got to Question 2, you are still going to answer that Question 2 no? You are not going to answer that

penalty case, if someone did that. I would have no problem answering yes, yes, but I believe in the death penalty.

But like I say, that is not going to bring any

20

21

22

23

24

25

of them back, and I can't say definitely whether I should or not. If I be -- after everything has presented itself and everything, I could probably get a whole different inner feeling.

- Okay. I am not sure if I follow where you are at right now. I think we have gone back to the point --
- A. I want to consider the facts, as the judge said.
- Even after you considered the facts, you know if you assess the death penalty, you are not going to bring those thirty kids back.
- A. No.
- Q. By knowing you can't bring those thirty kids back by answering yes, yes to these questions, would you still answer one of them no to avoid the death penalty?
- A. I still would.
  - Q. You see, that is what I am getting at. You disagree with the death penalty, no matter what the facts are.
  - A. Like I said, until I get a different feeling within --
- Q. You are pointing to your heart.

Have you ever had a different feeling other than being opposed to the death penalty?

A. Not really. It is just when something presents itself to me like that. It is up to me after I think about it. I wonder if I could do it from the way I feel.

Q. Let me give you an example of something and see if we follow each other.

I am sure you have heard of the terms like bias, prejudice, and impartiality.

- A. Correct.
- And a lot of times, when people accuse another person of being biased or prejudiced, the person being accused of being biased and prejudiced takes offense at it and says, "I am not biased and I am not prejudiced," because for some reason, we give bad connotations to those terms.

But I think we all have biases and prejudices.

I am biased against green vegetables.

I don't like green vegetables. You can't convince
me green vegetables are good. I could not be a
good judge of green vegetables.

I've got another bias. I don't like this law that says you can't sell certain goods on Sundays. There is a law that says on Sundays, grocery stores can't sell some kitchen utensils.

To me, that is a ridiculous law. If I can buy a spoon on Monday through Saturday, why can't I buy it on Sunday to make my dinner?

I would like to think I could be fair on any type of jury I would sit on. I don't think of myself as a bigot or biased or prejudiced in any manner, but if I were called to sit on a jury where a man were accused of selling a spoon on Sunday, to be honest, I don't think I could be a fair juror in that case because of my position on the case.

I would probably distort the facts to believe the Defendant was not guilty. You see how I feel? I would not do it consciously but subconsciously, because of my beliefs. It would affect the way I follow the evidence. Do you understand?

A. Yes.

Both sides have a right to a fair trial. There is no question the Defense has a right to a fair trial, but, you know, the officer in this case has a right to a fair trial, too, and the widow of the officer has a right to a fair trial and the people of the state have a right to a fair trial.

- 2 A. Sure.
  - Q. You know how strong they are?
  - A Right, at the present.
  - Do you think the way you feel presently, that this is the type of jury that you should be on or do you think that perhaps Mr. Chopp, because of his feelings, would be a good juror in an auto theft case or burglary case, but when we are talking about killing somebody --
  - A. I would not like to sit on the jury, but I would sit on the case.
  - Q. Even if you are not selected on this jury, feel free to come and listen every day.
  - A. I could get a better outlook on whether it should be done or shouldn't be done.
  - Okay. Getting back to my question again, you've got some reservations in your mind, obviously, whether you can do it?
  - A. Right.
  - Q. Even if the evidence called for it, you are not sure you could do it? You are saying you would have to be there and see it done?
  - A. Yes.
    - Q. Knowing you have reservations right now, can you

tell me that you are positive in your own mind you can be a fair juror to both sides, or do you feel that maybe, "This is not my type of case, at least not right now. Maybe after I sit and listen to a case like this, I will know better"?

- A. That is the way I look at it. If I could listen to it, by getting the facts, I have to gather them to myself after you present them to me, and I have to, you know, get a feeling about it.
- Q. Sure, and right now, you don't know what your feeling would be, even if the evidence would be so overwhelming you knew you would answer yes?

  You can't tell me you would answer yes if confronted with them, and even in a case where you found they should be answered yes, you might answer them no?
- A. That is a possibility.
- Q You can't tell me one hundred percent you will answer yes to these questions because maybe your feelings will take over and you will answer them contrary to the evidence just so you can wake up in the morning and look in the mirror and face yourself?
- A. That's it. That's it.
- Q. When I say, "Mr. Chopp, do you think you can be

Z

fair to us in this case," I am not saying that in a nasty manner.

Do you understand?

- Yes.
- Q. I think what you are telling us is Mr. Chopp cannot be a fair juror in a death penalty case because he can't tell me now he can follow the evidence.
- A. I see.
- Q. Would you agree with me?
- A. Just like going to a funeral. If it's not any of my relatives, it doesn't affect my emotions. I might sit there like I am at a football game or something, and that doesn't have any effect on me, but I would have to let it take effect within me in order to make a decision on it, you know, and I don't say yes or no.
- Q. So what you are telling me is you may hear all the evidence, okay, and after hearing all the evidence, you may be convinced that the answers should be yes, yes --
- A. Yes.
- Q. -- but you can't tell me you would answer them yes, yes because your personal beliefs about the death penalty might prevent you from doing it?

