IN THE CIRCUIT COURT IN THE EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NUMBER: 05-2012-CF-035337-AXXX-XX

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

BRANDON BRADLEY,

ORIGINAL

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPT OF DIGITAL STATUS CONFERENCE RECORDING

The transcript of the hearing

taken in the above-styled cause at Moore Justice Center, 2825 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera, Florida, 32940, on the 13th of September, 2013, before the Honorable Morgan Laur Reinman, commencing at 8:40 a.m.

Case # 05-2012-CF-035337-AXXX-XX

RYAN REPORTING REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS

1670 SOUTH FISKE BOULEVARD (321) 636-4450 OFFICE:

ROCKLEDGE, FLORIDA 32955 FAX: (321) 633-0972

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	APPEARING FOR PLAINTIFF
4	
5	JAMES MCMASTER, ESQUIRE Office of the State Attorney
6	2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way Building B
7	Viera, Florida 32940 (321)617-7510
8	
9	
10	APPEARING FOR DEFENDANT
11	RANDALL MOORE, ESQUIRE
12	Assistant Public Defender 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
13	Building E, 2nd Floor Viera, Florida 32910
14	(321)617-7373 (Attorney for Brandon Bradley)
15	
16	
17	
18	* * * *
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

2.2

## PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Please be seated.

MR. MOORE: Can we approach just before we get started?

THE COURT: We can, but give me just a moment. Okay, bench conference.

(Bench conference was held.)

MR. MOORE: Judge Reinman, I -- every time the issue came up of bringing Mr. Bradley over, I was asked if we want him here, and every time I said, We do not want him here. Most recently, it was yesterday or the day before when your JA called and asked if we wanted him here, and I said, No. They brought him over, and I don't want him brought in --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOORE: -- to the courtroom. That's why
I asked that he not be brought over.

THE COURT: And what's it -- I think what -- what's -- I think the State requested that he be present. And what was the purpose of the State requesting that?

MR. MCMASTER: Judge, we just want to put on the record that he's in agreement with the defense's strategy pushing this case for trial in

January. As the Court is aware, the State has filed a notice of intent to seek the death penalty. No death penalty motions have been filed. I don't believe the Court has any hearing time for motions between now and then. The defendant has given a videotape confession to the crime.

There's been no motion to suppress the confession. I just want the record to be extremely clear that the defendant is aware of the strategy being pursued by the defense and is in agreement. I don't know how to do that other than having him present in open court.

MR. MOORE: Well, I can offer this. I've spoken to him, and he's in agreement. I'm representing as his lawyer and as an officer of the court. And he's in agreement with, number one, going to trial January 27th; and, number two, not coming into court today. I've spoken -- I've spoken to him about it. We're keeping him informed about what's going on.

As far as the other issues which we're going to be dealing with, well, we can deal with that when it's appropriate. But the issue, I think, now is that he not be brought in. And the reason is, we've got the entire SWAT Team, lots of deputies.

It's just another perp walk and another media event. And we've got enough -- we're going to have enough problems getting a jury with just the publicity that we've had which has been voluminous.

I mean, ever since a year and a half, it's been front-page news just about every week, at least. We don't need any more of that. And no evidence is going to be presented today, so, I mean, that would change everything. He would have a right to be here then.

We're just talking about a date that we've already set, and I've discussed with him and he's in agreement with it. So the State isn't prejudice here. Their only concern is that Mr. Bradley knows about it and is in agreement with it. I'm representing as his lawyer and an officer of the court that he knows and he agrees.

MR. MCMASTER: My only concern about that —

I don't have any concerns with

Mr. Moore representing. I've never known Mr. Moore
to even exaggerate, let alone, say something false
to the Court. However, my concern is what happens
if Mr. Bradley gets convicted and decides he no
longer in agreement then with the strategy. There
is nothing to prevent Mr. Bradley from making the

accusation that Mr. Moore never consulted him about this, he was not aware of these things, and he is now asserting the ineffective assistance of counsel claim. We have nothing on the record other than Mr. Moore's representation of to what Mr. Bradley says. I think Mr. Bradley needs to be present and the Court needs to inquire.

MR. MOORE: When the -- when the appellate courts you do an ineffective assistance of counsel under Strickland. What they look at is whether the lawyer was deficient and if there's prejudice because of it, not whether the defendant thinks his lawyer was -- was ready -- competent or ready.

It's, in fact, they look at the whole record.

And it's my experience and opinion that we can be and will be ready by January 27th.

Regardless of, you know, hypothetically, whether defendant says, I don't think I'm going to be ready. I don't think my lawyer is going to be ready. I'm the lawyer and I'm saying we will be, and I've discussed it with my client.

THE COURT: Okay. What we'll do for purposes of today, I can have those discussions with Mr. Bradley before the trial. I'll accept the representations today, but you're going to have to

put them on the record that you have conferred with him and that he says -- I mean, he's aware and that he's on board with going to trial on that date.

