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,

Case # 05-2012-CF-035337-AXXX-XX
Document Page # 422

versus

BRANDON LEE BRADLEY

Defendant,

ORIGINAL

BR.

III JUL 25 A II: 4

VOLUME VII OF XV

TRANSCRIPT OF DIGITAL RECORDED JURY TRIAL,

SPENCER HEARING AND SENTENCING

The transcript of the Digital Recorded Proceedings taken in the above-styled cause, at the Moore Justice Center, 2825 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera, Florida, on the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 26th, 27th, 28th and 31st day of March, the 1st, 3rd, 4th and 8th day of April, 2014 (Trial), the 5th day of June, 2014 (Spencer Hearing), and the 27th day of June, 2014 (Sentencing), before the Honorable Morgan Reinman.

RYAN REPORTING
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS

1670 S. FISKE BOULEVARD

Page 1202 1 APPEARANCES 2 THOMAS BROWN, ESQ., 3 and JAMES MCMASTER, ESQ., 4 Assistant State Attorneys State Attorney's Office 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way 5 Building D. Viera, Florida 32940 Appearing for 6 Plaintiff 7 8 J. RANDALL MOORE, ESQ., MICHAEL PIROLO, ESQ, 9 and MARK LANNING, ESQ., 10 Assistant Public Defender Public Defender's Office 11 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way Building E Viera, Florida 32940 12 Appearing for Defendant 13 14 Brandon Lee Bradley, Defendant, present 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

		Page 1203
1	INDEX	
2	PROCEEDINGS:	
3	March 18, 2014	22 275
4	March 19, 2014 March 20, 2014	465
5	March 21, 2014 March 26, 2014	755 990
6	March 27, 2014 March 28, 2014	1293 1479
7	March 31, 2014 April 1, 2014	1570 1899
8	April 3, 2014 April 4, 2014	2076 2475 2651
9	April 8, 2014 June 5, 2014	2860 2876
10	June 27, 2014	2070
11	MOTION TESTIMONY:	
12	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
13	ROBERT MARKS: (Proffer)	
14	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	24 35
15	Cross Examination by Mr. Moore	33
16	ANDRIA KERCHNER: (Proffer)	
17	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	43 51
18	Cross Examination by Mr. Moore	21
19	JEFFREY DIEGUEZ: (Proffer)	
20	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	58
21	Cross Examination by Mr. Moore	66
22	TRIAL	
23	JURY SWORN:	140
24		
25	INDEX	

			Page 1204
	1	INDEX	
•	2	RULE OF SEQUESTRATION:	142
	3	OPENING STATEMENT:	
	4	By Mr. McMaster By Mr. Pirolo	156 189
	5	By MI. FIIOIO	109
	6	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
	7	CHARLES COLON:	
	8	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	224
	9	ROBERT MARKS:	
	10	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	237
	11	JAMES SEATON:	
	12 13	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster Voir Dire Examination by Mr. Moore Continued Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	249 253 257
	14	AGENT CRAIG CARSON:	
	15	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	260
	16	CHRISTOPHER MONTESANO:	
	17	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	290
	18	Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo Redirect Examination by Mr. Brown	298 302
	19	ANDREW JORDAN:	
	20	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo	303 343
	21	Redirect Examination by Mr. Brown	348
	22	Recross Examination by Mr. Pirolo	349
	23		
.,	24		
	25	INDEX	

	-			
			Page	1205
	1	I N D E X		
	2	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:		
	3	VANESSA MCNERNEY:		
	4	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo		351 369
	5	Redirect Examination by Mr. Brown		374
	6	TAMMY BROWN:		
	7	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown Cross Examination by Mr. Lanning		376 383
	8	Redirect Examination by Mr. Brown Recross Examination by Mr. Lanning		384 384
	9	Recloss Examinacion by Hi. Danning		J04
	10	MOHAMMAD MALIK:		
	11	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo		385 398
	12	CLOSS HAMMINGCION BY THE TITOTO		
·	13	AGENT CRAIG CARSON:		
	14	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster Cross Examination by Mr. Moore		428 435
	15	Redirect Examination by Mr. McMaster		437
	16	SERGEANT DARRYL OSBORNE:		
	17	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		438
	18	MAJOR BRUCE BARNETT:		
	19	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		446
	20	AGENT BRIAN STOLL:		
	21	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster Cross Examination by Mr. Moore		451 454
	22			
	23			
	24			
	25	INDEX		

			Page	1206
	1	INDEX		
	2	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:		
	3	SERGEANT TERRANCE LAUFENBERG:		
	4	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		455
	5	Continued Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		477
	6	AGENT FRANCES DUFRESNE:		
	7	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		481
	8	CORPORAL BRAD CERVI:		
	9	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		488
	10	Cross Examination by Mr. Lanning Redirect Examination by Mr. McMaster		495 499
	11	Recross Examination by Mr. Lanning		501
	12	DEPUTY JAMES TROUP:		
<i>3</i> →	13	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		502
	14	Voir Dire Examination by Mr. Moore Continued Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		523 532
	15	AGENT DON REYNOLDS:		
	16	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		551
	17	Cross Examination by Mr. Lanning Redirect Examination by Mr. McMaster		567 572
	18	Recross Examination by Mr. Lanning		575
	19	JEFFREY DIEGUEZ:		
	20	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster		577
	21	Cross Examination by Mr. Lanning Redirect Examination by Mr. McMaster		583 643
	22	Recross Examination by Mr. Lanning		644
	23			
)	24			
	25	INDEX		

			Page 1207
	1	INDEX	
	2	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
	3	TRISTA LOWMAN:	
	4	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	647 653
	5	Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo	033
	6	DEPUTY VICTOR VELEZ:	
	7	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	656
	8	DETECTIVE GREG GUILLETTE:	
	9	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	662
	10	ANDRIA KERSCHNER:	
	11	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo	676 692
	12	Redirect Examination by Mr. Brown	739 746
	13	Recross Examination by Mr. Pirolo	740
	14	OFFICER DERRICK MIDDENDORF:	
	15	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	758
	16	SERGEANT MICHAEL CASEY:	
	17	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	769
	18	GERARD WEBER:	
	19	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	781
	20	SERGEANT TREVOR SHAFFER:	
	21	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	793
	22		
	23		
z f	24		
	25	INDEX	

			Page 1208
	1	INDEX	
	2	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
	3	DETECTIVE CHAD COOPER:	
	4	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster Cross Examination by Mr. Lanning	830 851
	5		
	6	SERGEANT JEFF RAU:	
	7	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster Cross Examination by Mr. Moore	854 862
	_	OFFICED TENNITEED AMNIEUG.	
	9	OFFICER JENNIFER AMNEUS:	
	10	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	864
	11	MICHAEL RYLE:	
	12	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	872
	13	ANDREA ZIARNO:	
	14	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	890
	15	CSI LISA CONNORS:	
	16	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster Cross Examination by Mr. Lanning	893 901
	17	Redirect Examination by Mr. McMaster	903
	18	CSI JENNIFER MILLER:	
	19	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo	905 915
	20	Cross Examinación by Mr. Filoro	919
	21		
	22		
	23		
. 1	24		
	25	INDEX	

		Page 1209
1	INDEX	
2	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
3	CSI STEPHANNIE COOPER:	
4	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	916
5	Cross Examination by Mr. Lanning Redirect Examination by Mr. McMaster	977 985
6	Recross Examination by Mr. Lanning	987
7	AGENT DANIEL OGDEN:	
8	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	993
9	OFFICER RON STREIFF:	
10	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	997
11	AMY SIEWERT:	
12	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	1024
13	CST VIRGINIA CASEY:	
14	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	1053
15	Cross Examination by Mr. Lanning	1076
16	SERGEANT BLAKE LANZA:	
17	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	1081
18	Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo Redirect Examination by Mr. Brown	1086 1086
19	DEPUTY MICHAEL THOMAS:	
20	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	1088
21	Cross Examination by Mr. Moore Redirect Examination by Mr. Brown	1091 1093
22	Recross Examination by Mr. Moore	1093
23		
24		
25	INDEX	

. .)

		Page 1210
1	INDEX	
2	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
3	SAJID QAISER, M.D.:	
4	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	1102
5	Cross Examination by Mr. Moore	1129
6	AGENT WAYNE SIMOCK:	
7	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	1137
8	Cross Examination by Mr. Moore Redirect Examination by Mr. Brown	1249 1279
9	Recross Examination by Mr. Moore	1285
10	AMANDA OZBURN: (Proffer)	
11	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	1302
12	Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo	1315
13	AMANDA OZBURN:	
14	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	1327
15	Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo Redirect Examination by Mr. McMaster	1332 1343
16	Recross Examination by Mr. Pirolo	1343
17	CORY CRUMBLEY:	
18	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	1346
19	STATE RESTS:	1372
20	MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL:	1373
21	DEFENSE WITNESSES:	
22	RAVEN DUROUSSEAU:	
23	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	1398
24		
25	INDEX	

		Page 1211
1	INDEX	
2	DEFENSE WITNESSES:	
3	DAVID MCGUINNESS:	
4	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	1426
5	Cross Examination by Mr. Brown	1429
6	LINDA SULLIVAN:	
7	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	1430
8	Cross Examination by Mr. McMaster Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore	1452 1455
9	Recross Examination by Mr. McMaster	1457
10	OFFICER CASSANDRA WORONKA:	
11	Direct Examination by Mr. Lanning	1503
12	Cross Examination by Mr. Brown Redirect Examination by Mr. Lanning	1505 1505
13	DR. SUSAN SKOLLY-DANZIGER:	
14	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	1509 1544
15	Cross Examination by Mr. McMaster Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore	1544
16	DR. JACQUELYN OLANDER:	
17	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	1593 1672
18	Cross Examination by Mr. Brown Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore	1697
19	DEFENSE RESTS:	1720
20	RENEWED MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL:	1720
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	INDEX	

		Page 1212
1	INDEX	
2	STATE'S REBUTTAL WITNESSES:	
3	DR. BRUCE GOLDBERGER:	
4 5	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster Cross Examination by Mr. Moore Redirect Examination by Mr. McMaster	1721 1754 1767
6	DR. PATRICIA ZAPF:	
7 8 9	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown Cross Examination by Mr. Moore Redirect Examination by Mr. Brown Recross Examination by Mr. Moore	1768 1797 1839 1843
10	STATE RESTS:	1852
11	RENEWAL MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL:	1854
12		
13	CHARGE CONFERENCE:	1857
14	CLOSING ARGUMENTS:	
15 16	By Mr. Brown By Mr. Lanning By Ms. McMaster	1903 1955 1973
17	JURY CHARGE:	1998
18	VERDICT:	2070
19	JURY POLLED:	2072
20	PENALTY PHASE:	
21	OPENING STATEMENT:	
22	By Mr. Brown By Mr. Moore	2286 2295
24		
25	INDEX	

		Page 1213
1	INDEX	1090 1110
2	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
3	CHARLES COLON:	
4	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	2303
5	GARY SHREWSBURY:	
6 7	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster Cross Examination by Mr. Pirolo	2308 2315
8	OFFICER WILLIAM GLEASON:	
9	Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	2319
10	Voir Dire Examination by Mr. Pirolo	2324
11	JEREMY PILL:	
12	Direct Examination by Mr. Brown	2325
13	STATE RESTS:	2328
14	MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL:	2328
15		
16	DEFENSE WITNESSES:	
17	CASEY GREEN:	
18	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	2331
19	JULIE MARTIN:	
20	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	2338
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	INDEX	

		Page 1214
1	I N D E X	
2	DEFENSE WITNESSES:	:
3	DR. JOSEPH WU:	
4 5	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore Cross Examination by Mr. McMaster Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore	2347 2431 2466
6	DR. JACQUELYN OLANDER:	
7 8 9	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore Cross Examination by Mr. Brown Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore Recross Examination by Mr. Brown Further Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore	2487 2499 2535 2554 2556
10	CARRIE ELLISON:	
11	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	2566
12	Cross Examination by Mr. McMaster Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore	2578 2580
13		
14	LAWRENCE KEITH NELSON:	
15 16	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore Cross Examination by Mr. Brown Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore	2582 2592 2593
17	ANTHONY NELSON:	200
18	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	2594
19	RONALD MCANDREW: (Proffer)	
20	Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	2637
21	DEFENSE RESTS:	2708
22	CHARGE CONFERENCE:	2658
23		
24		
25	INDEX	

	Page 1215
INDEX	
CLOSING ARGUMENTS:	
By Mr. McMaster	2708
By Mr. Moore	2751
JURY CHARGE:	2793
QUESTIONS:	2834
	2839 2842
VERDICT:	2848
JURY POLLED:	2849
SPENCER HEARING:	2860
PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
BERNIE BOLTE:	
Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	2868
BERRY BOLTE:	
Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	2870
STEVEN PILL:	
Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster	2871
SENTENCING HEARING:	2876
INDEX	
	CLOSING ARGUMENTS: By Mr. McMaster By Mr. Moore JURY CHARGE: QUESTIONS: VERDICT: JURY POLLED: SPENCER HEARING: PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES: BERNIE BOLTE: Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster BERRY BOLTE: Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster STEVEN PILL: Direct Examination by Mr. McMaster SENTENCING HEARING:

	<u>,</u>		·····	
				Page 1216
1		INDEX		
2	PLAINTIF:	F'S EXHIBITS:		
3			MARKED	
4	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	FOR ID	RECEIVED
4				
5	1 2	Arrest Warrant Arrest Warrant	A B	232 232
6	3	Arrest Warrant	C	232
	4	Amended Arrest Warrant	D	234
7	5	Amended Arrest Warrant	E	234
	6	Copy of Driver's License	F	236
8	7	Application	FZ	257
	8	Photograph	DX	258
9	9	Diagram	H	292
	10	Diagram	J	306
10	11	Registration Documents	AL	307
	12	Photograph	DD	313
11	13	Photograph	DE	313
	14	Photograph	K	322
12	15	Photograph	L	322
	16	Photograph	М	322
13	17	Photograph	N	322
	18	Photograph	0	322
14	19	Photograph	P	326
4 -	20	Photograph	Q	326
15	21	Photograph	R	326
1.0	22	Photograph	S	326
16	23	Photograph	T	326
1 77	24	Photograph	U	326
17	25	Photo Lineup Instructions	AF	339
1.0	26	Photo Lineup	AG	339
18	27	Photo Lineup	AH	339
19	28	Photo Lineup Instructions	Z	368
19	29	Photo Lineup	AA	368
20	30	Photo Lineup	AB T	368
20	31	CD	I	392
21	32	List of Property	V	393
Z T	33	Photo Lineup Instructions	AI	396
22	34	Photo Lineup	AJ	396
22	35 36	Photo Lineup	AK	396
23	36 37	Photograph	GA	435
دے	37 38	Photograph	AN	458
24	38	Photograph	AO	458
25		INDEX		

				Page 1217
1		INDEX		
2	PLAINTIF	F'S EXHIBITS:		
3	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	MARKED FOR ID	RECEIVED
4	NOMBER	DESCRIPTION	TON ID	KECHIVED
5	39 40	Photograph Photograph	AP AQ	458 458
6	41	Aerial Diagram	G	507
١	42	DVD	AT	531
7	43	DVD	AU	531
′	44	Photograph	FI	532
8	45	Phone Record	BJ	558
٥	46	Diagram	AX	562
9	47	Photograph	AW	672
ا	48	DISC	GB	672
10	49	Driver's License Photo	AM	785
10	50		AY AY	788
11	50 51	Photograph	AI AZ	788
ㅗㅗ	51 52	Photograph Photograph	BA	788
12	53	Photograph	BB	788
12	54	Photograph	BC	788
13	55	Photograph	BD	788
10	56	Photograph	BE	788
14	57	Photograph	BF	788
T.4	5 <i>7</i> 58	Photograph	BG	788
15	59	Photograph	BH	788
10	60	DVD	BL	841
16	61	DVD	BK	883
10	62	Medical Records	FG	893
17	63	Diagram	BZ	897
Ι,	64	Diagram	BM	907
18	65	Photograph	BN	909
10	66	Photograph	ВО	909
19	67	Photograph	BP	909
	68	Photograph	BQ	909
20	69	Photograph	BR	909
	70	Photograph	BS	909
21	71	Photograph	BT	909
	72	Photograph	BU	909
22	73	Photograph	BV	909
	74	Photograph	BW	909
23	75	Photograph	BX	909
	76 76	Photograph	BY	909
24		_ 110 0 0 9 1 0 1 11	<u>~</u> ~	2 0 0
25		INDEX		

Γ

	Γ					
						Page 1218
	1			I N D E X		
	2	PLAINTIF	F'S EXHIBITS:			
	3				MARKED	
	4	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION		FOR ID	RECEIVED
	5	77	Photograph		CC	922
		78	Photograph		CD	922
	6	79	Photograph		CE	922
		80	Photograph		CF	922
	7	81	Photograph		CG	922
		82	Photograph		СН	922
	8	83	Photograph		CI	922
		84	Photograph		CJ	922
	9	85	Photograph		CK	922
	1	86	Photograph		CL	922
	10	87	Photograph		CM	922
		88	Photograph		CN	922
	11	89	Photograph		CO	922
		90	Photograph		CP	922
	12	91	Photograph		CQ	922
		92	Photograph		CR	922
-	13	93	Photograph		CS	922
		94	Photograph		DC	938
	14	95	Photograph		DF	938
		96	Photograph		DG	938
-	15	97	Photograph		DH	938
		98	Photograph		DI	938
•	16	99	Photograph		DJ	938
	_	100	Photograph		DK 	938
:	17	101	Photograph		DL	938
		102	Photograph		DM	938
	18	103	Photograph		DN	938
		104	Photograph		DO	938
-	19	105	Photograph		DP	938
	_	106	Photograph		DR	938
•	20	107	Photograph		DS	938
	_	108	Photograph		DT	938
•	21	109	Photograph		DU	938
	ا م	110	Photograph		DV	938
•	22	111	Photograph		DW	938
	23	112	Photograph		DY	938
-	24					
:	25			INDEX		

				Page 1219
1		INDEX		
2	PLAINTIF	F'S EXHIBITS:		
3			MARKED	
4	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	FOR ID	RECEIVED
5	113	Photograph	DZ	938
	114	Photograph	EA	938
6	115	Photograph	EB EC	938 938
7	116 117	Photograph Room Key	EC FE	948
_	118	Room Key Sleeve	GC	952
8	119	Cartridge	EE EG	958 958
9	120 121	Cartridge Magazine	EG EH	958
٦	122	Cartridges	EI	958
10	123	Cartridge	EJ	958
	124	Firearm	ED	964
11	125	Ammunition Box w/ Cartri	idges EN	966
	126	Fingerprint Cards	GD	970
12	127	Fingerprint Cards	GE 5-	970
10	128	Cell Phone	BI	1023
13	129 130	Magazine Fired Bullet	EF CT	1029 1033
14	131	Fired Bullet	FA	1035
	132	Fired Bullet	FC	1037
15	133	Fired Bullet	FH	1038
	134	Fired Bullet Jacket	EL	1039
16	135	Jacket Fragment	FB	1043
	136	Jacket Fragment	CU	1045
17	137	Piece of Lead	EM	1048
4.0	138	Fired Cartridge Case	EK	1050
18	139	Fired Cartridge Case	CV	1050
19	140	Fired Cartridge Case	CW	1050 1050
19	141 142	Fired Cartridge Case Fired Cartridge Case	CX CY	1050
20	143	Fired Cartridge Case	CZ	1050
20	144	Fired Cartridge Case	DA	1050
21	145	Fired Cartridge Case	DB	1050
	146	Fingerprint Examplars	GF	1063
22	147	Fingerprint Images	GI	1065
	148	Fingerprint Images	GH	1065
23			÷	
24				
25		INDEX		

				Page 1220
1	ĺ	INDEX		
2	PLAINTIF	F'S EXHIBITS:		
3			MARKED	
4	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	FOR ID	RECEIVED
5	149	Chart	GG	1067
)	150	Photograph	FJ	1110
6	151 152	Swab Swab	FK FL	1110 1110
7	153	Fingernail Clippings	FM	1110
0	154	Fingernail Clippings	FN	1110
8	155 156	Photograph Photograph	FO FP	1110 1110
9	157	Photograph	FQ	1110
_	158	Photograph	FR	1110
10	159	Photograph	FS	1110
11	160 161	Photograph	FT FU	1110 1110
ТТ	161	Photograph Photograph	FV	1110
12	163	Photograph	FW	1110
	164	Photograph	FX	1110
13	165	DVD	GJ	1149
	166	Buccal Swab	CA	1353
14	167	Buccal Swab	CB 	1353
1 F	168	DNA Card	FD	1353
15	169	Swab	EU	1354 1354
16	170 171	Swab Swab	EW ET	1354 1357
10	172	Swab	EV	1357
17	173	Swab	ΕX	1357
	174	Swab	EY	1357
18	175	Swab	ΕZ	1357
	176	Swab	EO	1358
19	177	Swab	EP	1358
	178	Swab	ES	1361
20	179	Swab	ER	1365
0.1	180	Swab	EQ	1366
21	181	Certified Conviction	GK CT	1851 1851
22	182 183	Certified Conviction Certified Conviction	GL GM	1851 1851
44	184	Certified Judgment	GN GN	2305
23	104	Cercified oddyment	OTA.	200
24				
25		I N D E X		

				Page 1221		
1		INDEX				
2	PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS:					
3	MINIDED	ED DEGCRIPHION	MARKED			
4	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	FOR ID	RECEIVED		
5	185	Certified Judgment	GP	2305		
6	186 187	Certified Judgment Photograph	GO GQ	2305 2323		
7	DEFENDAN	T'S EXHIBITS:				
8	NUMBER	DECCDIDETON	MARKED	DECETTED.		
9	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	FOR ID	RECEIVED		
10	1	Vials of Blood	A B	1444 1477		
11	2 3	Litigation Package DVD Power-point Presentation	I J	2360		
12	4 5	Power-point Presentation Photograph	F	2373 2691		
13	6 7	Photograph Photograph	G H	2691 2691		
14						
15		* * * *				
16						
17	·					
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

AGENT SPADAFORA: Jeff is -- did you call anybody by the name of Jeff? Did you make any phone calls after the deputy was shot?

MR. BRADLEY: Not that I know of.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Is it possible you could have and don't remember?

MR. BRADLEY: Could have.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Who would you have called if you -- if you remember going to make a phone call, and that's a very stressful thing for you that just happened, who do you think you would have called under that -- who would be the first person you would call under that circumstance?