- A. That's right, because of what effect it might have on me.
- And you don't believe in a man dying by another man's act, but that should be God's decision, and that it doesn't matter what the facts are in the case?
- A. No, I can't.
- Q. You can't tell me if you believed the answer was yes, you would go ahead and answer it yes?
- A. Yes.

Q. You would answer it no?

Mr. Elizondo is going to tell you you are going to take an oath and swear to God you would answer the questions according to the evidence, and he is going to say, "Are you saying you are going to violate your oath," and I believe when we are talking about something as strong as the death penalty and a man dying, what would stand between your oath would be your personal feelings, because if you wanted to, you could refuse to answer these questions. You wouldn't have to violate your oath. You could go back and say, "I am not answering. I know the answer should be yes, but I am not answering, because if I answer, he is going to die, and I

might be a party to that."

Do you feel that is the position you would find yourself in? You wouldn't be able to answer the questions?

A. That is right.

MR. BAX: At this time, the State would have a challenge for cause.

THE COURT: Mr. Elizondo;

## EXAMINATION

## QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:

0. Mr. Chopp, how are you doing?

It has been a long day, and I hope you are not confused.

I need to talk with you a little bit about the death penalty. It would be a sad day in this country if we had twelve people in that jury box, and say there were twelve people and the death penalty didn't affect them at all.

They should be affected, don't you think?

- A. Certainly.
- There is nothing wrong with the way you are thinking. That is natural. It would be sad

if you were to come in and say, "I could answer the two questions yes right away without even thinking about it." That would be sad, but, fortunately, in this country, we have people who will think about it, and after thinking about it, they will answer those questions the way they believe those questions should be answered.

Don't you agree with that?

MR. BAX: I object to that based on what the evidence would require, not what the evidence should be.

Q. (By Mr. Elizondo) That is what I mean, what the evidence shows, they should answer yes or no. They should answer yes or no.

Do you agree with that?

- A. I agree with it. That is what I said.
- Q. And, you know, there are some people in this country who have forfeited their right to live by their conduct and their past conduct.

Let me give you a few examples. Mr.

Bax brings up the school bus full of children,

you know, and I am going to give you a

hypothetical example and I am going to give you

some more examples just to kind of stimulate your

thought processes and see how you would feel

about certain things.

Let's say a school bus full of five-yearold deaf children gets hijacked by a kidnapper
over here at the south end of town in the southeast
mall, and the kidnapper calls the police department
and the kidnapper tells the police department,
"Give me a million dollars by noon or I will kill
all these children."

The parents somehow, they scrounge the money up somehow and they give the money to the police and the police give it to the kidnapper, and the kidnapper puts that money in his pocket, gets his machine gun out and kills those children anyway.

You come to find out when he gives his confession -- he confesses to the whole thing -- you come to find out he has done the same thing on two other occasions.

There is one thing about the death penalty. If he gets the death penalty, we can guarantee one thing, and that is that he will never do it again. Isn't that right?

- A. Right.
- Q. He will never bother any more school children.

Don't you agree?

What I am strying to get at: There are other situations. There are these people running around the country, this guy running around the country in Canada, Michigan, Houston, Galveston, going around killing women --

MR. BAX: If he is referring to a specific example of someone, that is not a capital murder case, and I object to him using that.

MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, if I may,
I would like to give him a hypothetical example.

MR. BAX: But to say there is a guy --

MR. ELIZONDO: Let me give him a hypothetical situation.

(By Mr. Elizondo) In a hypothetical situation, there is a person running around all over Canada, Michigan, all over Houston and Galveston, and he is killing women. He kidnaps women, sexually molests them, and then blows their brains out with a .45.

That, under our law, would be capital murder.

If a jury believed that he did it -- and he admitted these offenses -- beyond a

reasonable doubt and he goes to trial, and you find out during the trial, you find a lot of facts; you find he's been convicted on two other occasions for the same type of stuff; you find he gives a confession in that type of hypothetical case, you can see where a juror can consider -- might even find him guilty, first of all, and then we go to the punishment phase, and you can see in that hypothetical situation a jury could consider answering Question 1 yes because he did it deliberately in that situation, and you can see in that situation, a jury might consider and might answer Question 2 yes?

- A. I believe I could, in that matter.
- You see what I am getting at? There are many, many fact situations.

Ronald Clark O'Bryan. Remember him?

He was the guy who ruined Halloween, went out
there and bought some cyanide poison and put it
in Pixie Sticks and gave it to his children and
went to the insurance company and made himself
a beneficiary and goes out there and gives the
cyanide to his children.