MR. MOORE: Yes.

THE COURT: I will -- I'm assure the State
that I will, prior to trial -- I mean, at some
point he is going to have to be here. At some
point, he's going to have to be in the courtroom.
I will, prior to that time, inquire of him to make
sure that, you know, that he's -- he's been
informed and that he concurs with the strategy that
the defense has -- is pursuing, but we won't do
that today.

I do have some concerns, I think, that we -if that's the defense's strategy not to have him in
the courtroom, you know, it may be helpful in
picking a jury later on, then I'll accept that for
today. But at some point, he'll have to be brought
and we'll to have address that. But I think we'll
have time to do -- I mean, we will have plenty of
time to do that at a later date in time. So for
purposes of today, he is here.

I did discuss with my deputies that we would do these separately, Kirchner and Bradley separately, the status conference, and that they

would not be brought into the courtroom at the same time. And I did discuss with them and ensure that they didn't see each other at any time today. I thought that was important just for, you know, safety purposes and things of that nature. I think they do that anyway with co-defendants.

Having said that, is there any reason why we can't do them together or is it -- I think now that the case has been severed that we can do them separately?

MR. MCMASTER: Either way, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we'll go ahead and keep them separate, and then I'll tell them that they can take Mr. Bradley downstairs.

MR. MCMASTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you.

(End of bench conference.)

THE COURT: Okay. At this time, we're set for a status conference. We're going to do
Brandon Bradley first. State of Florida versus
Brandon Bradley, Case No. 1235337-A.

And, Mr. Moore, pursuant to the discussions that were held at the bench, it is my understanding that you're going to waive the defendant's appearance here in the court at this time; is that

correct?

MR. MOORE: That is correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So having said that,

Mr. Bradley, I know, is present here for purposes

of these proceedings, but he can be taken back to

the facilities. He's not going to come into the

courtroom.

THE BAILIFF: Okay, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Having said that, we're set for status conference. At this time, the dates that are set before the Court, there's a calendar call on January the 22nd, 2014, at 9:00 a.m. It's set for jury trial for January the 27th, 2014, at 9:00 a.m. Okay, are we proceeding on that? I haven't heard or seen anything else, so I assume we're proceeding on that schedule; is that correct?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Moore, one of the discussions that we held is that you have had discussions with Mr. Bradley with regard to this -- this trial schedule; is that correct?

MR. MOORE: Yes, ma'am, I have.

THE COURT: Okay. Can you --

MR. MOORE: He's in agreement with it. He understands that we feel that it's best, as his

1.3

lawyers, to try it on the schedule that the Court just outlined. And he's in agreement with it, and does not object to that, and that's his position.

THE COURT: Okay. And how long, just for the record, do we anticipate -- and I understand that that's an anticipation -- that we anticipate the trial will take?

MR. MOORE: We would -- we would need a better idea of the number of witnesses the State intends to call from an, approximately, 200 witness list. I know they're not going to call all of those. If we can do that, if the State can narrow that down, even a ballpark figure of how many, approximately, the witnesses on that lengthy list they intend to call, we would have a better idea. I think from our standpoint, we have done probably most of the important witnesses but --

THE COURT: When you say "done," you mean depositions?

MR. MOORE: Depositions, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Of the most important witnesses?

MR. MOORE: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOORE: As far as the length of the trial -- and that goes to pretrial preparations.

1

5 6

7

9

8

11 12

10

14 15

13

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

As far as the length of the trial, if they called every witness, well, you know, it would take a year to try the case. So I think we need to take a look at, approximately, how many witnesses the State feels it needs to call, and then we'll have a better idea.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. McMaster, can you assist the Court with that?

MR. MCMASTER: Judge, I haven't complied the final witness list yet, but I would estimate it's going to be between 30 and 40 witnesses for the State.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have an idea in your mind about how long it will take? And I understand we're -- it's fluid and it could change, I'm just trying to get an idea for scheduling purposes.

MR. MCMASTER: A quess would be between four and five weeks.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Moore, does that sound appropriate?

MR. MOORE: Yes, ma'am.

Now, the purpose of the status THE COURT: conference was to discuss deadlines for things. What is the -- I mean, I don't know the strategy of

the defense. Is there anything you need assistance from the Court from with regard to scheduling deadlines?

MR. MCMASTER: Judge, I believe the depositions have been scheduled. I think we've probably done 60 or 70 depositions already. There are some additional depos that are currently scheduled in November. I don't know if Mr. Moore has any additional witnesses he wants to depose.

He has been attending, or people from the public defender's office have been attending, the depositions scheduled by Mr. Bross's office in Ms. Kirchner's case. The Court has granted the motion to sever. I believe we will be addressing Ms. Kirchner's case shortly. I'm assuming that as it presently stands, we'll be going forward with Mr. Bradley's case first.