MR. BRADLEY: My mom.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Your mom. Okay. Who else would be next? Would you call anybody else?

MR. BRADLEY: You thinking like I'm like yeah,
I just did this.

AGENT SPADAFORA: No, no, I'm not saying that. I mean, to me I'd call and say, hey, what do I do, I don't know what to do. I don't know what you talked about.

AGENT SIMOCK: Maybe look for some guidance.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Yeah.

MR. BRADLEY: My mom, you feeling me. If I did

call (unintelligible) I call my mom. 1 2 AGENT SIMOCK: And when you got this truck from 3 the white quy, where did you get it from? MR. BRADLEY: Cocoa. AGENT SIMOCK: Do you know where in Cocoa? 5 MR. BRADLEY: Huh-uh. If you get my pants or 6 7 whatever, you can get everything. AGENT SIMOCK: And if I ask him did he borrow 8 your truck he's going to say yeah? 9 10 MR. BRADLEY: Hmm? AGENT SIMOCK: If I go and I look at the 11 paperwork that you have in your pants and I call that 12 13 quy up, the white, he's going to say yeah, he let you 14 borrow it? MR. BRADLEY: No, he's going to say I bought 15 16 it. AGENT SIMOCK: Is he going to say you borrowed 17 18 it? 19 MR. BRADLEY: I bought it. 20 AGENT SIMOCK: No, you bought it or borrowed 21 it? MR. BRADLEY: Bought it like --22 23 AGENT SIMOCK: He lent it? 24 AGENT SPADAFORA: No, he bought it. 25 AGENT SIMOCK: You bought it?

AGENT SPADAFORA: Purchased it. 1 AGENT SIMOCK: Oh, you purchased it. 2 3 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, that one thing, I got the --4 5 AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. MR. BRADLEY: -- insurance and all that. 6 AGENT SIMOCK: How much did you pay for it? 7 MR. BRADLEY: Five hundred. 8 AGENT SIMOCK: Five hundred bucks. What year 9 is that? 10 MR. BRADLEY: '03 I think. 11 AGENT SIMOCK: '03. How long have you had it? 12 13 MR. BRADLEY: Like maybe about two weeks. 14 AGENT SIMOCK: Two weeks. Okay. So, you bought it for five hundred bucks you say. 15 16 MR. BRADLEY: Um-hmm. AGENT SPADAFORA: Okay. So, the guy's name is 17 18 in your pocket? 19 MR. BRADLEY: It is in my pocket. 20 AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. You never 21 switched -- did you switch anything over into your name? 22 23 MR. BRADLEY: Hmm? AGENT SIMOCK: You didn't switch anything over, 24 the insurance and all that? 25

MR. BRADLEY: No.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Okay. And I'm going to go back. Now, you made -- did you make -- I'm going to go back and ask you again. Did you make any phone calls during that timeframe that we talked about between the hotel and the time you were stopped and arrested?

MR. BRADLEY: Like I said, (unintelligible).

AGENT SPADAFORA: Right.

MR. BRADLEY: I can't tell you.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Okay.

MR. BRADLEY: If I did, you say I did, I guess I did.

AGENT SIMOCK: You said you called your mom?

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, my mom.

AGENT SIMOCK: What did you say to her? I mean, I don't know, what did you say to your mom?

MR. BRADLEY: I did some shit.

AGENT SIMOCK: What did you tell her you did?

MR. BRADLEY: I don't want to talk about it.

I'm going to go to jail and all this and that. She's know what time it is, but I don't know what all that other shit.

AGENT SIMOCK: Did you tell her you were scared, sorry?

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, she know all that. 1 2 AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. 3 4 5 see me do good. 6 7 8 9 else? 10 MR. BRADLEY: Mad I guess. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BRADLEY: I cried (unintelligible). cry about my baby mama, I cry to my mama, she want to AGENT SIMOCK: What did your mom say? MR. BRADLEY: That I'm stupid. AGENT SIMOCK: All right. Did she say anything AGENT SPADAFORA: We came and talked, is there anything that we -- that you feel is important that we should know that we didn't ask you that you think that maybe we should know about you, about your girlfriend, about this whole situation that you think is important that we should know? MR. BRADLEY: Beside got in a beef with people (unintelligible), shit, that's not the only, only, only reason, I ain't going back, besides that. AGENT SPADAFORA: Now, did you go -- let me ask another question. Did you go in anybody's garage, stop and go in anybody's garage to get a phone or anything?

> MR. BRADLEY: In the garage?

I'm asking. I'm asking. AGENT SPADAFORA:

1 MR. BRADLEY: I tell you no. 2 AGENT SPADAFORA: No. Okay. All right. 3 AGENT SIMOCK: We were talking a little bit to 4 Andria and she had mentioned giving you some money 5 for your gun. She said you bought it, she said she 6 gave you money and is that the money you gave to the 7 baser for the gun? 8 AGENT SPADAFORA: She told us she earned money 9 by dancing. She said she works --10 MR. BRADLEY: That's true. 11 AGENT SPADAFORA: She earned money by dancing, 12 she gave you some money to get the gun is she told 13 us. 14 MR. BRADLEY: Well, that ain't that bad. 15 AGENT SPADAFORA: I'm sorry, that is isn't 16 that? 17 MR. BRADLEY: Huh-uh. 18 AGENT SPADAFORA: That's not true. 19 MR. BRADLEY: Well, it's true, she did give me 20 money (unintelligible). Please. No, no, no. 21 AGENT SIMOCK: Listen, she told us. It's not 22 something that we're not -- something that she didn't 23 say to us. 24 MR. BRADLEY: I'm talking about LJ.

AGENT SIMOCK: Everything is true. You're

talking about LJ, what about LJ?

MR. BRADLEY: She told you about her? Did she tell you about him. That her boyfriend had -- I wish I had my phone talking about he going to shoot my girl (unintelligible) saying he going to shoot (unintelligible) he going to run down, ain't no rapping, you hear me. Her brother got killed.

THE WITNESS: She told us that.

MR. BRADLEY: I'm like her protector,

(unintelligible), you feeling me, and that's real and

(unintelligible) nobody that I love and me not do

nothing about it or say this and that, that ain't me.

AGENT SIMOCK: So, here's what I'm asking,
Brandon. LJ was threatening Andria and you, and you.

MR. BRADLEY: (Unintelligible), all of them.

AGENT SIMOCK: So, from her dancing money she gave you money to get a gun from baser or whenever you could get one, not necessarily that she said go get it from a baser, but is that true? Is she telling us the truth?

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah.

AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. And is that the gun that she gave you the money for that it's a week ago that you got that gun from the baser?

MR. BRADLEY: No.

AGENT SIMOCK: Or was it longer than that that 1 2 you had it? 3 MR. BRADLEY: Which one? The one that was used today for 4 AGENT SIMOCK: 5 the deputy, that you shoot the deputy with? MR. BRADLEY: Don't say it like that. 6 I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I don't 7 AGENT SIMOCK: know how else to say it. It's hard for me. She's a 8 friend of all of ours. 9 MR. BRADLEY: I know she is, (unintelligible), 10 I can understand it. 11 AGENT SIMOCK: But is that true? 12 13 MR. BRADLEY: That and that gun but she felt like she needed protected and I ain't going to let 14 her go no where without it. 15 AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. All right. Okay. 16 MR. BRADLEY: (Unintelligible). I feel sorry 17 for the lady and I ain't just saying it just to say 18 it but I'll say it. 19 AGENT SIMOCK: How many times do you think you 20 shot her? 21 MR. BRADLEY: I swear to god I heard two shots. 22 AGENT SIMOCK: Do you remember where on her 23 24 body you shot her? 25 MR. BRADLEY: Huh?

AGENT SIMOCK: Do you remember where you shot 1 her? I know it's hard. 2 MR. BRADLEY: I feel like in the chest. 3 AGENT SIMOCK: In the chest. Is that the only 4 place you shot her? 5 MR. BRADLEY: That's what I'm saying, I 6 7 remember the whole barge in. AGENT SIMOCK: When you shot her, was the 8 door -- was it through the open door, through the 9 window, through the door? 10 MR. BRADLEY: When I opened the door, that's 11 when she went like this. 12 13 AGENT SIMOCK: So, the door was opened and 14 that's where you shot her through the opening of the door? 15 MR. BRADLEY: Um-hmm. 16 17 AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. 1.8 AGENT SPADAFORA: I want to understand you and 19 know you a little bit. MR. BRADLEY: Um-hmm. 20 AGENT SPADAFORA: You said that you went to 21 school with is it Adrian (sic.)? 22 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. 23 24 AGENT SPADAFORA: What school did you go to?

MR. BRADLEY: Eau Gallie, Johnson.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Eau Gallie and Johnson. Did 1 2 you finish high school? 3 MR. BRADLEY: Um-hmm. 4 AGENT SPADAFORA: You graduated? Okay. Now, did you ever play football? 5 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, I played football. 6 7 AGENT SPADAFORA: Did you ever play any other 8 sports? 9 MR. BRADLEY: No. AGENT SPADAFORA: Okay. Did you ever suffer 10 any head injuries? Do you take any medication for 11 memory loss or do you have any disabilities? 12 13 were you ever diagnosed by a doctor who said, hey, man, you're not right? Or you're just like a normal 14 15 quy? MR. BRADLEY: I don't know (unintelligible). 16 17 He's paying for it though. AGENT SPADAFORA: What's that? 18 19 MR. BRADLEY: It appears I don't even remember half of it. 20 AGENT SPADAFORA: Have you ever been prescribed 21 anything by a doctor that says you need medication so 22 you can function as a normal person or you just 23 24 normal like the rest of us?

MR. BRADLEY: Xanax and shit.

AGENT SPADAFORA: By a doctor? For what? Why are you prescribed Xanax?

MR. BRADLEY: Anxiety.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Anxiety. Okay. Have you been diagnosed with anything for this anxiety? What causes it? Did they tell you why you have anxiety?

MR. BRADLEY: Just too hyper.

AGENT SPADAFORA: You're just two hyper?

MR. BRADLEY: Not in a bad way, just like --

AGENT SPADAFORA: Not in a bad way?

MR. BRADLEY: I got to be maintained.

AGENT SPADAFORA: When you say hyper, is that like I can't sit still and he's always got to be doing something? How do you mean hyper? I mean, there's different things of hyper, hyperness I should say.

MR. BRADLEY: I'm just saying I eat a lot of lot of candy.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Eat a lot of candy. Okay. All right. And that's why they gave you the Xanax because you eat a lot of candy?

MR. BRADLEY: No, not that.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Okay.

MR. BRADLEY: I'm just saying I eat a lot of candy and shit.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Okay. Okay. When you -- if you take the prescribed amount of Xanax, would it make you like, I don't know, do something you normally wouldn't do like jump off a building or?

MR. BRADLEY: Do anything (unintelligible), you read the bottle you're supposed to take two and don't think. (Unintelligible) whatever you want, I probably pop like four or five.

AGENT SPADAFORA: When was the last time you got a prescription filled from your doc for Xanax?

MR. BRADLEY: I ain't get a script, I got it from somebody else.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Okay. So, did the doctor ever prescribed you or you just take it because it makes you feel better?

MR. BRADLEY: Makes me feel better.

AGENT SPADAFORA: So, the doctor never prescribed it for you, you just take it because it makes you feel better?

MR. BRADLEY: Um-hmm.

AGENT SPADAFORA: Okay. All right. So, you don't suffer from -- you haven't been to a doctor and a doctor did a test on you and said that there's any -- you have brain damage or you -- you went to high school so apparently you're like the rest of us.

I mean, you don't suffer from any brain injuries. 1 You ever bee in a car accident where you had a brain 2 injury? MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, I can show you one car 4 accident, I almost died. 5 AGENT SPADAFORA: Oh, okay. Okay. So, you 6 7 got --AGENT SIMOCK: When you had your legs hurt in 8 9 the accident? MR. BRADLEY: You're thinking --10 AGENT SIMOCK: Hold on, I'm trying to look at 11 12 you showing me scars on your leg. MR. BRADLEY: Got on the knee. 13 14 AGENT SIMOCK: I believe you. MR. BRADLEY: I got a big scar right here. 15 look (unintelligible). I went through the 16 windshield. You can look it up if you all want to. 17 AGENT SIMOCK: No, that's okay. How long were 18 you in the hospital from that accident? 19 MR. BRADLEY: A week. 20 AGENT SIMOCK: How long ago did that happened? 21 MR. BRADLEY: '08. 22 AGENT SIMOCK: In '08? 23 24 MR. BRADLEY: They got records and all that

shit and they can tell you when I did get pulled over

I'm trying to walk straight and they think I'm lying 1 to where I show them the papers and that was the 2 3 (unintelligible) ain't even took my shoes off. AGENT SIMOCK: Did you have a driver's license 4 5 back then? MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. 6 AGENT SIMOCK: Have you ever had a driver's 7 license since? I mean since the accident? 8 9 MR. BRADLEY: When? AGENT SIMOCK: A driver's license, do you have 10 a valid Florida driver's license now? 11 MR. BRADLEY: Now it's suspended. 12 13 AGENT SPADAFORA: Suspended. Okay. Do you remember when you filled out your Florida driver's 14 license application there's a box there do you suffer 15 from any mental disabilities, did you check no or yes 16 17 on that? MR. BRADLEY: I don't know. 18 AGENT SPADAFORA: Okay. You don't know? 19 if I look it up it will tell me? 20 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, you can look it up. 21 AGENT SPADAFORA: Did you think you suffer from 22 any mental disabilities? 23 24 MR. BRADLEY: To tell you the truth, when my

cousin died I went crazy, I ain't going

(unintelligible) nobody to try me like before I was 1 2 (unintelligible) school and my cousin got hurt 3 (unintelligible), it just like (unintelligible). AGENT SIMOCK: Do you know the difference 4 5 between right and wrong? 6 MR. BRADLEY: Um-hmm. AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. You know -- do you know 7 what year it is this year? 8 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, 2012. 9 AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. Do you know what month it 10 is? 11 12 MR. BRADLEY: March. 13 AGENT SIMOCK: You know that. Did you ever --14 do you read? Do you ever read? You can read because 15 you went to high school, correct? MR. BRADLEY: Um-hmm. 16 17 AGENT SIMOCK: When was the last time you read something, magazine, sports, paper? 18 MR. BRADLEY: A while. 19 AGENT SIMOCK: A while ago. Okay. You don't 20 know what you read? 21 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. 22 AGENT SIMOCK: So you don't suffer from any 23 24 mental disabilities?

MR. BRADLEY: Huh-uh.

AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. All right. Is there anything else that you think that we should know that we didn't ask you or? We came in here today like gentleman and talked to you.

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, you did.

AGENT SIMOCK: We didn't pull a gun or knife or punch or make a mean face at you or anything like that, did we? We sat down like men like you treated us, we had a good conversation with you. Is everything you told us the truth?

MR. BRADLEY: I put down everything (unintelligible).

AGENT SIMOCK: Can you raise your right hand for me. Is everything you told us today the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God?

MR. BRADLEY: Nothing but the truth so help me God.

AGENT SIMOCK: Now, the one question I do have and I don't know if you have any further questions, but one question I do have is we did contact the owner of that truck, that owner of that truck sold it to somebody else two years ago.

MR. BRADLEY: Can I please get my own things, please? Can I please get my pants. I will show you

1 my mother --2 AGENT SIMOCK: Is it in your pants? 3 MR. BRADLEY: It's in my pants. I can show you the mother fucking everything. His name is Jeff. 4 AGENT SIMOCK: Was the registration up to date? 5 MR. BRADLEY: It should be, he sold me the 6 7 thing. AGENT SIMOCK: Did you look at it? 8 Did you 9 look at the papers? 10 MR. BRADLEY: If you look -- huh? 11 AGENT SIMOCK: Did you look at the papers when 12 you bought the truck? 13 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. AGENT SIMOCK: Did you get the registration? 14 15 MR. BRADLEY: I got the papers in my pocket. Ι 16 got all whatever you need. AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. Do you have any? 17 18 MR. BRADLEY: (Unintelligible) because I supposed to the shit signed in my name and he told me 19 20 just chill. 21 AGENT SIMOCK: Let me ask you one last thing, 22 Brandon. Be completely honest with me. Okay? MR. BRADLEY: I'll be completely honest with 23 24 you (unintelligible).

AGENT SIMOCK: What you did today to the deputy

was a shooting, do you think that was wrong?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, I swear to God

(unintelligible) but at the same time, sir,

predicament or not, you feel me, if I feel like you

reaching, you feel me, even if I (unintelligible).

AGENT SIMOCK: I'm just trying to say this. The deputy never (unintelligible). I mean, it's wrong to shoot a police officer would you not say?

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, it's wrong.

AGENT SIMOCK: Okay.

MR. BRADLEY: But at the same time when three of my cousins got killed by a police and then you walking up unholstering your holster, you hear me, (unintelligible) in my heart, I feel like shit but at the same time anybody, I ain't going to say anybody, but a lot of people if they see police (unintelligible) boy or whatever coming up saying this and then going reaching for their holster like this in my face, you hear me.

AGENT SIMOCK: Would you say with this,
Brandon, that deputy had a reason to pull a gun out,
don't you think? Here's why I'm saying that. You
had a gun in that car, correct? There was a gun
inside your car, yes?

MR. BRADLEY: It wasn't my gun though.

AGENT SIMOCK: But there was a gun inside the 1 2 car? 3 MR. BRADLEY: Um-hmm. AGENT SIMOCK: So, you don't you think that she 4 would have a right not knowing who was in that car to 5 pull her gun out? Not to shoot, I'm talking about to 6 make sure that she was safe? 7 MR. BRADLEY: I feel you. 8 AGENT SIMOCK: And that she would go home? 9 1.0 MR. BRADLEY: Yes. AGENT SIMOCK: So, that's why she was probably 11 12 pulling her gun. 13 MR. BRADLEY: I feel you but --14 AGENT SIMOCK: And obviously from what happened today she was right in doing that because you shot 15 her then and she didn't know that you had a gun in 16 17 the car. 18 MR. BRADLEY: But in the same thing, okay, so she didn't know, she didn't know. 19 AGENT SIMOCK: How would she know? 20 MR. BRADLEY: That's what I'm saying. 21 AGENT SIMOCK: It could always happen to a 22 police officer, correct? That's always a chance that 23 24 we take being law enforcement officers.

MR. BRADLEY:

25

That's real but I been pulled

over, they don't do like what they do.

AGENT SIMOCK: But you being in that car, you had warrants, you were already running from the EconoLodge. Okay. You had a gun in the car. All those things you were aware of, right? But I mean you were aware of all those things, would that right?

MR. BRADLEY: I don't know about the whole we running people over.

AGENT SIMOCK: Let's just toss that away. Let's just go with the warrants.

MR. BRADLEY: (Unintelligible)?

AGENT SIMOCK: Absolutely.

MR. BRADLEY: Who said I had a gun?

AGENT SIMOCK: Well, you had the gun when you shot her.

MR. BRADLEY: No, I'm just saying, like (unintelligible).

AGENT SIMOCK: The gun was in the car.

MR. BRADLEY: I'm just saying though, either way if ands or buts ain't like I walked around with the gun on my hip, nobody knew I had no gun, ain't like I went to do anything wrong.

AGENT SIMOCK: Right, but if you -- if she would have asked you to step out of the car because of the warrants and you know she was going to run

your name, right?

MR. BRADLEY: She don't know my name yet.

AGENT SIMOCK: So, she's going to ask your name.

MR. BRADLEY: You all (unintelligible) but.

AGENT SIMOCK: So, when she asks your name she's going to find out you have warrants.

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, but I'm saying.

AGENT SIMOCK: So, she's going to take you out the car then and then she's going to find the gun.

MR. BRADLEY: You're not hearing me.

AGENT SIMOCK: Well, would that be true?

MR. BRADLEY: I'm just saying you're not hearing me though. She's like twenty feet back behind me, that's what I'm trying to tell you.

AGENT SIMOCK: She's twenty feet behind you. Okay.

MR. BRADLEY: My (unintelligible) if a police don't be (unintelligible) and then one part right here, two walls down. You ask my girl, Andria, (unintelligible). Any police officer's going to be right over your ass, you feeling me, la, la, sir, can you please step out or whatever, whatever.

AGENT SIMOCK: How far away do you think she was when you shot her? I'm asking you. You were

1 there, I wasn't. 2 MR. BRADLEY: I'm sorry, sir, I ain't going out 3 the room. 4 AGENT SIMOCK: I know that. I know that. 5 MR. BRADLEY: (Unintelligible) because I feel 6 that you --7 AGENT SIMOCK: I'm just asking you how far away 8 she was from you. 9 MR. BRADLEY: That's what I'm trying to tell you and you thinking I'm playing around. 10 11 AGENT SIMOCK: No, no, I don't think you're 12 playing around. 13 MR. BRADLEY: I'm just saying if any police get, if any police get, they going to get on your 14 15 ass. 16 AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. Where was she at? How 17 far --MR. BRADLEY: That's what I'm telling you, she 18 19 was not to the point where my car hit and she right 20 on my ass like any other police. 21 AGENT SIMOCK: She was further away. 22 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, like, you know what I'm 23 saying, screaming and yelling. Ask my girl. I'm not 24 going to lie to you.

AGENT SIMOCK:

I'm not saying you're lying to

me.

MR. BRADLEY: I know you're hot at me, I'm sorry and this and that, I just, you know what I'm saying, bad guy's a bad guy.

AGENT SIMOCK: Do you think you're a bad guy?

MR. BRADLEY: I know I ain't no bad guy. I'm

just saying three of my cousins get killed by police

doing whatever, whatever (unintelligible) talk,

whatever, it's what happened, but when I feel like

he's going straight for your fire, your taser's over

here, your gun's over here, you go like get out, get

out, get out, I feel like if I get out I'm going to

be (unintelligible).

AGENT SIMOCK: Do you have anything else?

AGENT SPADAFORA: No, I don't have anything else.

(Thereupon, the detectives exited the interview room.)

AGENT SIMOCK: Do you have to use the bathroom at all, Brandon? You need a drink of water?

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, please.

AGENT SIMOCK: You want a drink of wanter and be able to use the bathroom?

MR. BRADLEY: Please, sir.