You can see where that conduct might be committed deliberately.

MR. BAX: I object to him trying to commit it to any one fact situation. I have no objection to him just talking in hypothetical terms, but he is asking the question as to whether he could himself ever participate in answering those questions yes, is what we are here about.

MR. ELIZONDO: Let me rephrase the question.

(By Mr. Elizondo) You can see there are many, many people who don't believe as we do and forfeit their right to live.

Do you see that?

Let me ask you: Do you think in the proper case, in your own mind, you could assess the death penalty, in your own mind?

- A. In the matter of the kids on the bus, yes.
- Q. I am not saying in that particular situation.
- A. Or either where he had committed a crime two or three times, sure.
- Q. Okay.
- Like I said, I could go on that No. 2 yes.

If I were to say, just say no to it and he would go out and commit a crime, I would figure I did it, I was a cause of it, you know.

I might as well go out and help --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

At the second phase, they don't shoot that question at you but give you other evidence sometimes.

MR. BAX: I object to that. doesn't have to be other evidence.

> MR. ELIZONDO: Judge, I said sometimes. THE COURT: Sustained.

(By Mr. Elizondo) You know, they can, if there is evidence, they can give other evidence, or they can just judge that by itself. You can submit that to a jury, just the case itself, how it was committed, and based upon that, then a jury can, if they believe beyond a reasonable doubt there is a probability that the Defendant will commit a criminal act of violence that will constitute a continuing threat to society, if they believe that, they can answer the question yes.

"Probability": What does the word probability mean to you? Possibility, anything is possible?

Probability: Had it on his mind to do so in the

3395

25

Q. Okay.

- A. To commit that crime. He had --
- Q So you can see where you could answer in any kind of situation, you could answer Question 2 yes, if the State has proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt that it should be answered yes and you answered yes?
- A. Sure. Sure.
- Q. And you could answer 1 yes if the State has proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to that question should be yes?

There is nothing magical about that.

- A. I follow you.
- Q. Could you answer that question yes?
- A. On the basis of, you know, what the type, the type of crimes that you asked me, you know, demonstrated to me, gave me an example of, I could say yes to both of them.
- O. Right.
- A. But like -- in just a case where a guy commits a crime one time, I couldn't say yes to No. 2.
- Q. We are not trying to commit you to a certain set of facts. We are just asking you if you can

consider in the proper case, in your own mind,
the death penalty and could you give it, and
just, you know, you don't have to tell me what
you are thinking about, but just in the proper
case in your own mind?

- A. Like I said, about the -- you know, the example that you gave me on the crime that was committed more than once --
- Q Sure.
- A. -- yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, but a crime doesn't have to be committed more than once.

MR. BAX: I object to him going into anything else. He has, I believe, gotten the answers he's required on his challenge.

THE COURT: Sustained.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ BAX}:$$  And I would like to ask him some further questions at this time.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:

- Q. Mr. Chopp, I am confused.
- A. Well, he asked me a question about the little kids --

Q. See --

- A. -- on the bus, and he gets his ransom and he goes out and shoots all the kids down.
- Q. Does that change it?
- A. That is not the first time he did it. He did it again. He committed some crime before similar to that.
- Q Okay.
- A. So, I could say yes to that.
- Q. Sure, and I think you could; you and I talking about it, you could agree that the answer to that question should be yes?
- A. He put it more than once.
- Q. We are going to get to more than that in a second.

  Could you answer that question yes,

  knowing the person you were answering that about,
  he is going to die?

MR. ELIZONDO: If it's proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

We are going to object.

Q. (By Mr. Bax) Mr. Chopp, let's separate two things. Okay?

You and I are talking, and Mr. Elizondo and I are talking, and we are talking about hypothetical cases. All right?

A. All right.

Question 2 yes, your answer should be yes based on the evidence.

What I want to know and what you and
I talked about before was: Could you answer that
question yes knowing the person was going to die
as a result of that?

- A. If the evidence proved it to me, then I could answer it yes, but if I were to feel different after I sat and listened to all the evidence, I couldn't. Just like now, I can't say yes without, you know, knowing the full facts and evidence, like I know the facts will be presented.
- Q. You remember a couple of minutes ago I asked you a question? I said, "Mr. Chopp, can you imagine yourself in a situation where you heard all the evidence, and after hearing all the evidence, can you imagine yourself in a situation where you would answer yes, yes, but you couldn't answer yes because of your feelings on the death penalty?

A. I told you I couldn't answer yes right now until after I heard the evidence. I couldn't say right now, but I don't know what would happen --

0. The Court --

THE COURT REPORTER: One at a time, gentlemen.

THE COURT: The court reporter is getting ready to get all of us with the machine if you don't talk one at a time. If somebody else is talking, let him talk, and when he is talking, let him talk. Okay?