THE COURT: Okay. I have no outstanding motions that I'm aware of from either the State or the defense.

Mr. Moore, anything that the defense needs assistance with from the Court?

MR. MOORE: No. But I can tell the Court that the death penalty motions are being prepared.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOORE: And they will be filed by the 1st of October.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOORE: And we intend to file a motion to suppress, and that will be filed by the middle of October. We'll try to do it sooner than that, but I think that will be our goal. And we could get — if the Court can give us some time now before the Court's schedule fills up, that would be, I think, ideal. We would need half a day for the death penalty motions, if that, and any other pretrial motions not related to the motion to suppress.

so if we do non-death penalty motions and -rather not if we do death penalty motions and any
other motions unrelated to the motion to suppress,
that would take half a day, at least. As far as
the motion to suppress, I think the Court is going
to have to -- well, I know the Court is going to
have to watch and listen to the statement by
Mr. Bradley. And that plus the testimony and
argument would take about a day and a half.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is -- I can't give you those times today, but I can work with my schedule and try to see what I can come up with.

But you're saying non-death penalty motions, I

heard half a day?

MR. MOORE: Death penalty motions and any other motions other than the motion to suppress.

The motion to suppress would take a day and a half, I think. And then all other motions would take about half a day.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're saying death penalty motions and non-death penalty motions, except for the motion to suppress, will take a half a day?

MR. MCMASTER: I don't think he has any non-death penalty motions except the motion to suppress.

MR. MOORE: I'm talking about the motion in limine.

THE COURT: I mean, I assume there might be some of those.

MR. MOORE: And those always -- normally, we don't hear those until at jury selection or after the jury is selected. But there may be some items that we want to resolve early rather than wait until the end, so that's why I'm asking --

THE COURT: And I'd rather you do that.

MR. MOORE: Sure.

THE COURT: If you know, I'd rather you do

that.

MR. MOORE: We do, yeah.

THE COURT: So you think those will take -the death penalty motions and the non-death penalty
motions combined will take a half a day?

MR. MOORE: At the most.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. McMaster?

MR. MCMASTER: I'm just trying to remember how long his statement is, hour and a half?

MR. MOORE: A couple of hours. But related to that -- and I don't want to get too far off track here -- most of the time he's sleeping, and I think we can agree that those parts don't need to be watched by the Court. We can stipulate and to have the Court consider that stipulation.

MR. MCMASTER: Okay. We can work that out.

MR. MOORE: The part the Court needs to see will probably be two or three hours. And what we'll need to do is do it in court so we can guide the Court as to where we think the Court ought to be.

THE COURT: So you think it will take longer than half a day?

MR. MCMASTER: I don't know, Judge, I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'll work on carving this time out for you. I'm not sure it will get done in 2013.

MR. MCMASTER: Judge, that's what my concern was. I know that in our Woodward case, the Court has just set a hearing on Mr. Woodward's stand-your-ground motion for January 10th. So that's what my concern was, that we have a calendar call for January 22nd. I don't know how the Court is going to hear all of these things and issue a ruling before the case would be called up for trial.

THE COURT: I'll have to -- this is the first that I've heard this, so I'll have to get with -- I don't do that scheduling myself, so I have to get with my judicial assistant and see what the schedule looks like. If it's going to be an issue, then, obviously, I'll get back with everyone. But at this time, I mean, I'll have to look at the schedule. And if it does, I mean, I think you all have been more than accommodating. If I say this is when it is, then that's when we need to do it because that will probably be the only time I have. So we'll see what we come up with.

Anything else?

MR. MOORE: Not from our side. 1 2 THE COURT: Mr. McMaster? MR. MCMASTER: No, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'll work on this, I 4 5 will get back with you. If it's an issue, then 6 I'll set a hearing or set some time to discuss it 7 further. If it's not, I'll give you the dates. 8 MR. MOORE: Fair enough. 9 THE COURT: Do you think that we need --10 other than scheduling these, do you think we need 11 another status conference? MR. MOORE: That would be a good idea, I 12 think, sure. Maybe mid-October? 13 THE COURT: All right. I'll work on that 14 15 too. MR. MOORE: And if all we're doing is a 16 1.7 status hearing again, I'd request that Mr. Bradley not be brought over. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 MR. MOORE: And if he changes his mind, I will be the first to tell the Court. 21 22 THE COURT: Okay. So you're representing that he knows that you -- that you're waiving his 23 appearance? You've discussed with him waiving his 24 appearance for purposes of today, and he agrees 25

with that?

weekend.

MR. MOORE: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Then that concludes the status conference with regard to Mr. Bradley. Just so everyone knows, it's the State's intention to try Mr. Bradley first before Ms. Kirchner based on the Court's ruling on the motion to sever.

Okay, then we can address -- we can address Ms. Kirchner.

MR. MOORE: Can we be excused?

THE COURT: You sure may. Have a good