AGENT SIMOCK: Okay. I'm going to get you a

```
drink of water.
1
2
                (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the
3
    interview.)
                AGENT SPADAFORA: Here you go, Brandon.
4
5
               MR. BRADLEY: Thanks.
                AGENT SPADAFORA: You're welcome.
6
7
                MR. BRADLEY: Can I at least talk to my
8
         girlfriend?
9
               AGENT SPADAFORA: Hold off, let me see what I
10
          got. Okay?
                MR. BRADLEY: I'm not incriminate her, I just
11
         want here to know that I love her to death and that
12
13
          I'm going to be gone. You hear me.
                (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the
14
15
    interview.)
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Got a blanket?
16
17
                MR. BRADLEY: Um-hmm.
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Give me a minute,
18
19
          I'll take you.
                MR. BRADLEY: Okay.
20
21
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hold it right here just
          a second. Go ahead and have a seat, man. I'll get
22
23
          that for you.
24
                (Thereupon, State's Exhibit Number 165 was
25
    paused.)
```

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, may we approach?

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of the jury as follows:)

MR. BROWN: Judge, I think we have a stipulation from this point forward nothing additional happens and then after that another fifteen minutes or so the defendant lies on the floor and is out of the video camera and then the tape literally after that stops.

MR. MOORE: If the Court could instruct the jury that basically that's what happens, another ten or fifteen minutes he lies on the floor and then the tape stops, then we can stop it now, we don't need to watch him sitting in there for fifteen minutes.

THE COURT: Okay. I have a question from a juror about not being able understand and they want a transcript. So, we can discuss that but. Okay.

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. I have a stipulation between the parties that this tape continues in this fashion for another ten to fifteen minutes, that there's nothing else that's -- there's no speaking and it's not relevant for the next ten to fifteen minutes and then after the defendant lies on the floor and then

2

the tape stops. So, rather than play that for you, you can take that as a stipulation by the parties.

3

Okay. Do you want me to turn on the lights?

4

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

5

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

5

6

BY MR. BROWN:

0

7

Q Agent Simock, are you familiar with the location where the motel was, the EconoLodge/York Inn?

9

8

A Yes.

10

11

Q And is there a I-Hop restaurant right in front of that?

12

A Yes, there is.

13

14

agents talk -- mention Andria Kerchner and the interviews

And during the interview yourself and other

15

with her, when you talk about things she may or may not

have said, was that -- are you saying exactly what she

16

17

said, is that the interviewing technique or what is that?

18

A It wasn't exact verbiage what she was saying

19

but it certainly a technique that we can bring up to try

20

to extract information from that individual.

21 22 Q And is it always necessarily something that she has said or is it just something to try to get information

23

from the person you're speaking to?

24

25

A It's not necessarily everything that she has said and we do use deception at times.

Q Now, there was a point in the chair after the twenty minutes or so into the interview where the defendant's been up for a period of time and he goes to sit back in the chair and the view is partially blocked at that point, can you tell the jury what happened there?

A The canvas blanket was kind of laid over the chair and basically he kind of miscalculated from sitting down and it -- looked like the chair was over more because it was very puffy the way the canvas was, thought he was sitting on the edge of the chair, however, he was not and he just caught the very corner edge of the chair with his buttocks.

Q And there was a timeframe there where he was -had gotten up and was moving around and was reenacting and
the camera view was blocked, can you demonstrate to the
jury what was his reenactment, what was he doing there?

A What he was showing was he was showing his hands on the side where Deputy Pill's gun would have been and he was acting as if she was pulling the gun out, never fully extracting the firearm, acting as if she was pulling it then shoving it back down and he kept doing that a number of times.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, may I have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Thereupon, a pause was taken in the

proceedings.)

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I have no further questions of this witness at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. Cross examination by the Defense.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MOORE:

Agent Simock, at the end of the -- toward the end of the DVD when Mr. Bradley is led out we hear voices on camera and you I'm sure heard as the rest of us who were listening somebody, presumably a law enforcement officer or another agent, asking Mr. Bradley if the pills he had taken have worn off yet, is that you asking him that?

A No.

Q You didn't. Were you there when that question was asked of Mr. Bradley?

A I don't recall that being asked. I didn't hear that. I didn't hear that.

Q Okay. So, you just -- well, the videotape --

A I'm not saying it didn't, I'm just saying I didn't hear it.

Q Let me ask the question. The video would speak for itself, would it not?

A Absolutely.

2

3

4

5

6 7

9

10

12

11

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

What's on it, what can be seen, what can be 0 hear, that's what the jury can rely on?

Absolutely. Α

All right. And so did you -- do you know who Q he may have been talking to out in the hall, Mr. Bradley?

It could have been several individuals out I know he was walking out with a -- we're talking about the bathroom or are we talking about when he's --

You know, it's off camera. I'm talking about a point in time where Mr. Bradley is led out and right after that he's brought back in and during that interval wherever he is his voice can be heard, he's with another male and the male is saying the pills that you took, have the pills that you took -- taken worn off yet, which you say you didn't hear, that's the point in time I'm talking So, do you know who would have been with him after he was led out into the hall after you and Agent Spadafora left and would have been with him and who would have brought him back in to the interview room?

Okay. Mr. Moore, you've asked about three different questions. So, I'll start --

Let me break it down for you, let me do it that way. All right. Do you remember the point in time when you and Agent Spadafora leave the room and Mr. Bradley is in there by himself?

- 1
- Yes, I do. Α
- 2

4

- And then another gentleman who we can't see his face, he's in green, and he takes Mr. Bradley out of the room out of the camera, you saw that?
- 5
- I did see it. Α
- 6
- Right. And so do you know who that individual 0 is or was?

7

- I do not.
- 9
- And that part, the video -- so, presumably you were not within earshot of whatever was said between
- 10

11

- Mr. Bradley and that gentleman?
- 12
- I was not.
- 13
- Okay. Now, would you -- since you never --
- 14
- 6th of 2012, you've never seen him before, had contact?

you've never met Mr. Bradley before that day, before March

when he's under the influence of drugs or alcohol compared

- 15
- 16 I have not.
- 17
- And so you don't know what Mr. Bradley is like
- 18
- 19 to when he's not? You have nothing with respect to his
- personal makeup, his disposition with respect to how he 20
- 21 would be affected by alcohol or drugs?
- 22
- I've never seen Mr. Bradley under the influence
- 23
- 24 And as far as your own training and experience, Q

of alcohol or drugs.

- 25
- you mentioned that you have had some experience in being

able to identify when people are under the influence of alcohol or drugs?

A I've certainly come across a number of individuals in the course of law enforcement that have been under the influence of drugs and alcohol.

Q And in your training I would imagine you've had some along the way to help you spot when people are under the influence of alcohol or drugs?

A Training and experience, yes.

Q Okay. But you don't claim any expertise in that field, would that be correct?

A I'm not a drug recognition expert, no.

Q Drug recognition expert is somebody who's had additional training and at least his or her expertise is recognized because of that additional training?

A Yes.

Q You have not had that?

A I have not.

And so would you know whether or not let's say a blood sample or a urine sample taken at the time let's say of the interview would have given a more accurate representation of the alcohol and drugs, whatever, controlled substances in Mr. Bradley's system at that time than a blood drawn say thirty hours later? Would you know? I mean, if you don't know, you don't know.

^

A A blood or urine sample would tell me what was in his system, yes, a toxicology report could indicate what was in his blood system, had it been within a certain amount of timeframe, I don't really know on that.

Q Well, would you agree based upon what you know that a blood draw at the time of an event would be more accurate than one say twelve hours later or twenty hours later, would you agree with that?

A Yes.

Q Because as you know whatever is ones system dissipates over time?

A Certain drugs do and certain drugs do not, marijuana could stay in your system up to forty-five days later, it's stored in fat cells, it would not be indicative that you were under the influence of marijuana at the time.

Q No, but it would indicate whether or not the person had alcohol or drugs in his system, that would reflect that, would it not, a blood draw?

A Certain drugs could remain again in the system for a long period of time but still not be indicative of whether you were under the influence of at that moment or not.

Q So, a blood draw taken at the time of the interrogation of Mr. Bradley would provide at least a more

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

0

accurate representation of the drugs in his system at that point in time than one done several hours later?

- That would be something for --Α
- Anything? Q

-- a physician or someone to answer the question, I don't know exactly --

- Q So, you don't know?
- I don't have an answer for you, no.
- Let me ask you this. Do you know of drugs or not that while they may not affect a person's outward behavior may still affect the way a person thinks, the way a person perceivings, the way a person processes information mental?
 - Certainly drugs or alcohol could do that, yes.
- Okay. And so even though a person may be under the influence at least in terms of how it affects their thinking, it may not outwardly manifest it stealth, it may not manifest itself outwardly in your experience and training?

My experience and training would say that outwardly it would exhibit some signs such as a delayed response if I asked a question, maybe some confusion, none of that was exhibited by Mr. Bradley.

I see. So, in watching that video, then you're saying that Mr. Bradley rapidly responded to your

questions, all of your questions, would you say that -would that an accurate characterization of Mr. Bradley's
responses to your questions?

A I would say Mr. Bradley thoughtfully answered every question that we asked him, yes.

Q And there were a number of times when you asked him to repeat himself, did you not?

A Yes.

Q And there were a number of times when it was very hard, if not impossible, to understand, at least us watching this out here for us to understand what he was saying?

A He's very soft spoken, yes.

Q And -- so, you have no basis of comparison as to what he's like when he's sober as opposed to when he's not?

A I can't say I've ever seen him under the influence of alcohol or if he was intoxicated through drugs.

Q So, the answer to that question is yes, there is no basis that you have to compare the two?

A I'm saying I've never witnessed him under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

Q Now, you are an experienced homicide agent, you've handled a number of homicide cases as an agent,

1 | have you not?

A I have.

Q And there are a number of your colleagues who work for the sheriff's department who are similarly, and don't be modest, qualified to conduct a homicide interrogation?

A Correct.

Q And at the time that Mr. Bradley was interrogated, were there not a number of other agents who were capable of conducting an interrogation in a homicide case?

A Yes.

Q And what would you say, besides yourself and Agent Spadafora, Agent Reynolds, Agent Reyes perhaps, Agent Harrell, I don't know whether they -- you would know, you can probably name a pretty long list of agents who could have conducted the interrogation of Mr. Bradley at that time?

A There are plenty of agents that could have interrogated Mr. Bradley.

Q Okay. Now, when you got to Mr. Bradley and began to interrogate him, that was approximately seven to eight hours after the shooting?

A Approximately seven to eight hours after he was taken into custody, I believe maybe more closer to nine to

1 ten hours after the actual shooting.

Q All right. And there were any number of agents who could have questioned Mr. Bradley earlier if they had chosen to do that or if whoever made the decision about had them asked to do so?

A I imagine they could have, I don't know, I wasn't present at that time.

Q Do you know what Mr. Bradley was doing for that eight to nine hour period of time that he was in that interrogation room?

A From when I was told when I returned to the office, he had been sleeping for the majority of the time.

Q Eight to nine hours?

A Correct.

Q Would you say that it's the sheriff's department policy to permit somebody who's been arrested particularly for a homicide especially involving a police officer to be shown to a room, given a blanket and allowed to sleep for eight or nine hours, is that your policy?

A I don't think that's a policy, there's no policy set for this.

Q Is there -- is that a usual way that interrogations are handled in homicides?

A I think every situation is different and you have to play it by ear, there's nothing set in stone on

how or when you need to interrogate the suspect and that is the way Agent Reynolds who was the case agent wanted to do this and so that's the direction that we followed.

Q Now, as a homicide agent I would imagine you have seen a number of first degree murder cases through the trial phase, have you not?

A Yes.

Q And a number of those have involved the death penalty?

A Yes.

Q And you are aware from your training and experience that the presence of alcohol or drugs or impairment could be of use to a defendant in a homicide case to mitigate the charge of first degree murder?

A I'm not sure if that would be a mitigating factor during the course of the commission of the crime which certainly is not a defense.

Q Well, you understand that that could be a mitigating factor and that information could be useful to a defendant from a defense standpoint?

A The defense could use something that is a mitigating factor later but that's for the jury to decide.

Q It is in fact and that would be something that if you had your preference, that the -- that a defense attorney not get his hands on, wouldn't that be correct?

- 1 A I'm not sure I understand what the question is.
 - Q Whether or not a person has drugs in his system at any point in time whether at the time of the shooting or at the time of the interrogation?

A I don't think that really is an issue for me to worry about whether the defense gets their hands on that or not, my job isn't to assist you in finding out if he's understand the influence of alcohol or what's in his system, mine is to make sure and ensure that he is able to comprehend my questions, answer them intelligently enough and that he's able to understand everything that I'm trying to convey to him.

- Q Now, you were with Andria Kerchner for several hours, were you not, before you interrogated Mr. Bradley?
 - A Approximately five hours.
- Q All right. And part of that time was spent at the hospital with her?
 - A Yes, it was.

1.8

- Q And there at the hospital she was treated for drugs, was she not, for drug -- being under the influence of drugs, being under the influence of drugs, she was treated at the hospital?
 - A The reason Andria Kerchner was taken --
 - O Is that correct? Is that correct?
 - A No, that's not correct.

1 So, were you with her when she was treated by 2 the doctors? I was, but the question was why she was there 3 Α and I didn't get a chance to answer that. 4 5 Well, I asked a specific question if whether 6 she was under the influence was one of the reasons why she 7 was taken to the hospital? 8 Α No. And -- but she was under the influence? 9 She was found to be under the influence of a 10 Α controlled substance. She had drugs in her system. 11 And at what point in time relative to when you 12 interrogated Mr. Bradley did you question Miss Kerchner? 13 I'm sorry, could you ask that one more time? 14 Α 15 Chronology, we're talking about points in time. Now, you interrogated Miss Kerchner before you 16 17 interrogated Mr. Bradley? 18 Α Yes. And if Mr. Bradley was -- you interrogation 19 began about 7:00 to 8:00 p.m., 7:30 I think, would you 20 21 agree? 22 Α Yes. 23 What time did your interrogation of Miss

> Shortly after she entered the building at the Α

24

25

Kerchner take place?

1 criminal investigations division.

- O What time would that have been?
- A You know what, I honestly can't recall, somewhere around 5:00, 5:30, and I'm guessing at that, I honestly don't remember the exact time.
- Q So, then if you're with her for an hour and a half, approximately, would that be about right?
- A It may have been longer than that, there were I believe two interviews with Miss Kerchner.
- Q And then you pretty quickly moved into your questioning of Mr. Bradley?
- A There was probably about a twenty to thirty minute break in between.
- Now, during your questioning of Miss Kirschner which lasted about an hour, an hour and three quarters to two hours, approximately, isn't it true at no time did she ever say that Mr. Bradley just before the shooting made any comment like I'll do whatever it takes not to go back to prison including shooting a cracker?
 - MR. BROWN: I'm going to object at this point and ask to approach.
 - THE COURT: Yes, you may. Bench conference.
- (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of the jury as follows:)
- MR. BROWN: Judge, this is improper

impeachment. He confronted the witness with this, she acknowledged that she didn't say that and that's it, they cannot bring in extrinsic evidence once the witness admits either saying it or not saying something, it's only if she denies, you know, denies what they're asserting that you can then bring in extrinsic evidence. She did not deny, she acknowledged and admitted to counsel that she didn't make those statements, this is improper impeachment.

MR. MOORE: What she said was she didn't remember what she said and she viewed the DVD and in that DVD she didn't hear herself, which is not -- you know, she didn't hear herself saying specific things but that's not the same as denying that she said it or admitting that she said it.

THE COURT: I thought after she did that she said she didn't -- yes, she agreed that she didn't say it.

MR. MOORE: I don't -- my recollection is she said she did not recall because of the drugs -- the influence of the drugs. I mean, that would be consistent with her deposition testimony, her mind is a blank as it relates to that.

THE COURT: If you want to get that portion of her testimony elicited, I'll be happy -- I'm going to

sustain the objection but I'll be happy to reconsider that based on her testimony. My recollection, and I can tell you sometimes I have a really clear recollection and other times I don't but, and I'm not a hundred percent sure on this case, but my recollection was first she said she didn't remember and then she said she looked at it and then she said she didn't say it. She agreed with you that she didn't say it, but I could be wrong.

MR. MOORE: Okay.

THE COURT: I'll be happy -- I'm going to sustain the objection at this time but if you want to get the DVD I'll be happy to review it.

MR. MOORE: I'm not going to do that right now but thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

BY MR. MOORE:

Q The room where Mr. Bradley was has a live camera feed so people can monitor what's going on by watching a TV screen outside of the interview room, right?

A Yes.

Q And what -- did you -- off and on while Mr. Bradley was in that room were you monitoring at least

- not maybe continuously but from time to time watching the monitor --
- 3 A No.

7

8

9

10

23

- 4 Q -- of Mr. Bradley?
- 5 A I did not.
 - Q Were you present when Agent Buggs went into the room where Mr. Bradley was to attempt to wake him up?
 - A Agent Buggs, no, I was not present.
 - Q Agent Buggs was at the -- this was on Gus Hipp at the CID facility where this interview room was?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 On the date when you were there?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q And did you -- you saw him there, right?
- 15 A I saw Agent Buggs at the CID building, yes.
- 16 Q You saw several agents there, quite a few actually?
- 18 A There were a lot of people there that day.
- 19 Q And who were homicide agents?
- 20 A All the homicide agents were there that day.
- 21 Q How many would you say? Just an estimate, best 22 quess.
 - A Our unit consists of five agents and one supervisor. So, all six of us were there that day.
- 25 Q And the -- at least some if not all of those

hospital?

Α

the room.

Α

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Deputy -- you're an agent. 0

Correct.

25

That's fine, deputy is fine. Α

the time. Now, as far as Mr. Bradley being under the influence at that time, you would agree that he appeared -- you couldn't really tell one way or the other but it appeared it could have been a combination of him

just being groggy and under the influence, wouldn't that

be an accurate assessment of what your observation was?

were there when you got there, when you got back from the

recall was Agent Martin, I'm not sure if he was there at

Most of them were there, the only one I don't

I would say he was tired when I first went into

Would you say it could have been a combination 0 of being under the influence as well and being -- a combination of him being under the influence and tired?

Being almost ten hours later I would assume he Α was probably not under the influence of drugs or alcohol at that point.

And this was -- yeah, as you pointed about ten hours after the shooting at the point in time when you began to question him?

We'll go with agent because that's what you 1 are. Agent Simock, on February the 19th of last year you 2 had your deposition taken, do you remember that? 3 Yes. 4 Α And I think Mr. McMaster was there and I was 5 6 there and a court reporter and you were asked a series of questions and gave a series of answers and I'd like to 7 start on page 13 of that transcript. I'll be glad to show 8 9 it to you. I'd like to see it. 10 11 Let me tell you what I'm doing and then I'll be Q glad to let you look at it. 12 Isn't it true at page 13 you were asked this 13 14 question and gave this answer? MR. MOORE: May I approach the witness and show 15 16 him so he can see? 17 THE COURT: Yes, you may. BY MR. MOORE: 18 And that would be on page 13, line 18. 19 0 20 Α Okay. Okay. So, you were asked this question and 21 Q 22 gave this answer: Did you see indications in Mr. Bradley that he may have been under the influence of something 23 alcoholic or drugs? Answer: I'm not an expert on this. 24

Okay. However, could he have been under the influence or

1 was he tired, it could have been a combination of both.

That's what you said, right?

A Could have.

Q Could have, right. That was your testimony a little over a year ago?

A Yes.

Q In your deposition, sworn testimony under oath like today?

A Yes.

Q Now, it's a little hard to understand but you listened as did the jury and the rest of us to the DVD that was just played, but do you recall that -- at the very beginning when you were talking about Miranda with Mr. Bradley you looked at him and, you know, you started to read Miranda to him and then you paused and you asked him if he was all right? You asked him if he was all right, do you remember doing that?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And he was trembling at that point, was he not?

A He was cold, yes.

Q Okay. But he was trembling from whatever reason, at that point in time he was trembling, right?

A I believe he said he was cold.

Q You did get him a blanket, right? You got him

a blanket?

- A Agent Spadafora got him a blanket.
- Q There you go. And some of the things that he said, let's just see if you heard these. Mr. Bradley said -- when you asked, when you asked him to relate to you what had happened that he said she reached for a gun like she was going to shoot me, that he said several times during the course of that interview, correct?
 - A Yes.
 - Q You heard that?
- 11 A Yes.
 - Q You did hear that. And he thought she was going to -- he said I thought she was going to shoot me several times? Yes?
 - A You're telling me if -- it's a question then, yes, okay.
 - O And I need an answer.
 - A Well, you're not asking a question, you're just testifying, you're telling me what's written there.
 - Q Thank you.
 - Mr. Bradley said, and this is a question which, you know, requires an answer she's trying to pull her gun out, that's what it looked like to Mr. Bradley, that's what he said?
 - A If you're asking me if that's what he said,

1 yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Had guns pulled on him many times. Yes:
- 3 A Yes.
 - Q Now, these are all questions, did he say these things, did you hear him say these things. That he had a number of friends who had been killed, shot and killed?
 - A Yes, he said that.
 - Q And some by police officers?
 - A Yes, he said that.
 - Q And he had tattoos on his body, a number of tattoos of people who he knew had been shot and killed?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And carried a gun like -- and we're talking about him -- this is another statement that he made. He carried a gun because everybody where he lived carried a gun for protection?
 - A Yes.
 - Q He said he had three cousins who had been killed by the police?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And in particular, Mr. Bradley was talking about a problem that Miss Kerchner was having with her boyfriend, L.J. Larry Galvin, is that correct? Remember him talking about that?
 - A I believe he said L.J., yes, he did say.

And Miss Kerchner talked about that as 1 Yes. 2 well during her interview? Yes, she did. 3 Α And that Mr. L.J. or whatever, L.J. was 4 0 5 threatening both of them? 6 Α Yes. And that Mr. Bradley felt a need to have a gun 7 8 to protect himself from L.J. and to protect her? 9 Α Yes. 10 Isn't it true also that Miss Kerchner during 0 11 her testimony said that at one point when the car was 12 surrounded by the EconoLodge staff that she stomped on the 13 gas which made the car go forward? MR. BROWN: Judge, I'm going to object. May we 14 15 approach? Yes, you may. 16 THE COURT: (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out 17 of the hearing of the jury as follows:) 18 MR. BROWN: Anything that Miss Kerchner said in 19 her deposition is not relevant here as far as any of 20 her statements and this doesn't go to any impeachment 21 of Miss Kerchner. 22 23 MR. MOORE: Except that she -- there can be no 24 impeachment of a statement that she can't remember.