Q. (By Mr. Bax) This has been a long day for all of us and I am not picking at you, Mr. Chopp. I just have a question in my mind as to whether you could put aside a personal belief.

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection, Your Honor.

It is repetitious. He has already answered that question.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q. (By Mr. Bax) Can you promise me you could do that and be a juror and answer both of those questions yes knowing that a man -- after hearing the evidence, of course. I am not asking you to answer these yes now. That would be ridiculous. But after hearing all the evidence

and knowing in your heart and knowing the answers should be yes, could you answer those yes knowing -- person on trial who is living and breathing is coing to have a needle injected into his arm and is going to die as a result of that?

can't give you that answer now. That will be evidence.

I can't talk to you and get you off this jury in o weeks from now after you have heard all the a idence and Mr. Chopp says, "I can't take the life another person. I don't care what the evidence " That is going to be getting down to the nitty-ritty, and we are not going to have a chance at lime to say, "Judge, time out. I am not going lo it."

We would have to pick a new jury and start again if you can't tell me now

That is what I need to know. I don't need now what your answers will be in this case, but now what your answers will be in this case, but not to know if I prove it to you that your answers not do be yes, are you going to do it or are you rate to say, "God is the only one who can do that"? It is a probability, what I feel within me.

Be the position you are putting yourself in?

That is what I need to know. I don't need within the same in the position you are putting yourself in?

1

2

You see the position you are putting yourself in, Mr. Chopp? Do you really know and do you have a belief in yourself that you would be able to do that?

5 6

I think you have reservations in your own mind as to whether you could answer those

7

questions yes. 8

9

I have a doubt in my mind whether I could answer it yes.

10

Based on the evidence?

12

11

Yes.

13

Even after hearing the evidence, you don't know if you could answer them?

14 15

I don't know.

16

Because your reservations, your personal feelings, may prevent you from answering it yes no matter what the facts are?

18

17

Right.

19

20

21

Let me go to one other thing you mentioned, and that is -- there is no requirement by the law -now you may require it and that is fine again, but you told Mr. Elizondo, "Sure, you heard it before." Okay?

22

23

24

25

I think you are talking about Question

Q.

No. 2. Sure, if you heard he was on trial for this killing, if it was brought out that two years before, he killed someone else, and two years before that, he killed someone else, then you could answer this question yes?

- A. Beyond a reasonable doubt.
- Question 2 yes if you never heard about the man killing anybody else, if only one person was killed, or would you always require that more than one person were killed before you could answer that question yes?
- A. There is a doubt in my mind whether I could or not.
  - You see, the only time that you changed your opinion when you were talking to Mr. Elizondo -- you and I had discussed the thirty school children, and you and I had agreed the death penalty in that case wouldn't bring the children back -- and Mr. Elizondo brought facts in and you heard he did it before, and that is what caught your attention, and that is when you said, "That is when I could do it," when it was shown that not only did the man commit the crime for which he was on trial, but the State had brought you evidence that he had done similar things before in his life, like killed thirty school children before and killed some

others some other time, and maybe another time killed somebody.

You would require, before you could answer 2 yes that more than one person be killed? If you had only heard that this person on trial had killed only one person, would you be able to answer that yes?

- A. If he's committed it more than one time, I wouldn't have the slightest problem, you know, the slightest hesitation --
- Q. Problem or hesitation.
- so that is the way I could say it clearly, and my conscience would be clear.
- 0. How about if you weren't shown any other evidence other than the evidence for which he is on trial?

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection to the prosecutor staking the juror out to a certain set of facts.

MR. BAX: I am not staking him to a certain set of facts. I just want to know if he would require more than the law would require.

THE COURT: Overruled.

(By Mr. Bax) Would you require he prove to you more than one person was killed at the trial?

A. Yes.

Question 2 yes, or would your answer always be

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection. He is trying to stake this juror to a certain set of facts.

MR. BAX: There are no facts.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. Like I say, if he gets life in prison, as is God's will, he will punish him some way through the prison system. Some criminal already in there might take his life. That won't be a part of me.
- O That's right.
- A. It's done practically daily.
- O. Right, but are you telling me then that if the person on trial just killed one person, that is all you knew about, that you would always then go for the life sentence rather than the death penalty?
- A. Yes, sir.
  - MR. ELIZONDO: Same objection, Your Honor.
- Q. (By Mr. Bax) In other words, in that type of case where only one person were killed, you would

THE COURT: Overrule your objection.

A. If he reformed.

Q. (By Mr. Bax) See, that is what I mean.

You would always think if a person killed one person, he would have a chance of reforming, correct? And, you would always answer Question 2 no to make sure he had a chance to reform?