No predicate can be laid when somebody doesn't

remember. In fact, 90.614(2), paren 2, says a person can be impeached even if they can't remember and so that --

THE COURT: I don't remember you even asking her that. I don't remember that question being asked of her.

MR. MOORE: Well, it would also be a statement -- it would be an admission under 90.804 where a witness is unavailable and she's unavailable because she doesn't remember making a statement, and it also would be acceptance of criminal liability because that's the underpinning of the felony murder which is the lurching forward of the truck and striking somebody, that's the base -- that's the force in the felony which makes it, you know, which and the State's theory makes this a felony murder and if she's accepting responsibility for that, then that -- and she's unavailable. We can bring her in but she's saying I don't remember making that statement.

THE COURT: That statement -- you may have asked her that before I do not remember that statement being asked.

MR. MOORE: But it's not impeachment under -- it's also -- it's also admissible under 90.804 as a

statement against interest, that's what I'm saying because she's not available. Unavailable and acceptance of criminal respon --

THE COURT: But she's not unavailable.

MR. MOORE: But she doesn't remember so she's unavailable in that sense.

THE COURT: But I don't know because that question wasn't asked.

MR. MOORE: No, what she said is a blanket statement. You know, what I'm referring to is a statement she made in an interview which she claims she can't remember. She has no memory of it because of drugs and that's what she said and so for that reason she's unavailable. I could put her on the stand and she would say I don't remember whether I said that or not, I don't remember anything that I said.

THE COURT: Well, I haven't heard that. I'm going to sustain the objection.

I have a couple of things. The jury's been in here for more than two hours and I'm a little bit concerned, it's two hours and ten minutes. Normally I don't keep them for more than two hours. Also I have this question. I was thinking of recessing for the night and coming back in the morning.

MR. MOORE: I would hate to break up -- I'm not going to go too much longer.

THE COURT: Can I ask them if they're comfortable because they may -- I may need to give them a break.

MR. MOORE: Right, I don't want to keep anybody --

THE COURT: Because you may have five people who have to go to the bathroom right in the middle of you -- and I apologize, that's just the way --

MR. MOORE: You're really twisting my arm hard here, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. If they say they're fine, we'll keep going.

Then I have this question and I'm going to tell them that I have a question that I need to talk to the attorneys about and that I'll address that question as soon as I can.

MR. MOORE: Okay.

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it's been over two hours, I usually give you a break at two hours. It's been about two hours and ten minutes by my calculation. We want to try to get

through this witness today. Is everyone comfortable or do you need a break, and if you do I won't hold that against you and neither will anyone else? Are we okay? For ten more minutes, fifteen more minutes possibly? Are you sure?

THE JURY PANEL: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't want to single anyone out but are we okay? If I don't hear anything we're going to continue.

Okay. I have a question by one of the jurors which I need to address with the attorneys which I'm not able to do at this time. So, I will respond to this question as soon as I have an opportunity to speak to the attorneys.

Okay. Mr. Moore, you may continue.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q Toward the end of interrogation of Mr. Bradley Agent Spadafora was asking questions concerning head injuries Mr. Bradley may or may not have sustained. Do you think Mr. Bradley is qualified to give an opinion about whether he had ever experienced a head injury?

- A I would think that he could, yes.
- Q Would you not think that's a medical thing?
- A I would think Mr. Bradley would know if he's ever experienced a head injury or not, I certainly would.

What's the difference between just getting hit 1 2 in the head and actually sustaining brain damage? are the indications of brain damage which anybody on the 3 street would know that he or she is experiencing? 4 Judge, I'm going to object to this 5 MR. BROWN: 6 question. MR. MOORE: He already -- he's answered the 7 8 question. THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection 9 as to the form of the question. 10 BY MR. MOORE: 11 Do you believe that any person who has a brain 12 injury without question and to a degree of medical 13 certainty would be able to diagnosis that brain injury? 14 15 MR. BROWN: Objection. 16 THE COURT: Overruled. 17 BY MR. MOORE: You understand the question? 18 Q I think you're asking me to give a medical 19 Α 20 opinion. 21 No, I'm not. 0 You're talking about a brain injury, Mr. Moore, 22 Α what are my qualifications to talk about a brain injury. 23 24 You're not qualified to talk about brain 0 injury, is that what you're saying? 25

1 How do I know if you have a brain injury or Α not, if you sustained one over the years. I mean, I don't 2 know, I'm not a doctor, I haven't done a CAT scan, an MRI. 3 It would take those things to diagnosis a brain 4 5 injury, wouldn't it? 6 I would think so. Right. And so if you're asking Mr. Bradley to 7 Q self seven diagnosis his brain injury, then he can't 8 9 really do that, can he? I think the question that Agent Spadafora was 10 Α asking --11 Can he do that? 12 0 MR. BROWN: Judge, I'm going to object and ask 13 the witness to allowed to explain his answer. 14 MR. MOORE: He hasn't answered the question. 15 16 It's a yes or no answer. THE COURT: I'm going to allow the witness to 17 explain that answer because I don't think that was a 18 yes or no question. So, agent, you may complete your 19 20 answer. THE WITNESS: Could he ask the question again, 21 22 Your Honor? BY MR. MOORE: 23 Sure. Do you think Mr. Bradley is qualified to 24

diagnosis a brain injury which he may have had at that

1 | time?

A What I would think is that he would hope to seek medical attention and know that if he had a brain injury or not. Did he ever have any head trauma, it's a question and he said he never had any.

Q Do you think that Mr. Bradley is qualified to diagnosis a brain injury in himself? Do you think he's qualified to do that?

A I don't think he's --

MR. BROWN: Objection.

MR. MOORE: He hasn't answered the question.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I think he's qualified to medically diagnosis himself but he certainly can tell us if he's ever experienced a head injury and the question was head injury.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q And do you think Mr. Bradley is qualified to give an opinion about whether he has any mental illness?

Do you think he's qualified to give that opinion?

A I would believe he would be qualified enough to tell us if he's ever been diagnosed with some kind of psychoses or psychiatric issue or mental health issue.

Q Suppose he hasn't been diagnosed, do you think
Mr. Bradley is qualified to give a diagnosis of whether or

1 not he has a mental illness or not? MR. BROWN: Again, objection as to 2 3 (unintelligible). THE COURT: Overruled. 4 THE WITNESS: I would say as a layman, no, he 5 cannot officially diagnosis anyone with that but he 6 certainly would be able to tell me if he had ever 7 been diagnosed by a doctor with one of those issues. 8 MR. MOORE: Okay. Can I have a minute? 9 10 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 11 (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the 12 proceedings.) MR. MOORE: One other thing. 13 BY MR. MOORE: 14 You asked Mr. Bradley about the possession of 15 the car and there was some confusion about what word he 16 was using, it sounded like borrow but what he said was 17 that he had bought it, correct. 18 I believe so. 19 But he had not transferred the tag or the 20 0 registration or anything into his name, isn't that 21 22 correct? 23 Α Yes. You agree with that? 24 0

25

Α

I believe so, yes.

MR. MOORE: I have no more questions. 1 THE COURT: Redirect by the State. 2 MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. 3 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 4 5 BY MR. BROWN: 6 Agent, when you are interviewing suspects, do Q you try to gather as much information as you can before 7 the interview? 8 9 Α Yes. And when you have two potential suspects, in 10 Q this particular case you were involved in the interviews 11 of both, correct? 12 13 Yes, I was. Α And are there advantages or reasons why you 14 would have the same agent involved in both interviews? 15 16 А Yes. 17 And can you tell the jury why that would be? Well, Mr. Bradley couldn't tell me something 18 Α that wasn't true that Miss Kerchner told me and vice versa 19 for later, if we had to go back and interview Miss 20 Kerchner again, I now knew what Mr. Bradley had told us 21 and that could be used in the interview technique. 22 23 So, it's part of having the knowledge to be able to confront and try to gather more information? 24

25

Α

Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

And is there any strategy or any process to 0 determine who you interview first or just a matter of you just have to decide to interview one or the other?

Just depends on the circumstances and in this Α one we wanted to interview Miss Kerchner first before we went in with Mr. Bradley. We didn't believe that she was the person that had shot Deputy Pill.

MR. MOORE: Objection, unresponsive, narrative.

THE COURT: Okay. Sustained.

BY MR. BROWN:

Why did you make -- why was the decision made 0 to interview Andria Kerchner first?

We wanted to have all the information that Α Andria could give us before we went to talk to Mr. Bradley.

And then was a decision also made to have the same agent, yourself, involved in both interviews?

Yes. Α

You indicated that part of your purpose in talking to the defendant is to make sure that he understands and understands you and can make a decision about Miranda, could you explain to the jury what's your purpose in doing that?

In making sure that he can understand Miranda?

Yes. Q

Well, certainly Miranda is very important, I Α mean, it's been around for many, many years, it's something that's required, we have to advise people of their constitutional rights. It's important, I need to make sure that he understands fully and comprehends what 6 we're talking about, that he understand each and every right so that he can make a coherent decision on whether 7 or not he's going to talk to us or not because it's going 8 to be played again in court and that's something we need 9 10 to live with.

1

2

3

4

5

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

During your twenty-six years in law enforcement, have you had defendants who after your contact with them you felt that they did not understand Miranda?

MR. MOORE: Objection, irrelevant.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BROWN: Judge, if I may approach.

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of the jury as follows:)

Judge, this certainly is relevant MR. BROWN: because it involves him to make a decision on whether to continue the interview. Defense counsel went into his experience in seeing other people under the influence of drugs. They tried to go into whether he

1.0

felt this defendant was under the influence of drugs. So, the fact that he's had that situation before, may have had it before, and has made a decision not to interview certainly is relevant because it goes to his observations of this defendant.

MR. MOORE: That's entirely subjective, it's entirely irrelevant, what goes on with interviews of other defendants has nothing to do with his interview of Mr. Bradley or his opinion about whether
Mr. Bradley understood and waived his Miranda rights.
I mean, he can't comment on Mr. Bradley's thought processes, he can't comment on other inmates -- other suspects processes and what may have happened between him and all those is irrelevant.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll maintain that it's sustained with regard to other interviews.

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)
BY MR. BROWN:

- Q Agent Simock, after having your contact with the defendant and going through Miranda, did you make a decision to continue with the interview?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And why was that?
 - A I believe he understood --

MR. MOORE: Objection, speculation. 1 THE COURT: It goes to his actions, overruled. 2 His actions, the witness's actions, overruled. 3 THE WITNESS: I believe he understood each --4 MR. MOORE: Objection. May we approach? 5 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 6 (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out 7 of the hearing of the jury as follows:) 8 That's a subjective opinion, that's 9 MR. MOORE: for the jury. 10 THE COURT: He made the decision, he can --11 it's what he did, it's his actions. He's testifying 12 as to his actions based on his observations. 13 can't say he thought he understood but he can say --14 MR. LANNING: That's what he just said. 15 16 MR. MOORE: That's what he just said. He just 17 said that. That's what I've been objecting to. THE COURT: He can say I believed he understood 18 so I continued. 19 MR. MOORE: He just gave a subjective opinion 20 about whether Mr. Bradley understood his rights. 21 can't comment on Mr. Bradley's thought processes, 22 he's not a mind reader, he's not qualified, he's not 23

24

25

an expert.

THE COURT: He can say I believe he understood

2

to I continued with the interview.

MR. MOORE:

the rules for deliberation is the voluntariness of a defendant's statement, that's for the jury to decide, it's not this witness's prerogative, it's for the jury to decide that and this is part of that, this is what we're attacking. He cannot give an opinion about what Mr. Bradley thought, he can't do that. He can't speculate about what another person's thinking.

If I may, Judge. You know, one of

10

9

THE COURT: Okay. Overrule the objection.

11

12

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

13

BY MR. BROWN:

14

Q Agent, would you please answer the question?

15

A Could you ask the question again, please?

16

17

Q After going through the Miranda with the defendant you made a decision to continue the interview?

18

A Yes.

agreed to speak with us.

19

Q Why did you make that decision?

20

A Because it appeared that Mr. Bradley understood

21

22

his rights, he acknowledged every time I asked him with each individual right that he understood them and then he

23

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, may I have a moment?

24

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Thereupon, a pause was taken in the 1 proceedings.) 2 No further questions, Your Honor. 3 MR. BROWN: THE COURT: Okay. Recross by the Defense. 4 RECROSS EXAMINATION 5 6 BY MR. MOORE: Another purpose of an interrogation is not just 7 Q to gather evidence but it's to foreclose or shut off 8 defenses, isn't that correct? 9 10 Α Yes, that could be. MR. MOORE: No further questions. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Sir, thank you for your 12 testimony, you're free to step down. 13 MR. BROWN: Judge, we have the question. 14 THE COURT: I'll do that with you and we'll 15 address it tomorrow. Okay. Thank you, sir. 16 17 (Thereupon, the witness exited the witness 18 stand.) THE COURT: Okay. We're going to have the jury 19 recess for tonight. Once again, I'm going to ask you 20 to be back here at 8:30 in the morning. Report to 21 the jury assembly room. You must continue to abide 22 by your rules governing your service as a juror. Do 23 not discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone 24

else or allow anyone to discuss it in your presence.

Do not speak to the lawyers, the parties or the witnesses about anything. You must avoid reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television, raid or Internet about this trial should there be any. Do not conduct any research yourself regarding any matters concerning this case. Okay. Court will be in recess for the jurors until 8:30 tomorrow morning. Thank you.

(Thereupon, the jury will jury was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated. If I could have a bench conference with the attorneys.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of the audience as follows:)

MR. BROWN: Judge, (unintelligible) question for the witness, I didn't want to excuse him and have to bring him back.

THE COURT: No, it's a general question. No, it's just a general question. I figured we could address it -- we could discuss it now and answer them tomorrow.

It says is this interview in transcript form, can't understand most of it. Please ask. Thank you.

And it's juror number 114.

3 tha

MR. BROWN: It can be sent back.

THE COURT: If they play it on it, you can hear

MR. LANNING: It is but it's not something that's tidy enough for the jury and it's just as inaudible in the transcript.

THE COURT: I mean, I can tell you that it's my experience in listening to these that it's -- you can hear it a lot better when it's not played on something like that. When you play it on like your home -- my computer, I understand a lot, lot more. I mean, I've this issue -- I had it in Andria Kerchner, I couldn't understand a lot of it and then I played it on the computer back there and I could understand a lot more. So, I mean it's hard to hear it out here.

MR. BROWN: I would suggest to answer something along these lines that the transcript cannot be provided because that's somebody else's opinion as to what was said.

THE COURT: We can say that they have to rely on -- I have kind of a formal response.

MR. MOORE: They will be able to listen to the CD again, so. The DVD. I would recommend you say that.

it a lot better. I mean, I have issues with that. I 1 have a lot of issues. I've learned a lot from these 2 DVDs with the --3 MR. BROWN: I always hate telling the jury 4 there's no transcript when we know there is one. 5 So, 6 I was thinking --7 THE COURT: Usually I just say you have to rely -- I have kind of a general instruction. 8 9 it's back here. I've had them ask for things before. 10 This one talks about being furnished transcripts. MR. MOORE: I suggest the Court just say in 11 response to the question the jury will be permitted 12 to have the DVD and be permitted to listen to it and 13 watch it, that should take care of it. 14 THE COURT: I have this really nice one. 15 16 MR. MOORE: Mine was pretty nice. 17 MR. LANNING: Your transcript? MR. MOORE: No, my suggestion. 18 THE COURT: You don't want to give them a 19 20 transcript? 21 MR. LANNING: The transcripts --22 MR. MOORE: No. MR. LANNING: -- that are available have 23 inaccuracies, they're full of inaudibles as well. 24

THE COURT: I'm happy with not doing that

because the one in Miss Kerschner's was, with all due 1 2 3 seen. 4 5 review it again. 6 7 deliberations. 8 9 the transcript? 10 11 12 provided. 13 14 15 16 17 transcript (unintelligible). 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

respect, probably the worst transcript I've ever The DVD will be furnished to you, you can MR. MOORE: When you go back to deliberate. MR. BROWN: They can review it during THE COURT: What do you want me to say about MR. MOORE: The transcript will not be MR. LANNING: Any transcripts --MR. MOORE: A transcript. We don't want to imply that there is one, they just can't have it. Just say a transcript will not be provided 0. MR. LANNING: Well, I was thinking my MR. MOORE: Yeah, yeah, I know. THE COURT: Okay. I will write something up and have it for you in the morning to look at. Okay. Is there anything else we need to address? Do you want to talk about timing for the case? MR. MCMASTER: Judge, we have Miss Ozburn who's

supposed to be here tomorrow morning, we have the

short proffer that we need to give before she would testimony and then we have Agent Cory Crumbley from FDLE on the DNA and then we'll rest. We would respectfully rest by noon.

THE COURT: Okay. Boy, I would have had the jury come thirty minutes later if I had known about Ozburn, but that's okay. I guess we'll just get started at 8:30 then. Okay. Okay. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Judge, as far as I know the Defense is going to present a case.

THE COURT: I don't know that. Are they?

MR. MOORE: Yes.

MR. BROWN: I presume that they are from what we've seen.

MR. MOORE: That's correct. That sounds like a question and unlike --

MR. MCMASTER: Unlike the statements you were making --

MR. MOORE: -- agent whatever his name is, right. We intend to start tomorrow with -- yes. What are you asking? Ask me a specific question.

MR. BROWN: My issue is we have two experts who will be travelling from out of the county. I would assume from what I'm --

THE COURT: You're talking about for the?

MR. BROWN: For the guilt phase. 1 THE COURT: For the quilt phase? 2 3 MR. BROWN: Right. For rebuttal. MR. MCMASTER: 4 THE COURT: I see what you're saying. 5 6 MR. BROWN: My thought process is I think 7 they're clearly going to go into Friday. MR. MOORE: Oh, probably even into Monday. 8 Okay. I'll tell you. We're going to do the 9 toxicology. We need to do the analyst and then the 10 toxicologist and that will be followed by Dr. --11 THE COURT: Olander. 12 MR. MCMASTER: Olander, right, the psychologist 13 and -- so, that should be the extent of our -- the 14 rest of our quilt portion. 15 MR. LANNING: Well, a couple of Palm Bay cops. 16 MR. MOORE: Palm Bay cops, right. And I have 17 yet to get -- I don't want to get too far off task 18 here, but I have only -- we've only recently heard --19 been disclosed Dr. Goldberger and I haven't got a 20 report from him yet and so I would ask that we get 21 that and I have a chance to depose him before --22 THE COURT: Say this again. Is this their? 23 MR. MOORE: This is their toxicologist who's 24

going to respond to our toxicologist and I -- you

know, I was just recently -- within the last week or so that he was disclosed and I haven't had a chance to depose because I've been in trial.

MR. MCMASTER: We verbally disclosed him some time ago but we finally got a verbal report from him and we listed him officially as a witness.

MR. MOORE: But no written report.

MR. MCMASTER: I requested one last week, I haven't received it.

MR. MOORE: Well, I need to prepare for his testimony. So, at least go over the report and my being able to depose him after I've had a chance to review the report. So, I'm asking for a report and a chance to take his deposition.

THE COURT: All right. Get that report so we can figure out when to give them an opportunity to depose him. Okay.

MR. BROWN: So, Judge, it's safe that I at least tell my witnesses, those experts, not until Monday? Would that be fair?

MR. MOORE: Yeah, I think that's an accurate.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Then we're going to go ahead

and recess for the night and we'll be in recess until 1 8:30 tomorrow morning. Okay. Thank you. 2 (Thereupon, court was in recess for the day, 3 3/26/2014. Thereafter, court was reconvened on 3/27/2014 4 5 and the proceedings were had as follows:) THE COURT: Please be seated. Okay. We can 6 7 bring out Mr. Bradley. MR. MOORE: Judge Reinman, we (unintelligible). 8 THE COURT: I'm just going to bring out 9 Mr. Bradley and we can do that. 10 (Thereupon, the defendant was escorted into the 11 courtroom by the court deputy.) 12 THE COURT: Okay. We can have a bench 13 conference. 14 (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out 15 of the hearing of the audience as follows:) 16 MR. MOORE: Scheduling, first we're going to be 17 asking for the 3.7(C) instruction on the defendant 18 being on psychotropic medications. We're 19 prepared and I have subpoenaed to bring Dr. Perez 20 who's a psychiatrist at the jail with his records to 21 establish that Mr. Bradley is on psychotropic 22 medications and the reason for it. 23 THE COURT: The instruction -- I'm not familiar 24

25

with the --

MR. MOORE: Yes, ma'am, I have a proposed -I'm not asking for it right this second.

THE COURT: You're talking about when I give the instructions or you talking about do you give that earlier?

MR. MOORE: We can't -- yeah, we can't give it until we lay a predicate and that leads me to ask the State, which and I did earlier, if they would be willing to stipulate that he's on these two specific medications, Doxepin and Risperdal, or do we need to bring the doctor and I've subpoenaed him for April 1, which would be Tuesday, at 9:00 a.m. So -- I mean, you know, what the State's position is, that will determine what direction we go in with that so. And I've got some other scheduling issues that I want to discuss.

MR. BROWN: Judge, we talked about it and we told Mr. Moore we'd have an answer for him before Tuesday.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BROWN: I have not checked (unintelligible) and we'll answer for him before this week's over.

MR. MCMASTER: If Mr. Moore has the records to show that he's on the medications I don't think there's going to be any big dispute about it but the

2.4

real question is whether or not the instruction's proper. If you look at the instructions they're in conjunction with insanity defenses. I don't think there's an insanity defense.

MR. MOORE: Well, it's -- it's not given if -- only if we're seeking an insanity defense, but in any event we'll be litigating that at the time that we present that testimony unless the State stipulates and so that's in limbo.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MCMASTER: Are you anticipating that in your case-in-chief?

MR. MOORE: What?

MR. MCMASTER: In your case-in-chief?

MR. MOORE: Yeah, as soon as we get the green light that we can get that instruction, we're going to ask that it be read and I'm not talking -- sooner rather than later. I'm not looking to give it at the penalty phase or any particular point in time, just as soon as we get a ruling from the Court that we can give it, that's when I would like to give it. And I don't want to drag the psychiatrist down here but, you know, I'm prepared to do that, but in any event. So, that's one issue.

THE COURT: Okay.

2

3

5

6

8

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOORE: Another issue is as far as presenting our guilt phase case, I have all the witnesses under subpoena, they've all been contacted. The first up would be Raven DuRousseau who is a per diem nurse at the jail who drew blood and Dave McGuinness who collected the urine specimen which would have occurred the March the 7th, the day after, of '12 and Miss DuRousseau has -- I've left several messages over the last two days, she's our starting point and she hasn't returned my calls but she has been very cooperative and in touch with me. student, she's works full time and so she's kind of busy, but still, I mean, we have to start with her. So, if she gets back to me today, we can start with her this afternoon and Mr. McGuinness would be the next up in the chain is available any time. have Linda Sullivan who is the toxicology analyst with Wuesthoff and she's available this afternoon but we can't do her until we, you know, establish that we've collected the samples and got them to her. She's available this afternoon, also tomorrow all And then there's Dr. Skolly-Danziger who is the toxicologist and she's not available this afternoon but she's available tomorrow.

Now, what this means, I'm throwing a lot at the

3

5

8

9

7

10

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

Court and what I've sorted out is that Miss DuRousseau who is the starting point is either going to be available this afternoon or not, but that's going to depend on her calling me back. I've left messages. She's not available tomorrow morning because she has to take a test. She tests every Monday and she's working toward a nursing degree and she's in Orlando doing that and so she's available tomorrow afternoon at 1:30. So, if we can't get her in today, then we would have to start with our experts at 1:30 tomorrow starting with her and we could do all of our toxicology stuff, that would be DuRousseau, that would be McGuinness, that would be Sullivan, that would be Skolly-Danziger and we can do all of that in one afternoon and then doctor -- our next expert would be Dr. Olander and she's available Monday but not tomorrow. So, that's the lineup, that's how it's shaping up.

We have a couple of other witnesses who are lay persons who would be rebuttal witnesses who are available and I think are coming in this afternoon at 1:30. So, we can do them.

THE COURT: Okay. What do you want me to say?

MR. MOORE: I'm just saying, you know, when the

Court looks at and says okay, Defense, you ready to

proceed, then I'm just laying sort of a ground work of how ready we are and when we're ready. Doing the best we can.

THE COURT: Well, I hope you've got a secretary on somebody on getting the one for this afternoon.

MR. MOORE: Well, I'm on it and I can only --

THE COURT: Do you have someone helping you?

You obviously can't be on it when you're here

listening to cross exam -- I mean listening --

MR. MOORE: You know, it requires her to return my calls. I mean, she can ignore me like she can ignore anybody else so. But she's not doing that. I mean, she -- when we take a break --

THE COURT: I'm saying you can't take a call if you're sitting here in court, so.

MR. MOORE: When we take a break they'll either be -- I understand. There would be something on my answering machine or there won't and I've put -- I've laid it all out and said we need you at 1:30 today and that's the message I've been leaving at the jail and on her voice mail, so. It's not a question of whether she's got the information, she knows when she's supposed to be here. I'm doing all I can.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MR. MOORE: That would be it.

THE COURT: Yesterday the juror had the question. We had more than one.

MR. MOORE: That's acceptable.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll respond -- I'll give that response to the question. You want to keep that for your records? Anything else?

MR. MCMASTER: Judge, Miss Ozburn was supposed to be first up this morning, last we've heard she's not yet arrived, she was instructed to be here at 8:00 o'clock. We were told that she had left the residence and was on her way and would be about fifteen minutes.

MR. BROWN: At about 8:25 we put another call into her. She apparently was in the hospital last night. She had a C section last week, she apparently had a bad night so her and her boyfriend were leaving their house at 8:25. When we talked to them they said they were on their way out the door and they said it's fifteen, twenty minutes. So, we expect her to be here if not already.

THE COURT: Is she first up?

MR. MCMASTER: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Yes, she's the one we have to do the proffer on.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm going to tell them

to tell the jurors that they've got a few moments. 1 MR. MOORE: Good idea. 2 (Thereupon, the benchside conference was 3 concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:) 4 THE COURT: Okay. We have a few matters that 5 we need handle outside the presence of the jury. So, they're going to have a few moments, if you'll let 7 them know that. If they want to go get coffee, they 8 can probably -- I mean, it's probably going to be 9 another fifteen minutes. Okay. I don't know if they 10 have coffee in the room. If they want something like 11 that, if we can accommodate them. 12 THE COURT DEPUTY: Yes, ma'am. 13 MR. MOORE: Can I step out for a minute, Your 14 Honor? 15 16 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 17 (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the 18 proceedings.) THE COURT: Do we know anything yet? 19 MR. MCMASTER: They're driving as fast as they 20 21 can. 22 THE COURT: Okay. (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the 23 proceedings.) 24 THE COURT: Is that jury instruction 3.7(C)? 25

Is it 7(C)? Because I don't have that instruction. 1 I don't see it as an instruction but it may be new. 2 I'll look it up in my other book. 3 MR. BROWN: Judge, I think it's 3.6(C). 4 5 THE COURT: 3.6(C)? 6 MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. I'm happier with that because there is no 3.7(C). 8 MR. PIROLO: It's on page J20, Judge, under the 9 10 2014 book. THE COURT: What page? 11 MR. PIROLO: J20, the 2014 purple book. 12 13 THE COURT: Yeah, I have that. (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the 14 15 proceedings.) MR. MCMASTER: Judge, she's here. 16 17 THE COURT: Do you need a moment? MR. MCMASTER: We're ready. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Then we'll go ahead and 19 bring in Miss Ozburn and that will be for purposes of 20 the proffer. So, Miss Ozburn, if you'll come 21 forward. If you'll step up before the clerk to be 22 23 sworn. 24 THEREUPON,

AMANDA OZBURN,

having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified 1 upon her oath as follows: 2 THE COURT: Have a seat in the witness chair. 3 And ma'am, once seated if you'll scoot that chair 4 forward. Do adjust that microphone and do talk into 5 that microphone. Okay Mr. McMaster. 6 7 MR. MCMASTER: Thank you, Judge. DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 9 BY MR. MCMASTER: 10 Good morning, ma'am. Q Hi. 11 Α If you would, please state your name for the 12 record and spell your last name? 13 Amanda Ozburn, O-Z-B-U-R-N. Α 14 Do you know the defendant, Brandon Bradley? 15 0 16 Α Yes. How do you Mr. Bradley? 17 0 I was friends with him for a period of time. 18 Α Okay. And what period of time are we talking 19 Q 20 about? 21 Α Like six months prior to. The shooting of Deputy Pill? 22 0 23 Yes. Α You had a social relationship with Mr. Bradley, 24 0 25 spent some time with him?

1 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Do you recall an incident in December of 2011 when you were with Mr. Bradley in a vehicle travelling from 192 to the Eau Gallie area?

A Yes.

Q Did you have an occasion to see several police vehicles during that trip?

A Yes.

Q What was Mr. Bradley's reaction to seeing the police vehicles?

A He was nervous.

Q Had you had conversations with Mr. Bradley where he had told you that he was aware that he had outstanding arrest warrants?

A Yes.

Q Do you know how many?

A No.

Q Did Mr. Bradley at any time ever tell you what it was he would do if he were apprehended by the police or the police attempted to apprehend him?

A Try to run and get away.

Q Did he also tell you that he was -- if he ever got pulled over they're going to have to hold court in the streets because I'm going out like a soldier?

A I don't recall.

2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

8

12 13 14

15 16

18

17

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

Do you recall giving a statement to the police Q. on March 9th of 2012 a, couple of days after the shooting of Deputy Pill?

MR. PIROLO: Objection, Judge. May we approach?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of the audience as follows:)

MR. PIROLO: They're getting improper impeachment of the witness. They're calling their witness solely to impeach her. There's case law right on point. There's a whole slew of cases actually, I'd probably want to start with a more recent case. I know Mr. Moore has a bunch here, but there's a Florida Supreme Court, Morton versus State, it's from 1997, 689 So.2d 259, and there are copies for the State and the Court as well. It stands for a party knowingly calls a witness for the primary purpose of introducing a prior statement which otherwise would be inadmissible impeachment should ordinarily be excluded and pretty much what we're getting at here is that Miss Ozburn's already said she does not recall making the statement.

In her deposition she's admitted she does not recall making the statement to law enforcement

officers. She was given a copy of her statement, she even read a couple of pages into it and told under oath that she did not agree with anything in the statement, that she can't give it any credibility at all due to her influence of -- being under the influence at the time she made the statement and she added to the fact that she did not recall Mr. Bradley making the specific statement to her and that's why she said that's why I don't understand, that's why I can't give the statement -- another reason why I can't give my own statement to law enforcement any credibility.

Judge, there's also another case, obviously it's a Supreme Court case and there's a more recent case holds the same exact premise. It's 2013 from the Fifth DCA, Bleich or Bleich, B-L-E-I-C-H, 108 So.3d 1132, same exact premise. State cannot call a witness for the sole purpose of impeaching a witness. In the Bleich case, Judge, it was a codefendant. Prior to trial and a proffer during the trial the codefendant said I don't recall making the statement to law enforcement regarding -- in reference to the defendant's involvement in the robbery. The defense objected, the state -- the court went ahead and allowed the state to essentially impeach their own

witness with the prior statement and the court found it reversible error. They found out the sole purpose was to impeach the witness and that's what we're getting at here.

THE COURT: I just want to make sure I know the fact scenario for the record is that she made a statement to --

MR. PIROLO: Law enforcement.

THE COURT: -- law enforcement and then in the deposition she denies that she made that statement or said she can't recall.

MR. PIROLO: Right, she can recall making that statement and more importantly --

THE COURT: She can't recall.

MR. PIROLO: Right, and she can not recall Mr. Bradley making the statement to her that the State is trying to elicit. State's trying to elicit that Mr. Bradley at some time made a statement to her, she indicates she cannot recall Mr. Bradley making that statement.

THE COURT: Okay. Response from the State.

MR. MCMASTER: First of all, the primary purpose of calling the witness is for two reason.

One was to get the testimony that the defendant admitted to her that he was aware that he had

outstanding arrest warrants, that he was intending to run. Secondly, she is going to I believe testify that he also carried a gun, a black gun and that she had seen it. I'm going to show her a photograph of State's Exhibit --

THE COURT: I think he's just talking about the one statement that she just said.

MR. MCMASTER: That's not the primary purpose for calling her. she's on the stand I believe I should be allowed.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MCMASTER: Once she's on the stand then I believe I should be allowed to ask her if he made a statement to that effect. Whether she recalls it or not, I think that's for the jury to decide what weight to give to her statement. It would be proper impeachment. I don't know what she's going to say when I ask her the question, that's why we're doing the proffer.

MR. BROWN: The Morton case, reading directly from the case of page 5 of 7 from the copy, on the other hand, a party may always impeach its witness if the witness give affirmatively harmful testimony. In a case where a witness gives both favorable and unfavorable testimony, the party calling the witness

should usually be permitted to impeach the witness for the prior inconsistent statement. That's the key. The issue in this case, they go on further that the prosecutor compounded the problem in closing argument in both the guilt and penalty phases by asserting the content of the impeaching statements as proven facts. That was the issue that they really had a problem. In this case --

THE COURT: Here's my problem. It's not -this isn't like she made a statement in a deposition
under oath. She's never admitted to making a
statement. So, how can it be a prior inconsistent
statement?

MR. MCMASTER: Page 7 of the transcript of her sworn statement to Agent Buggs of the sheriff's office.

THE COURT: Okay. So.

MR. MOORE: What is the Court reading?

MR. MCMASTER: The transcript.

MR. MOORE: We don't have the transcript up here. Let me get it.

THE COURT: Well, this -- I didn't realize it had been recorded.

MR. MCMASTER: Yes.

THE COURT: But it was --

MR. MCMASTER: It was a recorded statement.

THE COURT: That's why I was trying to get the facts because I didn't know what the facts of the statement was.

MR. PIROLO: But again, Judge, she did not -under oath in her deposition she denies -- she
indicates that she has no recollection of Mr. Bradley
ever making that statement. She reads that
transcript during the deposition and puts it down and
says I can't read this whole thing, everything in
here cannot be looked as being credible and that's
her own words in the deposition. And she indicates
that she was interrogated by seven other officers
prior to these officers interrogating her, she was
shackled in the courthouse, she was under the
influence of cocaine and other drugs.

THE COURT: That is all something you can save for cross examination. This was apparently a sworn statement, correct? Okay. I mean --

MR. PIROLO: Going back to the Morton case, on page 5 of that --

THE COURT: You can have that back.

MR. PIROLO: -- case, the third full paragraph on that page, starting with the second to the last sentence says the statement should be truly

inconsistent and cause should be exercised in committing impeachment of a witness who has given favorable testimony but simply fails to recall every detail unless the witness appears to be fabricating. This isn't impeachment, she's indicating I have no memory of Mr. Bradley ever making those statements to me.

THE COURT: If she denies making -- I mean, prior inconsistent statement can only come in if the witness denies making or does not distinctly admit making, it's either one, then it comes in. So, she says I don't recall, that does not distinctly admit making. So, I'm going to overrule the objection.

MR. MOORE: Here's another issue.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MOORE: If it comes in it can only come in as impeachment and the Court -- and we're requesting an instruction to the jury that it is not to be considered as substantive evidence but as impeachment and going to the credibility only of the witness.

Because it's not a statement that they're impeaching her with that was given in another proceeding under 90.801(2)(c).

And the Morton case also deals with that. If the -- if it were -- another proceeding is defined as

2

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. MOORE: At the time that she testifies or

after she testifies I would say because we're not for

a court proceeding, a deposition, a trial testimony, grand jury testimony, but the courts have consistently held a statement given to the police is not another proceeding within the meaning of 90.801(2)(c) and therefore it can only be used to impeach. As to the credibility it can't be relied upon by the jury of substantive evidence and the jury should be instructed to limit their consideration for that purpose.

> THE COURT: Okay. Response.

MR. MCMASTER: That's an accurate statement of the law, Judge, I don't have any problem with that.

THE COURT: What kind of instruction do you want me to give?

MR. MOORE: The testimony -- well, the testimony the jury should be given by this witness should only be considered as it goes to her credibility, her believability and may not be considered by you as substantive evidence.

THE COURT: I mean, when do I give that?

MR. BROWN: Simply saying the testimony of this witness, that's overbroad.

THE COURT: When do I give it?

sure what she's going to say.

THE COURT: I mean, then it's to all her statement as opposed to the one statement.

MR. BROWN: Right, that's why I said as phrased it's not accurate.

MR. MOORE: The testimony --

THE COURT: I mean, I should say this testimony so they understand that. I mean, I should give it right after she says it.

MR. MOORE: I'm thinking that we have to wait until she testifies because we're absolutely --

THE COURT: I know, but if she's going to testify and if that happens we have to be ready for it.

MR. MOORE: I'm saying -- because we don't know exactly what's going to come out of her mouth that we should wait until she testifies and then fashion the instruction.

THE COURT: Okay. You can object and we can have a bench conference but be ready with something.

MR. MOORE: Okay.

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. McMaster, you may continue.

Thank you. 1 MR. MCMASTER: BY MR. MCMASTER: 2 Miss Ozburn, do you remember giving a statement 3 0 to agents of the Brevard County Sheriff's Office on March 4 9th of 2012? 5 6 Α Yes. 7 That was here at this courthouse? Q 8 Α Yes. And do you recall making the statement to them 9 Q under oath that he even said if I ever get pulled over 10 they're going have to hold court in the streets because 11 I'm going out like a soldier? 12 I don't remember. 13 Α You don't remember whether you said that or 14 Q not? 15 16 Α No. 17 Would it refresh your recollection to be able Q to look at a transcript of your statement? 18 I suppose. 19 Α MR. MCMASTER: May I approach the witness, 20 21 Judge? 22 THE COURT: Yes, you may. BY MR. MCMASTER: 23 Showing you what is a transcript of the March 24 0 9th, 2012, interview and directing you to page 7. 25

would start right here on line 16 and read through there 1 and up through the top part of this. 2 Do I have to read it out loud? 3 Α MR. MOORE: I couldn't here what part of the 4 5 transcript. MR. MCMASTER: Line 16, page 7 to the bottom of 6 7 the page and the first couple lines on the second 8 page, page 8. BY MR. MCMASTER: 9 Have you had an opportunity to read that, Miss 10 Q Ozburn? 11 Yes, sir. 12 Α And does it refresh your recollection as to 13 0 whether or not you said that to the agents back on March 14 15 9th? 16 Α Yes. 17 You do recall saying that, is that correct? Q 18 Α Yes. Did you know Mr. Bradley to possess firearms 19 Q during the time you knew him? 20 21 Α Yes. What color and what kind of firearm was it that 22 you saw him have? 23 It was black, it was a handgun. I don't really 24

25

know a lot of about guns.

MR. MCMASTER: May I approach the witness, 1 2 Judge? 3 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 4 BY MR. MCMASTER: Showing you what has been admitted into 5 evidence as State's Exhibit 8, can you tell me if the 6 7 weapon that you saw Mr. Bradley with looked anything like that one? 8 9 Α Yes. MR. MCMASTER: Thank you, ma'am. No further 10 11 questions. THE COURT: Okay. Cross examination. 12 CROSS EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. PIROLO: 14 Miss Ozburn, you remember reviewing the 15 16 interview that you gave to law enforcement, the same 17 transcript you were given this morning? 18 Α Yes. You had a chance to look at that during your 19 Q deposition, remember that? 20 21 Α Um-hmm. 22 And isn't it true that a lot of the things you said, specifically the statement Mr. McMaster asked you 23 about what Mr. Bradley said about holding court in the 24 streets, that you don't even remember Mr. Bradley making 25

that statement, correct?

- A That's correct.
- Q A lot of things you told law enforcement you yourself say shouldn't be looked at in a credible way, right?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Including that statement?
 - A Especially that statement.
 - Q Especially that statement.

MR. PIROLO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Miss Ozburn, we're going to have you step outside for a few moments and then we're going to bring you back in and that will be in the presence of the jury. I am going to have to have you resworn because I want you sworn in their presence.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: So, if you'll step outside, we'll call you in a few moments.

(Thereupon, the witness exited the witness stand.)

THE COURT: Okay. This is in reference to -this is the proffer -- that was the proffer in
reference to this Court's order regarding defendant's
motion in limine three and motion in limine four and

that was with regard to this Court's ruling in paragraph two. Argument by the State.

MR. MCMASTER: Judge, it appears to me based on the proffer that the witness's testimony is relevant, it's admissible and we ask that we be allowed Miss Ozburn to testify (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. Response from the Defense.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, the witness herself said, quoting her, especially the last statement pertaining to the statement that she told the court especially that statement not to look at it to be credible. She's in fact saying that jurors should not believe that statement.

To be clear, Judge, she has no -- she's got no memory that Mr. Bradley ever made that statement to her. The sole purpose is to impeach her, it's not (unintelligible) proper manner. She's not coming up with different statements he made, she's got no memory. So, she should not be confronted with that in front of the jury that at a different time she gave that particular statement to law enforcement.

If the Court is going to allow the State to ask her do you recall making this specific statement to law enforcement, then we're asking for an instruction at that time and that statement -- well, heard by the

۷,4

jurors and essentially that should not be given substantive value is far as impeachment purposes as to that specific statement.

Judge, we're continuing to object also in regards to Miss Ozburn going to testify that Mr. Bradley had a firearm with him during the six months they were hanging out, friends, it's completely irrelevant. There's no relevancy Whatsoever whether or not Mr. Bradley had a gun on him six months prior, a month prior, six days prior or a day prior, it's completely irrelevant. The only relevance is whether or not on March 6th, 2012, at or around the time that Deputy Pill was shot whether or not Mr. Bradley had a firearm at that time.

There's been testimony already by Miss Kerchner and the State introduced Mr. Bradley's statement and you heard in that statement Mr. Bradley indicates there was a firearm in the car and he discharged it. To have another witness testify would be cumulative. There's completely no probative value to that testimony whatsoever, it's unfairly prejudicial and we ask the Court to exclude that and not have Miss Ozburn testify.

May, I have a moment, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

1.1

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24 25

On page 27, line 6 to 8 no memory of

(Thereupon, a pause was taken in the proceedings.)

MR. PIROLO: Judge, if the Court would give us a moment to make a copy of it, we have a copy deposition, we would like to have as part of the record, Judge, the transcript of Miss Ozburn's deposition taken on February 6th, 2014, and specifically we would ask the Court to view page 36, line 5 through 10. That's where she indicates that she doesn't believe -- may I approach?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. PIROLO: Her statement, meaning the statement she gave to law enforcement, should not be looked at as being credible, she was under the influence of various drugs, she was (unintelligible) proceeding before going to court.

She also indicates on page 20, line 16 through 22 reference to the statement he's going to hold court in the streets, that she doesn't remember saying that to law enforcement.

Going over to page 21, line 19 to threw 20 to 25 and onto page 22 she doesn't remember -- it's not a credible thing that I said.

Mr. Bradley ever making that statement.

Page 37, lines 1 through 16, she doesn't remember Mr. Bradley ever saying that.

And page 38, lines 9 through 17 that she can't recall his exact words, the only thing she knew for sure was that Mr. Bradley said he would run.

And on page 29, line 7 through thirteen, that's when she starts reading the transcript of the interview with law enforcement, she had to put it down and she indicated she does not agree with what's in it and goes back to saying a lot of portions of that interview should not credible.

THE COURT: Okay. That goes to the weight, not the admissibility. So, I'm going to overrule that objection.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, the limiting instruction that we're asking, the basis of it is actually 90.801(2) Alpha and we're asking that as to -- she can independent what she's saying recall the gun Mr. Bradley carried and so she has independent recollection, she's claiming an independent recollection. As to the statement about holding court in the streets, she doesn't have a recollection of that. So, what they're impeaching her with is a statement made to the police and under Delgado, State versus Delgado-Santos at 497 So.2d

1199, that being a statement to the police is not another proceeding by which exempts it from the definition of hearsay under 90.801(2)(a) and therefore the defendant -- we are entitled to a limited instruction and I would propose that the jury be instructed at the time that she testifies about the comments about the holding court in the streets. As soon as she says that the Court say as to the statement that she just made attributed to the defendant, these comments, that --

THE COURT: Okay I kind of wrote something down.

MR. MOORE: Ma'am?

THE COURT: I kind of wrote something down.

I'll read it to you. The testimony just given by the witness should not be considered as proven fact but for the purpose of impeaching the witness.

MR. MOORE: So, because we're presuming that the jury understands what that means, impeachment means matters --

THE COURT: I should say impeachment of --

MR. MOORE: -- to be considered

(unintelligible) credibility or believability.

THE COURT: That what? Say that again.

MR. MOORE: The credibility of believability of

the witness, that's what impeachment means.