- A. Yes, with one capital murder, I guess.
- Q. So, if a person were charged with capital murder just one time and even after you heard the evidence and you found him guilty and said that No. 1 should be answered yes, you could never ever answer Question 2 yes if there was just one killing and that was the only case you knew about, just the one capital murder?
- A. If the way it was went about, you know, if it was a gang-style murder or something like that, go get a guy out of bed and blow him away or something like that.
- Q. You see, gang style or something like that, it is usually -- it is not a capital murder.

 $$\operatorname{\mathtt{MR}}$.$  ELIZONDO: Objection to that as a misstatement of the law.

(By Mr. Bax) You see, Mr. Chopp, you are giving us different answers. Okay?

I don't know how to feel about it, but whether I feel comfortable or not -- and I know you are trying to tell us as honestly as you can how you feel --

A. Yes, I am.

- Q -- and on the one hand, you keep telling me that is God's decision. Okay? Because Mr. Chopp feels the life sentence is severe enough and God's will will take care of him either in the prison or after his death. God will have a way of handling him in his afterlife, okay, and then you are telling us that is the way you feel, and you feel strongly about it. Okay?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And I believe you do, but you turn around and say, "I could be a party to taking someone's life," and, you see, they don't agree, don't go together.
- A. You see, more crimes than one, murders, where you have committed more murders than one or get someone out of bed or take him in the yard and shoot him down like a bird or rabbit and get in the car and

drive off --

Q. How about somebody who shoots a police officer in the headsthree times?

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection, Your Honor. The prosecutor is staking the juror out as to a certain set of facts.

THE COURT: Sustained.

(By Mr. Bax) Do you think you could ever look at yourself in the face if you assessed the death penalty?

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection, Your Honor. Repetitious.

THE COURT: Not under these circumstances Overruled.

- A. Repeat that.
- (By Mr. Bax) Can you ever envision yourself waking up in the morning after giving someone the death penalty and looking at yourself in the face knowing you helped take the life of another person?
- A. I probably could until they have taken his life, as long as he is on Death Row or something.
- Q. You can't look at it that way. Okay?

If you give someone the death penalty -- and I want you to think about this this way -- you've got to assume it is going to happen.

I know there are two hundred people on Death Row and no one has been executed since the 1960's, but when you are answering these questions, you've got to assume, if you say yes, yes, that man is going to die.

A. If I answered yes to No. 2 --

What is the question you just asked me?

Yes, I could look myself in the face with a mirror all day long.

- Q. Knowing that you have answered Questions 1 and 2 yes?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Knowing you are going against this belief, how could you justify that in your mind, knowing that you believe God is the only one to take a life, and now in our society you have helped take a life?
- A. He has committed, you know, murder in such a way he doesn't have any business in society, if it's done the way you quoted it as being done.
- Q. So you are telling me then that you do believe in the death penalty?
- A. I said I could answer yes to it if it was done in the manner like you described it to me.
- Q. So in certain situations you do believe in the death penalty?

Certain situations, certain types of murders or whatever was committed, I believe I could find out what you mean and say yes and walk around, like I say, with a mirror in front of me.

- Q. You could answer both questions yes and do that?
- A. From what you just said, if it was committed the way you explained it to me.

MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, he has answered the question already. It is repetitious.

THE COURT: Overruled.

(By Mr. Bax) Mr. Chopp, imagine yourself being charged with a crime. I want you to understand the position I find myself in right now.

Imagine yourself charged with a crime you didn't commit. All right?

A. Right.

Q. And you are sitting there with your attorneys and your attorneys are picking the jury and I happen to be one of the people out there when they are picking the jury. All right?

Just before your attorney sits down, he says, "Is there anyone out there that has anything to tell me about my client," and I raise my hand and say, "You want to know the truth? I don't believe that black people ever tell the truth. I

you from being a fair and impartial judge, from 1 being objective as far as the facts were concerned? 2 It would make me show some partiality until I did 3 sit on it. I would be doubtful. Can you give me a fair trial? 5 I don't know. 6 Can you promise me that if I prove the answers to 7 these questions should be yes, you will answer them 8 yes? 9 MR. ELIZONDO: Objection to the 10 prosecutor pointing his finger at the Defendant. 11 THE COURT: Overruled. 12 (By Mr. Bax) See what I mean? If I prove it to you, 13 if I prove the answers should be yes, yes and this 14 man should receive the death penalty, can you 15 guarantee me you will do it? 16 No guarantee. 17 So even if the evidence shows it should be yes, 18 yes, you can't guarantee me you will answer those 19 yes, yes? 20 No, I can't. 21 Because your personal feelings might prevent you 22 from doing that? 23 Right. 24 And I think that is what -- that is what I was 25 3413

A. Right.

- Q. You couldn't guarantee me, even if I proved the answers should be yes, you can't guarantee me the answers would be yes?
- A. Not right at present.
- Q. You might answer them no?
- 11 A. That is right.
  - Q. Even though the evidence shows they should be yes?
  - A. That is right.