MR. BROWN: Judge, the trouble is I think the instruction needs to be more limiting than what the Court read because it's not her testimony, it's that small sliver of her testimony.

THE COURT: That's why you give it right after she says it. I want the Defense to object and then I'll give that -- object based on the Court's prior ruling and then I can give -- I said the testimony just given by this witness.

MR. MOORE: Attributing comments to the defendant assuming that's all she's going to be testifying to.

THE COURT: I can add attributing comments to the defendant. Or you want me to say the statement?

MR. BROWN: I think it needs to be limited just to that small portion.

THE COURT: Yes, I agree. So, tell me how you want me to do that. You want me to use the word statement instead of testimony?

MR. BROWN: Just statement that she made to the police officer, to the police on March 9th, 2012.

MR. MOORE: Okay. So, we're broaden it to the whole statement.

THE COURT: I don't know if you want to broaden

it to the whole statement. I was going to say the testimony she just gave because it's only that one portion, it's not everything else.

MR. MOORE: That one portion being statements she claims the defendant made that hold court in the street.

THE COURT: That's why I can say the statement just given by the witness attributing.

MR. MOORE: Comments to the defendant or out of court statements by the defendant.

THE COURT: Well, when you say out of court statements, then the jury just doesn't understand that. The statement just given by the witness attributing comments to the defendant.

MR. MOORE: Right. That's fine.

THE COURT: I like that better. Should not be considered as a proven fact but for purpose of impeachment of this witness and then you want me to say impeachment means.

MR. MOORE: That it may be considered by you in making a determination of the credibility or believability of the witness.

THE COURT: What did you say, it may be?

MR. MOORE: Information that may be considered by you in assessing the believability or the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

credibility of a witness is what impeachment means.

Maybe we should look up Blacks Law THE COURT: Dictionary as to what impeachment means. Impeachment means information to be.

MR. MOORE: Which you may consider in determining the believability or the credibility of this witness.

THE COURT: I'm going to read the whole thing. Did you say believability and credibility?

MR. MOORE: Believability or credibility.

THE COURT: I didn't know if it was an and or an or. Okay. This is what I have written so far. The statement just given by this witness attributing comments to the defendant should not be considered as a proven fact but for the purpose of impeachment of the witness. Impeachment means information you may consider in determining the believability or credibility of the witness. Is the State satisfied with that?

MR. MOORE: That's acceptable.

THE COURT: Acceptable by the State?

MR. MCMASTER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Acceptable by the Defense?

MR. MOORE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOORE: Without waiving our previous objections.

THE COURT: Of course. If she does testify to that, then what I want you to do is object and say, Judge, based on Court's prior ruling and then I'll give that. You'll stand up and do that, I'll give that statement at that time. I'm going to file this -- for purposes of the record, I'm going to file this with the court.

MR. PIROLO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So it's part of the record.

MR. PIROLO: Thank you.

THE COURT: The transcript of Amanda Ozburn dated February 6th, 2014.

Okay. Anything else we need to address before we bring the jury into the courtroom?

MR. MCMASTER: No, Your Honor.

MR. MOORE: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I think we're ready to bring them in.

(Thereupon, the jury was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

THE JURY PANEL: Good morning.

2

3

reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating

THE COURT: Has anyone read or been exposed to

4

to this trial or its participants?

5

THE JURY PANEL: No.

6

THE COURT: Has anyone seen or heard

7

television, radio or Internet comments about this

8

9

trial?

THE JURY PANEL: No.

10

THE COURT: Have you read any news headlines or

11

articles relating to this trial or its participants?

12

THE JURY PANEL: No.

13

THE COURT: Has anyone conducted or been

14

exposed to any research regarding any matters

15

concerning this case?

16

THE JURY PANEL: No.

17

THE COURT: And have you discussed this case

18

among yourselves or with anyone else or allowed

19

anyone to discuss it in your presence?

20

THE JURY PANEL: No.

21

THE COURT: Okay. Yesterday I had a question

22

by a juror and this is in response to that question.

23

The DVD of the interview with the defendant has been

24

received in evidence. This item will be available

25

for you for viewing during your deliberations at the

end of the trial. A transcript of the interview will not be provided. Okay. That's in response to that question.

Okay. Other witnesses on behalf of the State.

MR. MCMASTER: State calls Amanda Ozburn.

THE COURT: Okay. Ma'am, if you'll come forward. Step before the clerk to be sworn.

THEREUPON,

AMANDA OZBURN,

having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified upon her oath as follows:

THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated in the witness chair. Okay. Ma'am, if you'll scoot your chair forward. Do talk into that microphone, it helps your testimony aids, in aids in recording your testimony. Okay. Mr. McMaster, you may proceed.

MR. MCMASTER: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MCMASTER:

Q Miss Ozburn, I'm going to ask you a series of questions, if you would, direct your responses to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury and let's start by telling them your name and if you would please spell your last name for the record?

A Amanda Ozburn, O-Z-B-U-R-N.

Miss Ozburn, do you know the defendant, Brandon 1 Q 2 Bradley? 3 Α Yes. How do you know him? 4 Q I was friends with him. 5 Α And what period of time are we talking about? 6 Q Six months prior to the shooting. 7 Α Prior to the shooting of Deputy Pill on March 8 9 6th, 2012? Yes. 10 Α Did you spend a considerable amount of time 11 0 12 with him? Yes. 13 Α Were you aware that during the timeframe that 14 0 you knew him that he possessed and carried firearm? 15 16 Α Yes. MR. PIROLO: Objection, relevance. 17 THE COURT: Overruled. 18 MR. MCMASTER: Approach the witness? 19 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 20 21 BY MR. MCMASTER: Showing you what has been marked and admitted 22 0 as State's Exhibit 8 in evidence, would you look at that 23 24 and tell me if that looks like the weapon you observed

Mr. Bradley to have during the time that you knew him?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q Where was it that he would carry the weapon?
- 3 A In his waistband.
- 4 Q Do you recall an incident when you and
- 5 Mr. Bradley were together in December of 2011 driving from
- 6 | the area of 192 toward the Eau Gallie area?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q During that drive, did you have an occasion to 9 see a number of police vehicles?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q What, if Onything, was the reaction of
- 12 Mr. Bradley had to seeing the police vehicles?
- MR. PIROLO: Objection, relevance.
- 14 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 15 THE WITNESS: He was nervous.
- 16 BY MR. MCMASTER:

- Q Did he say anything?
- 18 A Um-hmm.
- 19 Q Were you aware that Mr. Bradley had outstanding
- 20 | arrest warrants?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Do you know how many he had?
- 23 A I don't recall.
- Q He told you he knew that he had outstanding
- 25 | arrest warrants?

21

22

23

25

Α

- Q Did he tell you what it was he was going to do or what he would do if the police tried to pull him over or take him into custody?
 - A Just that he would try to run.
 - Q Did he ever tell you anything else?
 - A Not that I recall.

Yeah.

- Q Did he ever tell you that he would -- if he ever got pulled over they're going to have to hold court in the streets because I'm going out like a soldier?
- A I didn't recall until this morning when you showed me.
 - Q But he said that to you at one point?

MR. PIROLO: Objection, Judge.

- THE COURT: Okay. It is -- is it a different objection that we discussed earlier?
- MR. PIROLO: No, Your Honor, same objection that you wanted us to approach.
- THE COURT: She hasn't completed her answer. So I, want her to complete her answer and then you can renew your objection.
- THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question, please?
- 24 BY MR. MCMASTER:
 - Q All right. Do you recall Mr. Bradley making

1 | that statement to you?

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 I did not recall until this morning. I don't recall him saying that, no.

Q Did you ever tell anybody under oath that he told you that?

A Yes, I did.

Q And that was in a sworn statement that you gave to the agents on March 6th of 2012?

A Yes.

Q Just a couple of days after the shooting?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Pirolo due, want to renew your objection?

MR. PIROLO: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Based on a Court's prior ruling, this statement just given by this witness attributing comments to the defendant should not be considered as a proven fact but for the purpose of impeachment of this witness. Impeachment means information you may consider in determining the believability or credibility of the witness.

Okay. Mr. McMaster, anything else?

MR. MCMASTER: Just one thing, Judge.

BY MR. MCMASTER:

Q Miss Ozburn, do you see Mr. Bradley, the person

you knew as Brandon Bradley in the courtroom today? 1 2 Yes. Where's he seated? 0 Right there. 4 Α Where ma'am? 5 0 (Witness indicates.) 6 Α MR. MCMASTER: Let the record reflect that she 7 pointed to the defendant. No further questions, 8 9 Judge. THE COURT: Okay. Cross examination by the 10 Defense. 11 MR. PIROLO: Yes, Your Honor. 12 13 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. PIROLO: 14 Good morning, Miss Ozburn. You need a moment? 15 Q (Witness nods head.) Okay. 16 Α Would you like some water? 17 Q Α No thank you. 18 I know you recently had a child last week, 19 0 right? 20 Yes. 21 А Okay. Did you have to go back to the hospital 22 Q 23 last night? 24 Α Yeah. 25 Because of? Q

A Huh?

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 2 Q Because of?
 - A He's in the NICU so I go every night.
 - Q Sorry to hear that. If you need a moment, just let us know.
 - A No, I'm fine.
 - Q Miss Ozburn, you indicated regarding a statement Mr. McMaster asked you, you said you don't recall Mr. Bradley making that statement, correct?
 - A Correct.
 - Q As you sit here today, you didn't have any independent recollection, any memory of Mr. Bradley ever making that statement to you, correct?
 - A No, I do not.
 - Q And Mr. McMaster also talked to you about an interview that you gave to law enforcement, when you made that statement to law enforcement, do you remember that statement?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And there's a lot of things that you told law enforcement that you've told us since then that should not be looked at as credible, right?
 - A Correct.
 - Q And specifically the statement that you said Mr. Bradley said I'm going to hold court in the streets,

that specifically should not be looked at as a credible
statement, right?

A Correct.

Q You've been very candid about that, open about that, right?

A Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q In fact, we took your deposition back in February of this year and you were given a chance to read that statement that you gave to law enforcement, correct?

A Yes.

Q At some point you just put it down, right?

A Yeah.

Q And the reason why you put it down you said looking through it and a lot of this stuff can't be look at as credible, right?

A That's correct.

Q And one of the reasons why is you don't remember Mr. Bradley ever making again specifically that statement to you, right?

A Correct.

Q And the morning that you gave that statement that was here in Viera, right?

A Yes.

O In the courthouse?

A Yes.

- 1 Q And you were in custody, right?
- 2 A Um-hmm.
- 3 Q You have to say yes or no.
- 4 A Oh, yes.
- 5 Q And they had you, for lack of a better term, 6 shackled?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q By shackled means your -- you had handcuffs on 9 your wrists?
- 10 A And ankles.
- 11 Q And ankles too. Okay.
- And would you say there was a lot of law enforcement officers talking to you that morning?
- 14 A Yes.
- And would you say seven, eight be a fair number?
- 17 A Yeah.
- Q Okay. They were talking to you about something else, right?
- 20 A Correct.
- 21 Q They were talking to you about a home invasion 22 robbery that you were arrested on, right?
- 23 A Correct.
- Q And at that moment in time that was a pending case, right?

A Yes.

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

- Q And to your knowledge, do you remember -- at that point in time you were potentially looking at -- as the case evolved potentially looking at thirty years in prison, right?
- A Yes.
 - Q That was a very serious case, right?
- 8 A Yeah.
 - Q And do you feel that you were, for lack of a better term, swarmed, stormed by law enforcement that morning?
- 12 A Yeah.
- Q And they talked to you for quite a while about that case?
- 15 A Correct.
- 16 Q Doesn't involve this case, right?
- 17 A Correct.
- 18 Q And at some point after that they wanted to 19 talk to you about Mr. Bradley, right?
 - A Yes.
- 21 Q And you would admit that that morning you were 22 under the influence of drugs, right?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q You had been up pretty much that entire night?
- 25 A Yes.

You were under the influence of cocaine and 1 Q 2 Xanax? 3 Yes. Α And at that time, I know things have changed 4 Q since then, but at that time you were doing drugs pretty 5 6 much every day, were you not? 7 Α Yeah. And you were doing cocaine on a daily basis? 8 Q 9 Α Yes. And when you would do cocaine you would do 10 Q what, about a gram each time? 11 12 If not more. Α So, when you went into the courthouse that 13 0 morning you had -- do you recall how much cocaine you had 14 15 done prior to going to court? Quite a bit because I was up for the entire 16 17 night. And you did some that morning as well before 18 coming to court, right? 19 Α Yes. 20 You can't give us an exact amount, it was just 21 Q 22 a lot, right? Correct. 23 Α And that's another reason why you don't believe 24 Q

the statement you gave to law enforcement should be looked

at as being credible, right?

A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q You were heavily under the influence, is that a fair statement?

A Yes, it is.

Q You don't agree with a lot of things that you said to law enforcement, correct?

A No.

Q After being able to look back sober and read that statement, you can't say that a lot of those things should be -- that you agree with those things, correct?

A Correct.

Q And you would also agree that a combination of the drugs you were on, Xanax and cocaine, at that time would affect your memory as well, right?

A Yes.

Q Were you dating someone by the name of Eric or living with someone by the name of Eric at that period of time?

A Yes.

Q And there would be times that because you were on that combination of drugs that sometimes you would ask Eric did this really happen, you really didn't know if it happened or not, right?

A Correct.

A lot of times Eric would say no, that didn't 1 Q 2 happen, right? 3 Α Yes. Mr. McMaster asked you during the time leading 4 Q up to March 6th, 2012, whether you had seen a firearm with 5 Mr. Bradley and you had seen Mr. Bradley in possession of 6 a firearm? 8 Correct. Α And he was carrying that for protection, isn't 9 10 that true? 11 Α Yes. There was a guy by the name of Pookie that was 12 0 constantly threatening Mr. Bradley? 13 14 Α Yes. And that's why he was carrying the gun at that 15 16 time? 17 Α Correct. And I know you said you were with -- hanging 18 out with Mr. Bradley for about six months prior to March 19 6th, right? 20 21 Α Yes. And you guys would hang out pretty much on a 22 0 23 daily basis together? 24 Α Yes.

And during that time and closer to March 6th,

25

Q

2012, you were doing drugs, right? 1 2 Yes. Α Mr. Bradley was doing a lot of drugs too, 3 Q 4 right? 5 Correct. Α And you would smoke something called Backwoods, 6 Q 7 right? Yeah. 8 Α That's a way of smoking marijuana, right? 9 Q 10 Yeah. Yes. Α And that's a lot bigger than a joint, right? 11 Q 12 Α Yes. 13 You laugh because it's much bigger. Tell the 0 members the jury what you mean by that, how much --14 15 I mean, as opposed to something this big around, it's about that big around. 16 17 Q How long would it be? Like that. 18 Α Basically take the tobacco out and stuff it 19 with marijuana? 20 21 Correct. Α And since you were constantly around Mr. 22 Q Bradley you'd see smoke when he smoked that much marijuana 23 it would pretty much impair his judgment? 24

25 Α Yes.

- 1 Q That's a fair statement?
- 2 Also make him more paranoid?
- 3 A Yeah.
- 4 Q Is that a yes?
- 5 A Yes.

7

8

9

13

- Q And you are currently being prosecuted by the State Attorney's Office, right?
- A Yes.
 - Q All right. A few charges that are pending?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q Grand theft auto and a grand theft?
- 12 A Yes.
 - Q And I believe you're looking at a total possible of ten years in prison on that, right?
- 15 A Correct.
- MR. PIROLO: Judge, may I have a moment?
- THE COURT: Yes, you may.
- 18 (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the
- 19 proceedings.)
- 20 BY MR. PIROLO:
- 21 Q Miss Ozburn, I first want to clear up
 22 something. The home invasion that was pending at that
 23 time, someone else was implicated with you and that
 24 someone else wasn't Mr. Bradley, correct?
- 25 A Correct.

Was it a boyfriend at the time or some other 1 Q 2 guy? It was a friend. 3 Α Okay. And Mr. Bradley when he saw law 4 Q enforcement officers back in 2011 you believe it was, he 5 6 pretty much told you he was going to run, right, if he was confronted by police officers? 7 8 Correct. Α Run or flee? 9 Q 10 Α Yes. He never indicated that he was going to shoot 11 Q them or be violent towards them, right? 12 13 Α No. No, that I'm not right or no, that he didn't 14 Q say that? 15 16 А No, he didn't say that. Okay. And getting back to the drugs that you 17 0 were doing at the time, they also would make you paranoid 18 19 as well?

> Α Correct.

> > MR. PIROLO: I don't have anything else.

THE COURT: Okay. Redirect on behalf of the

State.

MR. MCMASTER: Very briefly, Judge.

25

20

21

22

23

1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MR. MCMASTER: Miss Ozburn, the charges that are pending 3 Q against you, you did not enter into any kind of agreement 4 with the State for your testimony here today, is that 5 6 correct? 7 Α No. You do have use immunity for what you say here 8 in court just like any other witness? 9 10 Α Correct. But you really didn't even want to be here 11 today, isn't that correct? 12 Yeah, I didn't. 13 Α MR. MCMASTER: No further questions. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Recross by the Defense. 15 RECROSS EXAMINATION 16 17 BY MR. PIROLO: Miss Ozburn, the charges pending, that's coming 18 up for calender call or pretrial conference next week? 19 20 Α Correct. 21 Q April 1st? 22 Yes. Α 23 You have a lawyer for that case, right? Q Yes. 24 Α I'm sure you've discussed the case with your 25

Q

1 | attorney, right?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A Yes.

Q And the attorney knows that you're a witness in this case, right?

A Correct.

Q In fact, you discussed -- before we started the deposition in February, you were given the opportunity to contact your attorney to have him present, right?

A Yes.

Q And you talked to the office and then you went ahead and gave the deposition in February, correct?

A Correct.

Q And isn't it true that your attorney would have suggested to you that you testifying here could help you out actually in the pending case?

A No, they said they don't represent me at all on this case and to go ahead and testify.

Q But that is something that your attorney could then go to the prosecutor that has your case and say Miss Ozburn testified for you guys in Mr. Bradley's case, right?

A I guess but that's not ever been discussed.

Q Because you hadn't testified yet, you're testifying now?

A Right, but it's never even been brought up.

But that court date is not until next week? 1 0 2 Α Correct. MR. PIROLO: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Ma'am, thank you for your 4 testimony, you're free to step down. 5 (Thereupon, the witness exited the witness 6 7 stand.) THE COURT: Okay. Other witnesses on behalf of 8 9 the State. MR. BROWN: The State would call Cory Crumbley. 10 THE COURT: What's the last name? 11 MR. BROWN: Crumbley? 12 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Ma'am, if you'll step 13 14 up to the clerk to be sworn. 15 THEREUPON, CORY CRUMBLEY, 16 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified 17 18 upon her oath as follows: THE COURT: Ma'am, if you'll have a seat in the 19 witness chair. That chair does roll around as 20 compared to other chairs, so if you'll scoot that 21 chair up forward. Do adjust that microphone, do talk 22 into that microphone, it helps us hear your 23 testimony, it also aids in recording your testimony. 24

25

Okay. Mr. Brown.

1 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. BROWN: 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. BROWN: Ma'am, could you please state your name and 4 0 5 spell your first and last name? My name's Cory Crumbley, C-R-U-M-B-E-L-Y. 6 7 How are you employed? Q I'm employed as a crime lab analyst with the 8 Α Florida Department of Law Enforcement. 9 And how long have you been so employed? 10 0 Approximately twelve years. 11 Α 12 And what are your duties? Q 13 I'm a crime laboratory analyst. So, my job is Α to examine items of evidence for potential sources of DNA. 14 15 Once identified, I perform DNA analysis on those samples. And can you tell the jury what's your 16 17 educational background and training for DNA analysis? I have a Bachelor of Science degree in 18 Α molecular biology and microbiology from the University of 19 Central Florida and I completed a year long training 20 program at the Florida Department of Law Enforcement. 21 And have you previously testified as an expert 22 23 in this field? 24 Α Yes, I have. And can you tell the jury how many times and in 25

Q

what courts?

A Approximately thirty-five times in Orange County, Osceola County, Volusia County, St. Martin County.

Q And would it even be possible to give the jury a number of items that you've examined for potential existence of DNA?

A I've performed STR testing over thirty-five hundred times.

Q Now, can you tell the jury what is DNA and how is it left on an item?

A DNA stands for deoxyribonucleic acid, it's your genetic blueprint, it's found in virtually every cell of your body and within those cells it's the same. You inherit half of your profile from your mother, half from your father. The profile is determined at conception and it remains the same throughout your lifetime. Only identical twins will have the same DNA profile at all thirteen markers that I tested for in this case. You can leave DNA behind in the form of body fluids like blood, semen or saliva. You can also leave DNA behind in the form of skin cells if you touch or handle an item or you can shed hairs.

Q Okay. Now, you indicated thirteen genetic markers, what are those thirteen and how do you pick those thirteen?

A Those thirteen markers were determined by a panel, they were chosen because they were fairly well characterized, they could be multiplexed very easily and used for databasing purposes.

Q And can you tell the jury how do you extract DNA from an item?

A I use chemicals and heat.

Q And then once you're able to profile, the DNA, how do you test it? What do you do with it?

A After extraction, the next step is quantitation. That is a test that tells me how much DNA I've recovered.

The next step is amplification, that's where I target and copy the DNA at the thirteen loci and a gender identification marker. That's the PCR reaction, the preliminaries chain reaction. So, the DNA at those locations is copied over and over again.

The next step is processing, that's where instrumentation detects the DNA, and the final step is analysis and that's where I analyze the data, make comparisons and interpretations relative to the data.

Q And do you ultimately then compare it to what is a known DNA sample?

A Yes, I take evidence DNA profiles that I obtain and I compare them to reference standards or known DNA

standards from individuals who may have been involved in the case.

- Q And when you do that comparison, can you tell the jury, do you do a statistical analysis to make that match and what do you do?
- A Yes. Once two profiles are determined to match, I perform random what's called a random match probability statistic, that statistic tells me what the probability is of a coincidental match between the two profiles.
- Q And so you indicated you have the fourteen genetic markers, the one being the sex marker and then the thirteen other genetic markers, correct?
 - A Correct.

- Q And if a person -- if the two samples differ in any particular genetic marker, what does that tell you?
- A That that individual is excluded, there's no way that they donated the profile.
- Q And if they're the same, that's when you do the statistical analysis?
 - A Yes.
- Q And is the type process that you've discussed, your extraction process, analyzing it and then the statistical analysis, is that accepted within the scientific community?

- 1 A Yes, it is.
- Q Now, were you assigned and did you do

 comparisons on the case of the State of Florida versus

 Brandon Bradley?
- 5 A I did.
- 6 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, may I approach the
- 7 witness?
- THE COURT: Yes, you may.
- 9 BY MR. BROWN:
- 10 Q First I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit CA, do you recognize that?
- 12 A Yes, I do.
- 13 Q And how do you recognize it?
- 14 A I recognize the FDLE case number and my
 15 initials.
- 16 Q And can you tell the jury, did you receive that 17 item?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q And once -- when you received it, was it 20 sealed?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q And did you open that particular package?
- 23 A I did.
- Q And during the time that it was open, did you have the contents exclusively within your possession?

- 1 A I did.
- 2 Q And when you were completed with that item, did
- 3 | you reseal it?
- 4 A Yes, I did.
- 5 Q And the seal intact?
- 6 A Yes, it is.
- 7 Q What's contained within that package?
- 8 A These are buccal swabs represented as being 9 from Brandon Bradley.
- 10 Q Also want to show to you Exhibit CD marked for 11 identification, do you recognize that item?
- 12 A Yes, I do.
- 13 Q How do you recognize it?
- 14 A I recognize it by the FDLE case number and my
 15 initials.
- 16 Q And is your seal intact?
- 17 A Yes, it is.
- Q And did you -- when you opened that item to
 examine the contents, was it exclusively within your
 possession?
- 21 A Yes, it was.
- 22 Q Until you resealed it?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q And what is contained within that item?
- A A set of buccal swabs represented as being from

1 Andria Kerchner.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q And so the jury understands, what are buccal swabs?
- A Buccal swabs are samples collected from the inside of an individual's cheeks, it picks up skin cells so that I can obtain a DNA profile and use that for comparison.
- Q And I want to show you what has been marked as Exhibit FD for identification, do you recognize that item?
 - A Yes, I do.
 - Q And how do you recognize it?
- A I recognize it by my mark, the FDLE case number and the seal with my initials on it.
 - Q And is your seal intact?
- A Yes, it is.
 - Q What is contained within that item?
 - A This is a DNA card represented as being from Deputy Pill.
 - MR. BROWN: Your Honor, at this time the State would move these three items marked as the next numbered State exhibits.
 - THE COURT: Response from the Defense.
 - MR. PIROLO: No objection.
- THE COURT: Okay. Hopefully I've got the numbers right. CA will be 166, CB will be 167 and FD

1 will be 168. 2 (Thereupon, State's Exhibit Numbers 166, 167 and 168 were marked and received in evidence.) 3 BY MR. BROWN: 4 5 Miss Crumbley, can you tell the jury what you did with each of those three items we were just 6 7 discussing? I took samples from the separately and I 8 performed DNA analysis on those samples. 9 And what was the result of that DNA analysis? 10 0 I obtained three different complete DNA 11 Α 12 profiles at all the markers that I tested for. 13 Next want to show you what is marked as Q Exhibits EU and BW, do you recognize these exhibits? 14 15 Α Yes, I do. And how do you recognize those exhibits? 16 Q I recognize them by the FDLE case number and my 17 Α initials. 18 And when you opened those, did you have those 19 exclusively within your possession until you resealed the 20 21 item? 22 Α Yes. 23 And is your seal intact? 0

Can you tell the jury what is in each of those

24

25

Yes.

Α

Q

1 items and please identify the item?
2 A This item, State's Exhib
3 swabs from item FE5, a magazine. E

A This item, State's Exhibit EW, is a set of swabs from item FE5, a magazine. EU, State's Exhibit EU, appears to be a set of swabs from item FE3 from a magazine.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, at this time the State would move each of those marked exhibits into evidence as the next numbered State exhibits.

THE COURT: Response from the Defense.

MR. PIROLO: No objection.

THE COURT: Okay. EU will be State's Exhibit 169, EW will be State's Exhibit 170.

(Thereupon, State's Exhibit Numbers 169 and 170 were marked and received in evidence.)

BY MR. BROWN:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q And did you do the analysis on each of those items, the same analysis that we've discussed already?

A Yes, I did.

Q And can you tell the jury what was the result of your DNA analysis for those two -- the swabs from the magazines?

A May I consult my report?

Q Yes. You need those items back? Do you need the items back to compare it to the report?

A Yes, only because my numbers aren't the same as

1 yours.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Just so it's clear, these items are listed and they have an item number on here as SW21 for what is now in evidence as 169 and SW23, correct?

A Yes.

Q And SW23 is item 170?

A Okay.

Q And those are the item numbers that you use on your report, they are the numbers that the police list on the package, correct?

A Yes, I use the agency numbers.

Q And have you had a chance it review your report as far as your examination of these two items?

A Yes.

Q Can you tell the jury what was the result of you DNA examination?

A I obtained no DNA profile from those items.

Q Next want to show you first what is marked as Exhibits TE otherwise known as SW20, Exhibit EV as SW22, EX which was SW24.

THE COURT: EX did you say or ES?

THE WITNESS: EX.

MR. BROWN: E?

THE COURT: EX?

MR. BROWN: Yes, ma'am.

1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 BY MR. BROWN: 3 EY which was SW25 and EZ which was SW27, do you 0 recognize those items? 4 5 Yes, I do. Α And how do you recognize those items? 6 I recognize them all by the FDLE case number 7 Α 8 and my initials. And when you obtained those items and opened 9 them, did you keep them exclusively within your possession 10 during that time? 11 12 Α Yes, I did. 13 And then did you reseal those items? Q 14 Α Yes. And is your seal on each of those items intact? 15 Q 16 Α Yes, it is. 17 And can you tell the jury what is in each of those items? 18 State's ET is a set of swabs from item FE2 from 19 20 the rim and head stamp. And when you say a head stamp, is that a 21 0 22 casing? 23 It could be, yes, casing or a bullet. EV is a Α set of swabs from item FE4 again from a rim and head 24

stamp. EX is a set of swabs from item FE6 from rim and

head stamps again. EY is a set of swabs from FE7, rim and 1 2 head stamp and EZ is a set of swabs from FE11 from rims 3 and head stamp. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the State would move 4 those five items into evidence as the next numbered 5 6 State exhibits. 7 MR. PIROLO: No objection. THE COURT: Okay. ET will be State's Exhibit 8 9 171, EV will be State's exhibit 172, EX will be State's Exhibit 173, EY will be State's Exhibit 174 10 and EZ will be State's Exhibit 175. 11 12 MR. BROWN: Judge, if I can ask a follow up 13 question before I bring those items to the clerk. BY MR. BROWN: 14 15 Did you do your DNA analysis on those items? Q Yes, I did. 16 Α 17 Q And can you tell the jury what was the result 18 of your analysis on those items? I did not obtain any DNA results from these 19 20 particular items. 21 (Thereupon, State's Exhibit Numbers 171 through 175 were marked and received in evidence.) 22 23 BY MR. BROWN:

Next want to show you what's been marked as EO

and EP, do you recognize those two items?

24

25

- 1 Yes, I do. Α
- How do you recognize them? 2 0
- I recognize them by the FDLE case number, my 3 Α initials. 4
 - And is your seal intact in those two items? Q
- 6 Α Yes, it is.

7

8

9

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

- And when you opened those items, did you keep Q them exclusively within your possession during that time until you resealed them?
- Yes, I did. 10 Α
- 11 Can you tell the jury what are each of those Q 12 items?
 - EO is a set of swabs from stain PM1, EP is a A set of swabs from stain at PM9.
- And do you know PM being photo marker or just 16 PM?
 - Α It's just indicated PM.
 - MR. BROWN: Your Honor, at this time the State would move into evidence each of those two items as the next numbered State exhibits.
 - THE COURT: Response from the Defense.
- 22 MR. PIROLO: No objection.
- 23 THE COURT: EO will be State's Exhibit 176, EP will be State's Exhibit 177. 24
- (Thereupon, State's Exhibit Numbers 176 and 177 25

- 1 | were marked and received in evidence.)
- 2 BY MR. BROWN:

10

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

2.4

- Q Miss Crumbley, did you do a DNA analysis on those two items?
- A Yes, I did, I first tested them for blood though.
- Q Okay. And what was the result of testing them 8 for blood?
 - A They gave chemical indication for the possible presence of blood meaning they were positive.
- 11 Q Once you did that, what was your next step in 12 you analysis of these items?
 - A I performed DNA analysis on samples from those items.
 - Q And did you perform the analysis that you had discussed earlier?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q And can you tell the jury what was the result 19 of that analysis?
 - A I obtained the same complete DNA profile from those two samples, that DNA profile was consistent with originating from a female individual and it matched the DNA profile from Deputy Pill.
 - Q And did you do the statistical analysis to determine the possibility of a random match?

1 A Yes, I did.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Q Can you tell the jury what was the result of that analysis?

A The frequency of the occurrence of the profile is one in ninety-seven quadrillion Caucasians, one in eighty-five quadrillion African Americans, and one in forty-two quadrillion Southeastern Hispanics.

- Q And can you tell the jury what is a quadrillion?
- A A quadrillion is a one with fifteen zeros after it.
- Q And Miss Crumbley, how do you arrive -- what database do you use to arrive at those numbers?
- A In this case I used the FBI's population statistics database and software.
- Q And is that generally accepted within the scientific community?
- A Yes, it is.
- Q Next want to show you what is marked as Exhibit ES, ask you to examine that item. Do you recognize that item?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q How do you recognize it?
- 24 A I recognize it by the FDLE case number and my 25 initials.

1 And is your seal intact on that item? Q Yes, it is. 2 Α Did you have it exclusively within your 3 0 possession during the time that you examined it? 4 5 Α Yes. And what is contained within that item? 6 This is a set of swabs from item FE1, red brown 7 Α stain, or sorry, RBS and yellow stains. 8 And did you perform a DNA analysis on that 9 10 item? Yes, after I tested it for the possible 11 Α 12 presence of blood. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, at this time the State 13 would move that item into evidence as the next 14 numbered OTate exhibit. 15 16 THE COURT: Response from the Defense? 17 MR. PIROLO: No objection. THE COURT: ES will be State's Exhibit 178. 18 (Thereupon, State's Exhibit Number 178 was 19 marked and received in evidence.) 20 21 BY MR. BROWN: 22 First can you tell the jury, Miss Crumbley, 0 what was your results of your test for blood? 23 That exhibit failed to give chemical 24 Α indications for the possible presence of blood, the test 25

1 was negative.

Q And then after that, what was the next step that you performed?

A I performed DNA analysis on a sample from that swab.

Q Can you tell the jury were you able to obtain a DNA profile?

A I obtained a partial DNA profile from that exhibit.

Q Can you explain to the jury what is a partial DNA profile?

A A complete DNA profile is DNA results at all thirteen of the locations or markers that I test for, a partial profile is a DNA profile of less than that. So, in this case I had results at four locations that I test for. So, it's a partial profile in that respect.

Q And when you had that, did you compare that profile to the DNA profile of Barbara Pill?

A Yes?

Q And what was the result?

A She's excluded.

Q And when you exclude somebody, does that mean her profile did not match at those four genetic markers that you had tested?

A Yes.

1 Q And did you also compare it to the sample of 2 Andria Kerchner?

A Yes.

O And what was the result there?

A She was also excluded.

Q And did you compare it to the results for the DNA profile for Brandon Bradley?

A Yes.

Q And what was your result?

A It was a match to the DNA profile from Brandon Bradley.

Q Did you also do the statistical analysis for that match?

A Yes.

Q And can you tell the jury what was the result of that?

A For the four loci that I obtained results for, the frequency of occurrence of the profile is one in three hundred thousand Caucasians, one in two hundred twenty thousand African Americans, and one in eight hundred forty thousand Southeastern Hispanics.

Q And can you tell the jury the prior match was one in ninety-seven quadrillion for Caucasians, for African Americans was one in two hundred and twenty thousand, why the difference?

Because previously I had a DNA profile at all 1 thirteen of the areas that I test for so I could use all 2 3 of those locations in order to calculate the statistic. In this case I had results at four locations so the 5 statistical analysis is done at only these four. Next want to show you Exhibit ER for 6 0 identification, do you recognize that exhibit? 7 8 Yes, I do. Α How do you recognize it? 9 0 From the FDLE case number and my initials. 10 Α And what is that exhibit? 11 0 This a set of swabs from item FE1, muzzle. 12 Α And did you have that item exclusively within 13 Q 14 your possession when you opened it? Yes, I did. 15 Α Until you resealed it? 16 0 17 Α Yes. 18 0 And is your seal intact? 19 Yes. Α MR. BROWN: Your Honor, at this time the State 20 would move to offer that item into evidence as the 21 next numbered State exhibit. 22 Response from the Defense. 23 THE COURT:

MR. PIROLO: No objection.

THE COURT: ER will be received as State's 179.

24

2

(Thereupon, State's Exhibit Number 179 was marked and received in evidence.)

3 BY MR. BROWN:

4

Q And did you perform your DNA analysis on that item?

5

A Yes.

7

Q And can you tell the jury what was your result?

8

A I first tested it again for the possible

9

presence of blood, that test was negative. Then I

10

performed DNA testing on that sample and obtained a DNA

11

profile from at least two individuals. The sample was a

12

mixture. It was a very limited sample, I didn't have that

1.3

much information to work with so it was insufficient for

14

inclusion purposes but may have been suitable for

15

exclusion purposes.

that mixture.

16

Q And were you able to do anything with that?

17

A I compared it to the DNA profiles from the DNA

18

standards that I obtained in the case and I was not able

19

to make any determinations about who may have donated to

20

Q And when you indicate that it's insufficient

22

21

amount, can you tell the jury what does that mean?

23

A Just means that there wasn't enough DNA left behind for me to get enough information to say anything

24

25

about who may have donated to the particular sample.

- Q Next want to show you what has been marked as
 Exhibit EQ, do you recognize that exhibit?

 A Yes, I do.

 Q And how do you recognize that?
 - A By the FDLE case number and my initials.
 - Q And when you opened that exhibit, did you keep it within your exclusive possession during the entire time until you resealed it?
 - A Yes.

6

7

8

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q And is your seal intact?
- 11 A Yes, it is.
 - Q Can you tell the jury what is that exhibit?
 - A This item is a set of swabs from item FE1, textured areas and trigger.
 - MR. BROWN: Your Honor, at this time the State would move that item into evidence as the next numbered State exhibits.
 - THE COURT: Response from the Defense.
 - MR. PIROLO: No objection.
 - THE COURT: Okay. EQ will be received as State's Exhibit 180.
 - (Thereupon, State's Exhibit Number 180 was marked and received in evidence.)
- MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I also want to show

 Miss Crumbley Exhibit 124 which is the firearm.

BY MR. BROWN:

- Q Can you tell the jury what item number is on that exhibit?
 - A Item FE1.
- Q And is that where -- in the previous swabbings, exhibit, the last exhibit, EQ, that we just admitted, swabbing from textured areas and trigger, does it indicate that it came from this exhibit?
 - A Yes, it does.
- Q And did you -- on that exhibit did you indicate that you tested for blood?
 - A No, I did not.
- Q Okay. And what did you then do with the swabbings that came from the textured area and trigger of the handgun?
 - A I performed DNA testing.
 - Q And were you able to obtain a DNA profile?
 - A Yes.
- Q Was it -- excuse me. Was it a complete profile?
- A Yes, it was a complete profile but it was a mixed profile. So, again, mixture is a DNA profile that is comprised of more than one contributor. In this particular case I was able to distinguish one of the contributors from the other contributor because that

3

6

5

8

7

10

11 12

13

15

14

16

17

18

20

19

21

22 23

24

25

individual was donating a lot more DNA to the sample, that's what we call the major contributor. So, I was able to determine that the major contributor was male and matched the DNA profile from Brandon Bradley.

As far as the minor contributor, did you compare that to both Deputy Pill, first Deputy Pill?

Yes, I did not have information relative to the Α minor contributor to make a determination about Deputy Pill but Andria Kerchner is excluded.

- So, the second contributor could be Deputy Pill 0 but you could not make any determination?
 - That is correct. Α
 - And DNA, can that come from sweat? 0
- It can come from sweat, skin cells left behind Α when you handle a particular item. If you're talking to someone you may spit on them in terms of a little bit of spray and the saliva contains skin cells just like when you touch something. So, that can also be transferred.
- How about any other type of matter from the body, brain cells, anything like that, body matter?
 - Α Pretty much anything.
- And as far as -- did you compare it to Andria 0 Kerchner?
 - Α The limited?
 - Yes, the minor contributor. Q

- 1 A She was excluded.
 - Q And did you -- you indicated you compared it to the DNA profile of Brandon Bradley?
 - A Yes.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q And what was your conclusion there?
- A He was a match to the profile.
 - Q And did you do the statistical analysis?
- 8 A Yes, I did.
 - Q And can you tell the jury what were the results of the statistical analysis?
 - A Sorry, I have to find it on here, it was calculated under a different sample. The frequency of occurrence of the profile is one in thirty-seven quadrillion Caucasians, one in thirty-five quadrillion African Americans, and one in two hundred and ninety quadrillion Southeaster Hispanics.
 - MR. BROWN: Your Honor, may I have one moment?
- 18 THE COURT: Yes, you may.
- 19 (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the 20 proceedings.)
- MR. BROWN: No further questions, Your Honor.
- 22 THE COURT: Cross examination by the Defense.
- MR. LANNING: No questions.
- THE COURT: Okay. Ma'am, thank you for your
- 25 testimony, you're free to step down.

1 (Thereupon, the witness exited the witness 2 stand.) THE COURT: Okay. If I can have a bench 3 conference. 4 (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out 5 6 of the hearing of the jury as follows:) THE COURT: It would be appropriate for us to 7 take a morning break but I don't know where the 8 State's at. Is that your last witness? 9 MR. BROWN: Judge, that is our last witness. 10 We have one item that we have marked as coming in but 11 we need to check. 12 THE COURT: Which item is that? 13 MR. MCMASTER: It's the DHSMV photo of Andria 14 Kerchner. 15 THE COURT: What is it? I don't have -- oh, 16 17 it's 49. MR. BROWN: Okay. 18 THE COURT: You might just want to check that 19 but I have it as 49. I don't have any reason to 20 believe that's not accurate. 21 MR. BROWN: Can we just double check with the 22 23 clerk. MR. MOORE: Where did they get that list of 24 evidence? Have you ever seen that before? 25

MR. LANNING: I'm not sure if I've seen that 1 2 one. 3 MR. BROWN: That's it. THE COURT: Okay. Then the State is going to 4 5 rest? 6 MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: And then where are with regard to 8 the Defense? 9 MR. MOORE: Well, last I checked, I went out a minute ago, well, whenever I went out again to check 10 11 on, but my -- a variable secretary on the trial of 12 the first witness we need, Miss DuRousseau, and she's 13 working on it. THE COURT: So, if we break now, is there any 14 matters we need to address outside the presence of 15 16 the jury? 17 MR. MOORE: After the break -- could we do that after the break, the JOA motion. 18 THE COURT: I can let the jury go and we can 19 have them come back at 1:00 and then you can get 20 someone in the car and go pick that witness up. 21 22 MR. MOORE: If need be, yes. 23 THE COURT: We have lots of time to do that. 24 Okay. I'm going to say next witness and you say 25 State's resting and I'll let them go until 1:00 and

then need to take a break and then we'll come back and do the other things. Okay.

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Other witnesses on behalf of the State.

MR. MCMASTER: State rests, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we have some matters that we need to discuss outside your presence and this is the appropriate time to do that. So, I'm going to allow you to take an early lunch until 1:00 o'clock. During this recess you must continue to abide by the rules governing your service as a juror. So, for the jury, court will be in recess until 1:00 p.m. Report to the jury assembly room at that time. Okay. Thank you.

(Thereupon, the jury was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated. We'll go ahead and take our morning recess since we've been here since 8:30. So, we'll take a fifteen minute recess and if you'll be back at 10:45, we'll do our motions, any motions. Okay. Court will be in recess

for fifteen minutes. Thank you.

2

(Thereupon, a short recess was taken in the proceedings.)

3

THE COURT: Okay. We can bring out Mr. Bradley.

5

(Thereupon, the defendant was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy.)

7

THE COURT: Okay. I'm waiting for Mr. Moore.

9

MR. LANNING: Judge, we can proceed.

10

11

THE COURT: Okay. Now, the State for the record has rested. Are there any motions to be heard

12

on behalf of the Defense?

statement.

13

indictment, we would move for a judgment of acquittal

MR. LANNING: Yes. Judge, as to Count I of the

15

14

as to premeditated murder. The State -- or the

16

Court's heard from two witnesses to establish

17

premeditation in this case, one being Jeffrey

18

Dieguez. Mr. Dieguez, he's a five time convicted

19

felon, he has several crimes of dishonesty or false

20

He's testified that he -- in numerous

22

21

inconsistencies he's testified that he knew the

23

defendant's voice in court when he admitted that he

24

had previously sworn under oath that he wouldn't know

25

the defendant or his voice from Joe Blow, that no

one. He's testified being on numerous pain pills and psychiatric medication since 1995. He's testified that during the, during the phone call he hears screaming by both the defendant and Andria Kerchner all the way up to the shots. We've heard the tape, there's no, there's no screaming, the only thing we hear at one point is Brandon Bradley saying why you going to shoot me to the deputy. He's testified that he heard two shots, we know that's wrong.

Mr. Dieguez is bas -- he's a walking contradiction.

His interpretation of the truth various with the day.

He testified in court that only reason he forgot his prior statement was that he was in the hospital after being stabbed and robbed. We have witnesses under subpoena who will establish that he was in the hospital because he had loaded himself up with cocaine the night before in an attempt to kill himself.

Andria Kerchner, also one of the witnesses the State seeks to establish premeditation, we know that in her prior statements she lied repeatedly. She said she just gotten a ride, didn't know the individual. She identified a third person as being the shooter. Struck a plea bargain for twelve years in prison when she was facing the death penalty.

She's admitted that she doesn't, she doesn't know substantial portions of what's true or what's not between -- because of what's been related to her from attorneys, the discovery or what she actually remembers. She has no independent recollection of even speaking with Jeffrey Dieguez. Her concluding testimony was that she lied because she didn't want to go to jail and -- well, if she didn't lie she would still be facing the death penalty.