MR. BAX: Again, Judge, I renew our challenge. I think we have a juror here who cannot tell us unequivocally that he could answer both questions yes based on the evidence, that it would require him to first hear the evidence and then to his comparing that evidence to his personal feelings, and would require his personal feelings to make the decision rather than the evidence, and, therefore, we would challenge.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  ELIZONDO: Your Honor, we submit he is qualified.

THE COURT: Let's take a couple of

minutes and retire just a second.

(The Court and counsel retired to chambers outside the presence and hearing of the prospective juror and the court reporter, after which time, they returned to the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had.)

(By Mr. Bax) Mr. Chopp, I've got a few more questions.

Where we left off was where I had asked you the question: Even if you had heard all the evidence.

Assume with me you have heard all the evidence. Make up the evidence you want to think about, as horrible a fact situation as you can conceive, whether it is Mr. Elizondo's case about the thirty school children, whatever he had done before, whatever fact situation, you put that in your mind and think about it.

Can you tell me, after hearing the evidence, if you are convinced the answers to these questions will be yes, are you telling me you won't know that?

- A. Won't know that until I have heard it.
- Really, what you are telling me, it may not be the evidence that causes you to answer one way or the

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes.

other, but your feelings about the death penalty that would cause you to act one way or the other?

Yes.

- Do you agree with me that even though you agree with Mr. Elizondo that the man who killed the school children and he did it before, you agreed the answers should be yes in that case --
- Α. Yes.
- -- but you don't know if you could answer the questions yes at this time?
- Not to know the probability he would continuously -- to be able to decide that he would be a threat to society.
- Can you see a situation -- do you agree with Mr. Elizondo in that situation if a man killed thirty school children for ransom money, shot them down, cut their heads off, horrible acts to collect a million dollars, and it was proved he had killed someone before, let's say, okay, you are telling me now if you believed if you read that in the newspaper or I were to walk up to you on the street, do you believe your answers could be yes?
- I could say yes to No. 2 without a doubt.
- If we are talking about it, yes?

- What I am asking you is: In a situation like that where you are asked those questions as a human being, how would you feel about those? When you are answering those questions and deciding whether a man lives or dies, how would you answer those questions? Can you tell me beyond a reasonable doubt how you would answer those questions?
- A. Not now.

- Q. You can't guarantee what you would do until Mr. Chopp is put in that situation?
- A. That is right.
- Q. Even in the fact situation Mr. Elizondo gave you where you can talk about yes, the answers should be yes, you can't even tell me your answers would be yes if it meant the death penalty until you were actually put in that situation?
- A. That is right.
  - Q. And even though you heard that evidence and you thought it should be yes and you knew it should be yes, you would still answer no because of your feelings about the death penalty?
- $_{23}$   $\wedge$  Yes.
  - Q. Which would be contrary to the evidence, correct?
  - A. I am talking, you know, the part where he would

I don't believe I could.

A.

MR. BAX: We renew our challenge. Even in Mr. Elizondo's fact situation, he is saying yes, he can see where the answer should be yes, but putting that question where the answer means the man is going to die, he can't tell us he is going to do it, even though it is required by the evidence.

MR. ELIZONDO: Can I question him?

MR. BAX: Perhaps the Court would like to question him. I don't know, Judge.

#### EXAMINATION

### QUESTIONS BY THE COURT:

Q. Let's assume that you were chosen to serve on a jury and you heard facts about whatever the case was, and it was a capital murder case just like this one and you decided, after hearing the evidence, that the verdict on guilt or innocence should be guilty of capital murder.

Are you with me so far?

- A. Right.
- Now, you are sitting in that jury box right over there, not out on the street talking to your neighbors and not sitting up here talking about

hypothetical situations. You are sitting in a jury box over there and it is down to yourself and eleven other people's decisions as to whether an individual gets the death penalty or a life sentence.

#### Are you with me?

- A. Right.
- Now, the State puts on evidence. They have put on the evidence about what happened and you have found that man guilty of that offense. Okay?

Then it becomes your duty and eleven other people's duty to answer those two questions over there on that blackboard.

Now, what I want to know is: Can you, if the evidence calls for it, answer both of those questions yes?

- A. Well, like I told the D.A., Judge, the way I would have to feel down here, after getting -- whether I am doing the right thing -- I don't know if I could answer yes to take another person's life.
- Q. Wait a minute. If you heard the evidence and you were convinced that the answer ought to be yes to both questions, would you be able to answer both of them yes?
- A. I am not -- I am not in a position to say right

```
3
                                       THE COURT: Sustain the object
                                     MR. ELIZONDO: May I question
                  5
                                     ^{THE} ^{COURT}: ^{Go} ^{ahead}.
                  6
                 7
                                     EX_{AMINATION}
                  QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:
                     You know, Mr. Chopp, when I talked to You a wh
                  Q.
             10
                    ago, maybe forty-five minutes ago, do you remen
            11
                   talking about that there were some people in soc
           12
                   that deserved to die, should have their lives
          13
                  forfeited for what they do?
          14
                           I gave you examples: The school bus, the
         15
                guy going around all over the country killing
        16
               women, Ronald Clark O'Bryan, who killed the little
       17
              children.
      18
                       There are many, many types of people
     19
            in this society. Society, by the way, means the
    20
           Penitentiary, too. The People that are in the
   21
          Penitentiary deserve to be protected from people
  22
         who are bad. There are just some bad apples in
 23
        this world, people who deserve to have their lives
24
        forfeited.
25
                 MR. BAX: I object to him making a final
                                                  3421
```

THE COURT: Sustained.

5

. .

22 | 23 |

(By Mr. Elizondo) You know what I am getting at, you know, and I am not trying to limit you to a certain set of facts.

There are other sets of facts probably more gruesome than the ones I have given.

All I am asking you is: In a capital murder case if you have found him guilty of capital murder, and that, you know, you were in the punishment phase after you have heard evidence and if you believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to those two questions should be yes, now keeping in mind those hypotheticals I gave you, you could answer those questions yes, couldn't you?

- A. If the evidence presented convinced me that to my belief, I could say yes.
- Q. Yes, if they prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt to your satisfaction?
- A. I could yes to both of them.
- Q. And you can give him a fair trial? You wouldn't be unfair to him, would you?
- A. I would be if I put it like he made the example a while ago.

- Q Yes. That was just an example.
- A. I said example, but for real, I could give him a fair trial.
- Q. You wouldn't be biased or prejudiced to him, would you?
- A. No.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  ELIZONDO: I submit he is qualified.

### EXAMINATION

# QUESTIONS BY THE COURT:

Q. I will go back to the same question I asked you a moment ago. We are not talking about a hypothetical situation. We are talking about where you have found a man guilty of capital murder and you are over there in that jury box and the question becomes those two on the board over there. The evidence is before you. You have heard all there is to hear, and you've got to make up your mind whether or not you answer those two questions yes or no or one yes and one no.

Could you, if the evidence called for it, answer both of those questions yes?

A. Yes, I answered that to you, Your Honor, when I

said if I feel within me that the evidence that they have presented to me deserved a, you know, what I feel that he should -- I could give both of them. I just answered that.

Okay. In view of that, I will change my ruling.

### EXAMINATION

# QUESTIONS BY MR. BAX:

- O. Mr. Chopp, are you going to be making that decision on the evidence or making it on the way Mr. Chopp feels about the death penalty at the time?
- A. The way the evidence presents it. The way I feel about it is the way I would take the evidence.
- Let me ask you this: You have heard the evidence. You would say to yourself, "Yes, the State has proven that first one should be yes. The man's conduct was deliberate, and he killed someone knowing he would die, killed with the expectation someone would die, and, yes, they have proved to me Question No. 2 should be yes by the evidence; proved to me the answers should be yes"?
- If it's proven to me, I can yes to that, but I am not saying yes now. I am saying I could yes to it.
- ). How about if the evidence said yes, but Mr. Chopp's

personal feelings said, "No, I can't do it"?
Which would win out? Your personal feelings or
the other?

- A. Well, that would have to remain -- I couldn't just say right off.
- On So perhaps even though you have heard the evidence and perhaps even though the evidence tells you the answer should be yes, you might still answer it no because your personal feelings would not allow you to answer it yes because the man would receive the death penalty?

I understand that you say yes, I could, but isn't it true, sir, that even in some cases, in some cases, yes, you could answer both questions yes, you agree, but aren't you telling me also there may be some cases where the answer in your mind should be yes, but you would still answer one no because you might feel either the man doesn't deserve the death penalty or your personal beliefs tell you you couldn't participate in death penalty? Whatever the evidence proved beyond a reasonable doubt, I could say yes, but it would have to be without a doubt within me.

Now, getting back to the other question: Could you ever answer Question 2 yes based on just one

you have it turned around before I could prove it.

What is it? I need to know.

2

Based on the evidence I would get after hearing the case and how it all came about, what was, you

4

know, the case of the whatever -- the case --

5

bringing the case about, I probably would, you

6

know, wouldn't have a doubt. I could say yes.

7

So, Mr. Chopp --

8

A. There could be evidence -- the evidence would have to come out on that one.

9

10

Q. Mr. Chopp, despite your strong feelings against the

11

death penalty, you are telling me you could participate in the taking of a life by a verdict

12

of two yes answers?

13 14

MR. ELIZONDO: Objection, Your Honor.

15

Repetitious.

16

THE COURT: Under the circumstances, I

17

will overrule it.