The court can take -- you know, at some point credibility of witnesses become such an issue that the Court can jump in place and I believe as to Count I as to first degree premeditated murder should be taken from the jury.

As to Count II -- not Count II, Count III, the robbery count, the witnesses presented by the State as to that offense, Vanessa McNerney testified -- judgment of acquittal is, we're requesting a JOA because the State's failed to present and prove that Brandon Bradley knew or intended the offense of theft to be committed.

Vanessa McNerney indicated that she believed that the vehicle was attempting to avoid striking anyone, was attempting to go in between people and the pole. No one -- the only person that saw Brandon

Bradley in possession of hotel property would have been Mr. Montesano and he never identified any specific item. He said -- he identified him as moving property, however, he may have just scene at the point where Brandon Bradley described in his statement to the police that he was -- actually picked something up and was telling Andria Kerchner you can't take this, what are you doing. And Tammy Brown never saw him holding any property.

The witnesses described Andria -- Jordan described Bradley as being out of it, wasted, just a blank stare. Every indication from the witnesses was that Andria Kerchner was the one committing the theft.

As to -- and if the Court believes that Brandon Bradley was part of theft, we believe the homicide should be JOA'd to a third degree homicide in the course of a theft and not a robbery.

As to Count V of the indictment, or Count VI of the indictment, the obstruction charge, in the event Mr. Bradley is convicted of any form of homicide under Count I, we believe that particular charge would be barred by double jeopardy. I don't know if it's an appropriate JOA or wait and see.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. Response

from the State.

MR. MCMASTER: Judge, certainly the State has presented sufficient evidence of premeditation to establish the Count I allegations of first degree premeditated murder as well as the felonies, they are subsumed in the particular count.

As Mr. Lanning essentially admitted, the two witnesses did testify about statements made by the defendant in the vehicle that the jury could certainly look to to determine that Mr. Bradley had adequate time to consider what it was he was doing, had time to reflect on it and didn't carry out the action during that several minute period between when the patrol car of Deputy Pill passed him by back by the Lamplighter Trailer Park and where it ultimately stopped him and the several minute period when the encounter ensued between Deputy Pill and the defendant.

Additionally, there was testimony from the probation officer as well as Miss Ozburn and others that the defendant was aware that he had outstanding arrest warrants and statements he was not going to go back to prison. So, certainly all of the elements necessary have been established by the State through various witnesses.

With respect to the robbery, certainly
Mr. Montesano' testimony is sufficient for the jury
to establish that Mr. Bradley participated in the
taking of the items from the hotel. Mr. Bradley's
statements himself in the recorded statement that he
gave following his arrest admitted that he saw that
Miss Kerchner was in the process of stealing items
from the hotel and nonetheless he got behind the
wheel of the vehicle and when she said let's go,
let's go, he helped her by driving the vehicle away
from the hotel and essentially almost returning over
Andrew Jordan who had positioned himself in front of
the vehicle.

With respect to use of the force by the vehicle, the vehicle may not have been travelling very fast, Judge, but getting run over by an SUV going two miles an hour you'd be just about as dead if it were going forty miles an hour. Certainly that's sufficient force to establish the basis for robbery and we believe that the motion for judgment of acquittal should be denied.

It does not appear that they've moved for a judgment of the acquittal on the fleeing and eluding so I won't address that one. Certainly the Court was able to watch that on video along with everybody

else. The lights and sirens activated and the maneuvering by the defendant down the roadway in opposite lanes and going through stop signs certainly would establish that.

With respect to the resisting arrest with violence, it's the State's position that we should take a wait and see attitude at this point. The State would ask that all the JOA's be denied.

THE COURT: Okay. The Defense's motion for judgment of acquittal is denied.

With regard to Count VI, we'll readdress that when appropriate.

I have a matter I do want it address with the attorneys by bench conference. Is there anything else we need to address by way of motions?

At some point I need to talk to Mr. Bradley with regard to his -- whether he's intends to testify or not. I don't know if now is an appropriate time.

MR. MOORE: Let's wait and see on that, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll wait and see on that but at some point we need to have that discussion. Okay. If we could have a bench conference.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of the jury as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. I've reviewed this

I have some research with regard to whether it's only appropriate when making the insanity defense and I haven't had a chance to review it yet, but I can tell you that it may be my intention regardless of that research to give a special instruction in this respect. And the reason why I say that is because it appears somewhat obvious to my observation that Mr. Bradley may be on some sort of psychotropic medications.

instruction with regard to psychotropic medication.

Now, I would say I probably have more knowledge about that than maybe the average person because of my job, but he doesn't appear to engage and he's awake but somewhat lethargic and I have somewhat of a concern that the jury may be concerned about that and I think it may be appropriate regardless of whether this instruction only applies when they're claiming insanity or not to give this instruction.

MR. MOORE: The Court has -- go ahead.

MR. MCMASTER: I did a little research during the break also trying to find out what the answer was about whether it only applied to insanity. It Apparently was proposed by the Olorida Supreme Court and adopted in 1994 pursuant to a decision out of the Third DCA, Rosales is the case decision. It was

2 3

4

5

6

8

10

9

12

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

I do have an obligation to disclose this.

reversible error for the court not to give it in that case although it was an insanity defense in that case.

If you look at the case, it points you to Rule 3.215 as the basis for this instruction and that's not limited to insanity, that's essentially an incompetent situation where the defendant is under medication and because of the medication he is able to be competent and able to go to trial. In those situations the Court is required under the rule, subsection B I think it is, to instruct the jury as requested by the Defense. In an abundance, I think it would be safest since although no incompetency proceedings have been held in this case, if there are claiming that he is under the care of a psychiatrist and is under medication, it's the State's position that it would be safer to give it than not.

MR. MOORE: I'd also point the rule of 3.215(c) I think but it says, the language of it, if the defendant -- if it is shown the defendant is proceeding to trial with the aid of a medication for a mental or emotional condition, then it's appropriate to give it. It doesn't say anything about competence or insanity. I'm just adding that.

2

3

4

6

7

5

8

9

10 11

12 13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

just got off the phone with Dr. Valdez who is the jail psychiatrist.

MR. LANNING: Perez or Valez?

MR. MOORE: Perez, yeah, Dr. Perez, thank you. And he informed me -- he will -- that Mr. Bradley is on meds, he doesn't know what specifically until he looks in his file.

And on the issue of mental condition or -mental or emotional condition, I'm quoting him, I asked him to repeat it because I was outraged when he said this. He said it's my belief that he doesn't have one and he's continuing the meds for political ramifications, to avoid political ramifications. Ι mean, how this guy's practicing medicine, I don't know, and that's one reason why he's continuing. That's the first reason that came out of his mouth. I said, what did you say? You said political ramifications and said yes. I said, well, what do you mean by that? Well, I mean in case the defendant comes back and claims that we mistreated him in any way and blah, blah, and plus this involves a lot of people here. So, that's one reason why he's on the The other is we can't just take him off the meds. Of course, Mr. Bradley's been in the jail for meds. four months now and so it's not a matter of weaning

him off of meds. If that was his intention he would have started that and been done with it a long time ago. So, it's strictly -- you know I'm saying if we bring the doctor in here that's what his testimony will be. He may deny the political ramifications statement but by god I heard it.

MR. BROWN: (Unintelligible) testimony is --

MR. MOORE: He's on the meds.

MR. BROWN: Means they are and they've been confirmed that they're psychotropic. I'm willing to take Mr. Moore at his word but (unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: And I'll give --

MR. BROWN: Once he gets the meds from him and they qualify as psychotropic and he can tell what the meds, then we're good with that.

THE COURT: I just wanted to tell you where I was leaning before the break so you didn't spend your whole lunch hour spending a lot of time on this because regardless, I think I would give this as a special instruction anyway. So --

MR. MOORE: I'll give the identities of the meds for the Court so the Court can include that.

THE COURT: Yeah, get those for them and then

I'll read this instruction. I'm going to say -- I

mean --

MR. MOORE: I'd ask it be read at the first opportunity when the jury comes back.

THE COURT: I can read it when they come back and then --

MR. BROWN: Assuming we got -- are we going to have witnesses this afternoon?

MR. MOORE: Yes, we are.

THE COURT: Okay. Good.

MR. MOORE: We'll get to that. You're trying to confuse me here.

THE COURT: So, I'll give this first opportunity and then what I'll do is I'll say how does the Defense wish to proceed and then you can call your witnesses.

MR. MOORE: Well, they will be here this afternoon. They'll be here by 1:30 and I've got three and probably I've got two hours --

THE COURT: Is there anyway I can get that one here by 1:00, the first one by 1:00?

MR. MOORE: It involves hears -- The thing. It involves a collection of two samples and they've got -- I got -- they're scattered all over the area of the state and they're going to be here and I've got to go over with them individually, I know the rule's been invoked, with the sample containers so

that they can review them and I can go over their testimony a little bit mainly so they can look at the containers and say, yeah, you know, I can identify that and here's why. So, I need a few minutes to do that. With one of them I'm good and we can probably do Mr. McGuinness at 1:00 if the Court wants to do that but I'm meeting with these others witnesses at 1:00. I asked them to be here at 1:00. So, as soon as I'm done with meeting with them, then we're good to go which should be by 1:15.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I told them to be back here at 1:00. We can start at 1:15.

MR. MOORE: Can we make it 1:30 just in case, we have a little wiggle room. You know, people run late sometimes.

THE COURT: Maybe I should get the jury clerk to tell them not to come back until 1:15 or 1:30. I just hate for them to sit around for a half hour.

I'll have them come back at 1:30. Do you want -- so, is there anything else we need to address between now and 1:30?

MR. MOORE: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

MS.GREENS: Okay. Then there's no other matters that we need to address before the Defense begins their case and so we're going to actually break until -- I know I told the jury to be back at 1:00 but based on my discussions with the Defense, we're not going to be ready until 1:30. So, court's going to be in recess until 1:30. All right. Court's in recess until 1:30. Thank you.

(Thereupon, a lunch recess was taken in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Okay. We'll go ahead and bring out Mr. Bradley.

(Thereupon, the defendant was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy.)

THE COURT: Okay. Any preliminary matters that we need to discuss on behalf of the State?

MR. MCMASTER: Yes, Your Honor. It came to our attention over the noon hour that Deputy Brett Cook has been asked to appear by the Defense and we've got two issues with that. One, I don't think he's been listed as a Defense witness.

Secondly, the only thing that it appears that he would be able to testify is a statement that he witnessed by Miss Kerchner when she was being led out to the patrol car from the CID building and

transported, excuse me, to the jail. I don't believe that that would be proper impeachment and the best purpose for which the Defense intends to call him (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. What is that name, Brett?

MR. MCMASTER: Brett.

THE COURT: Brett Cook? Yes?

MR. MCMASTER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Response from the Defense.

MR. LANNING: Judge, it's for impeachment. I think I did list him in a fairly recent supplement.

As far as the purpose, Miss Kerchner testified that she -- during this incident that she pled with Mr. Bradley don't do this, don't do this, a police officer and that's the way she testified on the witness stand. On March 6th when Deputy Cook came in contact with her it was to transport her and when she exited the CID building there was press crews and she -- her statement was fuck all you trolls, the bitch got what she deserved, fuck all you pigs. That certainly is inconsistent with her demeanor in court as to that she was pleading to not shoot this police officer and that certainly is inconsistent with her in court testimony.

Under 96.08 it should be admissible under sub

1, sub 5, sub 4. Her demeanor in court is strickenly inconsistent with that statement and that statement was made at the time indicating a hatred for law enforcement officers almost to the extent that -- well, most to the extent she's apparently happy that it happened.

THE COURT: Okay. Response from the State.

MR. BROWN: Judge, to start with, it clearly is hearsay, it's an out of court statement. They didn't question her on that, they didn't give her a chance to explain it, admit or deny making that statement. I would argue, of course, had they done that I would have had other objections at the time, but they clearly haven't done that and it's not inconsistent with anything she testified to because she didn't admit or deny making that statement.

They did question her on, you know, you told the police you have no respect for the cops, you weren't scared to tell them that, she admitted all of that, she admitted all of those things that she said in her police interview to that. So, this is simply a way to try to attack her character and that's all it is. It's impermissible, it's not allowed, it's improper impeachment, it's not relevant and they're trying to bring it now as extrinsic evidence of

statements that she was reportedly to have made without cross examining her on those things.

MR. LANNING: Judge, I'm told by Mr. Pirolo that he did ask her about that statement, she indicated she didn't remember making that statement and this is appropriate impeachment of that.

THE COURT: Okay. One, it's clearly hearsay.

Two, I'll agree that it's an inconsistent statement.

My question then becomes did she deny making it or

did she not distinctly admit making it. If she said

I don't remember, that would be distinctly admit

making it but I can't --

MR. BROWN: Judge, I was ready -- my position is they never addressed that. I was ready to a object if they approached that because it was not part of her plea sentencing, it was after the fact out in the parking lot. I think the Court in her pretrial motions I believe has seen that videotape.

THE COURT: No, I've seen that video tape, I know what you're referring to.

MR. BROWN: I was ready to object, I don't believe they covered it.

THE COURT: I'm not sure they covered it or did not cover it. When is your intention to call Brett Cook?

MR. LANNING: Right now.

2

THE COURT: Right now?

3

MR. LANNING: He's hear ready to testify.

4

MR. BROWN: We still don't see where he's been

THE COURT: I don't recall that specifically

5

listed but that's the least of our objections.

6

7

being asked of Miss Kerchner. I normally have a good memory for that. I don't recall that but I'm willing

8

to give you an opportunity. I'll order her testimony

10

and give you a DVD of it and I'm willing to give you

11

an opportunity to review it to see if that was. I'll

12

give a copy to both sides, but that's going to

13

take -- I mean, we could address it tomorrow.

14

MR. LANNING: Well, could I release Deputy Cook

15

16

until tomorrow?

THE COURT: I mean, is that what you -- do you

17

wants me to give you the opportunity to -- both sides

18

the opportunity to review Kerchner to see if there --

19

if she denied making or does not distinctly admit

20

making and I would tell if you asked her that and she

21

said I don't remember, I would consider that

22

distinctly doesn't -- I would consider that as

23

MR. LANNING: Yes.

distinctly does not admit making.

2425

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. LANNING: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Madame clerk, if you could ask them to give me a DVD of the -- I think all we need is the cross examination, either cross or recross, either cross and recross of Andria Kerchner and I'll need two copies. I'll give one to the State, one to the Defense and then if you need me to review it you can, you can show me yours, what part you be want me to review and you can work on that tonight and we can address it tomorrow.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, I believe it was during cross.

THE COURT: As opposed to recross?

MR. PIROLO: Yeah. If you want to order both.

THE COURT: I'll order both, any opportunity you had to speak with her.

Okay. And then we'll release Brett Cook for today. Mr. McMaster, do you want me to explore the issue about not being listed?

MR. MCMASTER: I'm just -- I do, of course, like to get notice of Defense witnesses, I just don't have it and I looked at E-Facts trying to find a witness list.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll ask the Defense to produce that and show the State where they listed it

and I'll ask the State to keep checking and if you want to renew that objection, we can -- I haven't ruled on that yet so we can address that tomorrow as well.

MR. MCMASTER: That's fine, Judge.

THE COURT: But we'll release him for today. When do you want him back tomorrow based on your side of the case?

MR. MOORE: I think first thing in the morning would be best. And we also ask Miss Kerchner be transported as well.

THE COURT: Response from the State to that.

MR. BROWN: Well, if their plan is to call her to ask her that question, we're certainly going to object because it's clear hearsay.

THE COURT: Let's go ahead and have her transported just in case. Let's go ahead and bring Brett Cook. Don't have either one -- I don't need either one of them until 9:00 and we'll address this at 8:30 tomorrow morning. They're saying she's not listed as a witness either.

MR. MOORE: Well, we'll address that tomorrow.

THE COURT: We'll address that at 8:30 and we'll have the witnesses at 9:00.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, just on the disclosure

issue, both witnesses, Andria Kerchner and Deputy
Cook, are listed by the State, they're on the State's
witness list and under the case law they're under the
expectation that if they list a witness the witness
is going to be called and they would have to show
prejudice to allowing us to call the witness.

THE COURT: Like I said, I'm asking them if they want to address that or not and then we'll get into that argument whether they're prejudiced.

Okay. Other issues on behalf of the State?
MR. MCMASTER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Issues on behalf of the Defense.

MR. MOORE: When the jury comes in we'd ask that the instruction of psychotropic medication be read.

THE COURT: I will read that after I talk to them about whether they --

MR. BROWN: Do you know what the medication is?

MR. MOORE: The doctor (unintelligible). We can add that to the instruction specifically what it is you.

MR. BROWN: Our concern is we just want to ensure that the medication that's being given fits the definition --

THE COURT: With all due respect, I don't think

4

5

3

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

it's necessary to give them what the medication. Psychotropic is psychotropic medication.

MR. BROWN: No, we want to confirm what the medication is.

THE COURT: I would agree with that. I don't think I need to change the instruction to put what it is.

I'm already representing that I've MR. MOORE: spoke to Dr. Perez and he confirmed by phone that Mr. Bradley is currently on medication, psychotropic That's what the doctor informed me. medication.

THE COURT: Okay. If you could get that in writing and we'll get that to them but I --

We just want to know just so we can MR. BROWN: confirm that he's on it. We can look it up and if it's psychotropic we're good. We don't need anything in writing from the doctor. If he can tell Mr. Moore what the medication is, we're good with that representation, we can confirm that it's psychotropic and then we're good.

THE COURT: Are you asking that I not read this instruction until that confirmation has been made?

> MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Well, here's the problem. doctor is not cooperating with me and has shown every

sign that he intends not to. So, if I have to wait for him to get back to me on that, I could wait until next year. So, I will give him -- I will call him at the first break and ask him. He's not still not giving me that information unless the Court can intervene and enter an order.

THE COURT: Okay. You can tell him that that's your intent and if he won't tell you what the medications are. I mean, can he tell you -- does he need a release from you?

MR. MOORE: I don't know what he needs, Judge. I mean, I've (unintelligible) staff at the jail, the medical staff, and they provide the information upon my request and I didn't see need to do that. I talked to the doctor and he said he'd provide it which he hasn't done it. So, I'll see what I can do at the first break and see if I can't find out his meds are and if need be we can look it up.

THE COURT: Does my deputies know what the meds are? Do we know what the meds are?

THE COURT DEPUTY: I don't know.

MR. MOORE: I could try to guess but I don't I don't know for sure.

THE COURT: Okay. I was made aware that he was on meds but I don't know what the meds are, I can

tell you that.

MR. MOORE: Well, the instruction doesn't -I've taken that directly from the instruction and it
doesn't say -- if I'm not mistaken, it doesn't say
psychotropic meds, it says medication so that he can
appear in court. And the psychiatrist says he has
prescribed medication.

THE COURT: It does say psychotropic medication.

MR. MOORE: Okay. All right. Well, then I need to find out.

THE COURT: He's being administered psychotropic medication. Okay. So, I'll hold off on this but we'll give you an opportunity to do that.

Okay. Anything else on behalf of the Defense.

MR. MOORE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, we're ready to bring the jury in?

MR. MOORE: We are.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. We can do so at this time.

THE COURT DEPUTY: You said the deputy could be released until tomorrow?

THE COURT: He is released until tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. Deputy Cook until tomorrow at 9:00 a.m.

(Thereupon, the jury was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Has anyone read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

THE JURY PANEL: No.

THE COURT: Has anyone seen or heard television, radio or Internet comments about this trial?

THE JURY PANEL: No.

THE COURT: Have you read any news headlines or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

THE JURY PANEL: No.

THE COURT: Has any conducted or been exposed to any research regarding any matters concerning this case?

THE JURY PANEL: No.

THE COURT: And have you discussed this case among yourselves or with anyone else or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

THE JURY PANEL: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. How does the Defense wish to proceed?

1 MR. MOORE: Your Honor, we would call Raven 2 DuRousseau. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Ma'am, if you'll come forward. Step up before the clerk to be sworn. 4 5 THEREUPON, 6 RAVEN DUROUSSEAU, 7 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified 8 upon her oath as follows: 9 THE COURT: Ma'am, please be seated. And once 10 seated if you'll scoot that chair forward. Do adjust 11 that microphone to fit you and do talk into that 12 microphone, it aids in everyone hearing your 13 testimony and in your testimony being recorded. 14 Okay. Mr. Moore. 15 MR. MOORE: Thank you. 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. MOORE: 18 Miss DuRousseau, what is your name? Q 19 Α Raven DuRousseau. 20 And what is your profession? 0 21 I'm an LPN. Α 22 0 What is that? 23 Α A licensed practical nurse. 24 0 Would you tell the jury, ladies and gentlemen 25 of the jury, where you work?

- A I work for Armored Correctional Health Services
 at the Brevard County jail located in Sharpes, Florida.
 - Q Are you what we consider a part time LPN at the jail?
 - A Currently I am per diem due to school.
- 6 O Per diem?
- 7 A Um-hmm.

4

5

13

14

- Q On March the 7th -- well, let me ask you this,
 back it up a little bit. What training have you had to be
 an LPN?
- A I went to school for a year and I have a
 12 Florida license by the State Board of Nursing.
 - Q And do your job responsibilities as an LPN include drawing blood?
- 15 A Yes, it does.
- 16 Q And have you done that a number of times?
- 17 A Yes, I have.
- 18 Q How many would you estimate have you done?
 19 Hundreds?
- 20 A Hundreds of times.
- Q Okay. On March the 7th of 2012, were you a per diem employee or per diem LPN at the Brevard County

 Detention Center?
- A I was full time at that time.
- Q Full time. And on that date did you encounter

1 Brandon Bradley? 2 Α Yes. 3 Q Do you see him in the courtroom? 4 Α Yes, I do. 5 Can you describe him, where he's seated? Q 6 He's sitting over to my right at the table, 7 young black male. And on that date on March the 7th, did you 9 collect a specimen of blood from Mr. Bradley? 10 Α Yes. 11 MR. MOORE: May I approach the witness, please? 12 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 13 BY MR. MOORE: 14 Miss DuRousseau, would you -- first of all, Q looking through that package, do you see what's in it? 15 16 Can you describe what's in that? 17 Α There are five vials of blood, two red tops, 18 three gray tops, all labeled with the name Brandon 19 Bradley, date of birth, my initials and his CID number. 20 0 Do you see a date?

24

25

21

22

23

Α

0

Α

(CONTINUED TO VOLUME VIII)

And the date that they were drawn.

Do you see the time?

15:55.