Q. (By Mr. Bax) Are you telling me that is the way

19

18

you feel? You would do that, even though you are

20

a man of strong feelings and everything, you could

21

put those strong feelings aside and assess the death penalty?

22

23

A. If the evidence proved to me without a doubt, I could. There would have to be no doubt in my mind that, you know --

24

 $\mathfrak Q$  Let's change the subject for a second.

Can you ever imagine a situation where you have found a person guilty of intentionally and knowingly taking the life of another person without justification, without legal excuse? Can you think of any case in that type of situation where you could give a person probation?

Do you know what probation is?

A. Yes.

Q. Probation means you go home. You don't go to jail. Okay?

You have certain rules you have to live up to.

Can you ever think of a case where probation would be proper for the intentional taking of a life?

- A. I have seen it happen.
- Q. Okay, but could you participate or can you think of any situation where you feel it would be proper, or would you be opposed to probation if someone intentionally took the life of another person?
- A. In the manner that it was taken, a dice robbery or robbery or something of the sort, I would be opposed to it.
- Q. Well, are there any cases where you are not opposed

MR. ELIZONDO: I object to the prosecutor

How about as a kid at school? Did anybody ever

accuse you of taking a pigtail and putting it in

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- A. I am not saying it as a joke. No one pinned anything on me since I was a baby.
- Q. If anybody accused you of doing something --
- A. Of course, mischief things.
- Q. Say somebody accused you of something you didn't do. Would you go and tell the people you didn't do it or sit by and keep silent?
- A. I would tell them I didn't do it, sure.
- Q You would be the first one to speak up and tell them you didn't do it, right?
- 12 A. Right.
  - Q. If a Defendant in a criminal trial accused of killing a police officer, if he didn't get up and tell them he didn't do it, would you hold that against him, thinking if he didn't do it, he would be up there telling them he didn't do it?
  - A. Well, there would be a doubt in my mind whether he conducted -- or the death of the decedent was committed deliberately.
  - Q. No, no.
- 22 A. I would have to go back to that.
- Q. We are not going back to that. I am talking about whether -- here we are trying to decide if he is guilty or not guilty. Right?

Q. You are on a jury sitting there with eleven other people and the State puts on witnesses saying the man on trial did it. He did it. He just sits there, the Defendant, and never gets on the stand and denies it, never gets up and says, "I didn't do it," or anything else. He just sits there and

Would you think he probably did it because if he didn't do it, he would be the first one telling us he didn't do it, and he must be trying to hide something from us?

In other words, would you consider that as some evidence against him, because like you say

A. There is a possibility.

says nothing.

- Q. You know if you were charged and didn't do it, you would be the first one up there?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And if he is charged with a crime and doesn't get up there, it must mean something? Why doesn't he get up there and tell us? Would that be a strike against him, do you thin?
- A. I doubt it.

THE COURT: All right. I am going to

2

call time on you, Mr. Bax.

MR. BAX: We pass the juror.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

### EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. ELIZONDO:

Mr. Chopp, how are you doing?

We are going to be talking briefly about a capital murder case. Of course, this man is -this man -- this man is charged with capital murder, you know, and as in all trials in Texas, it is divided into two parts.

The first part is the guilt-or-innocence stage.

I can't even think anymore. You are number eighty-nine, I believe.

Anyway, it is divided into two parts, and the first part is the guilt-or-innocence stage, and the second part is the punishment stage.

If he is found guilty, we go to the punishment stage, and at the punishment stage, his punishment will be determined by how you answer these two questions, and, of course, if the evidence calls for it, he can answer those questions yes or no depending on the evidence. If he is

found guilty.

If he is found not guilty, we don't have a punishment phase.

I can assure you, as much as the State is pushing for the death penalty, we are going to go ahead and push for a not guilty vote, and that is basically all we have to ask you, but --

MR. BAX: May I have a few moments, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BAX: Your Honor, I thought the State did not have another peremptory challenge, but since we have another peremptory challenge, we will exercise it and excuse this juror.

THE COURT: Mr. Chopp, thank you very much. You may be excused.

-

SUSAN BENCH BENTLEY,

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

# EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. MOEN:

THE COURT: Ms. Bentley, I apologize for the late hour. We have been out here working for some time.

Are you ready to proceed?

MR. ELIZONDO: Your Honor, may I have a moment?

MR. MOEN: Ms. Bentley, both sides are in agreement to excuse you. We noticed your answers on the back about the business problems you and your husband are having.

We anticipate this case will take about a week to try in addition to the voir dire examination where we have to do the jurors individually on a case like this and can't take them out of order, so we had to wait until we got to you just now, but we appreciate your kind patience with us.

It certainly has not been fun and games

through the last five weeks, and it hasn't been that way with us.

Judge, I think we can agree.

THE COURT: Do I understand the Defense agrees?

MR. ELIZONDO: We agree, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Bentley, thank you so

much.

THE JUROR: Thank you.