02131567*

Page 601

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 1 EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA 3 CASE NO: 05-2012-CF-035337-AXXX-XX 4 ORIGINAL 5 STATE OF FLORIDA, 6 Plaintiff, 7 VS. 8 BRANDON LEE BRADLEY 9 Defendant. 10 11 12 VOLUME IV OF VIII 13 TRANSCRIPT OF DIGITALLY RECORDED JURY SELECTION 14 HONORABLE MORGAN REINMAN JUDGE: 15 February 24, 25, 26, 27, and DATE TAKEN: March 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16 17, 2014 17 Moore Justice Center PLACE: 2825 Judge Fran Jamieson Way 18 Viera, Florida 32940 19 Diane Lynch REPORTED BY: Court Reporter 20 21 22 RYAN REPORTING REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS 23 ROCKLEDGE, FLORIDA 32955 FAX: (321)633-0972 24 1670 S. FISKE BOULEVARD OFFICE: (321)636-4450 25

APPEARANCES: THOMAS BROWN, ESQUIRE JAMES MCMASTERS, ESQUIRE State Attorney's Office 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way Viera, Florida 32940 Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff. RANDY MOORE, ESQUIRE MICHAEL PIROLO, ESQUIRE MARK LANNING, ESQUIRE Public Defender's Office 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way Viera, Florida 32940 Appearing on behalf of the Defendant. ALSO PRESENT: BRANDON LEE BRADLEY, Defendant

				Page 603
1		I I	N D E X	
2				
3	FEBRUARY 24, 2014	NII INAD IT D	1	4:2
4	QUESTIONING OF JUROR QUESTIONING OF JUROR			40:17 74:17
5	FEBRUARY 25, 2014 FEBRUARY 26, 2014			103:8 450:14
6	QUESTIONING OF JUROR FEBRUARY 27, 2014	NUMBER	65	1452:1 779:7
	QUESTIONING OF JUROR			782 : 25
7	QUESTIONING OF JUROR MARCH 6, 2014	NUMBER	102	820:18 856:23
8	QUESTIONING OF JUROR			893:15
	QUESTIONING OF JUROR			918:5
9	QUESTIONING OF JUROR MARCH 7, 2014	NUMBER	114	944:9 972:9
10	QUESTIONING OF JUROR			972:15
11	QUESTIONING OF JUROR	NUMBER	125	1007:13
11	MARCH 10, 2014	אונווערטונים	126	1040:22
12	QUESTIONING OF JUROR QUESTIONING OF JUROR			1041:1 1067:11
13	MARCH 11, 2014 QUESTIONING OF JUROR	NUMBER	156	1096:14 1096:18
14	MARCH 13, 2014 QUESTIONING OF JUROR	NIIMBER	190	1189:3 1189:7
	QUESTIONING OF JUROR			1219:7
15	MARCH 14, 2014 MARCH 17, 2014			1262:15 1370:23
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

They would have to be proven to you as well, but it's to a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. So if some of that evidence presented, if it's not proven, you disregard it, you don't consider it. All the mitigation evidence that's proven to you, if you feel it's met that standard of proof, you look at all of that, and you consider it.

The Court's then going to tell you to go through a weighing process. It's kind of like an ordinary decision that you have to make in the course of your life, work or whatever, a serious decision, you consider and look at all the factors, all the circumstances, you consider everything, right?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Right.

MR. BROWN: Same thing you have to do here. You would go through and you would weigh in your decision process, like in your personal life, those factors and those things you consider most important, and you give them the greatest weight. You look at other factors, things you consider, and you say, these really aren't that important at all, and you give them little weight in this decision, right?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Right.

MR. BROWN: You do the same thing here. You look at the aggravators, and you look at the mitigators.

You determine, personally, how much weight to give.

Considering everything that's been proven, but you determine the weight. Some things you may look at and say, I just don't find this to be that important, you assign little weight; the things you find more important, you assign greater weight. Fair enough?

You consider all, but you determine the weight.

Nobody's going to ask you or tell you how much weight you're going to give to something. Fair enough?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. BROWN: So you go through that weighing process, and the question for you would be, does the mitigation outweigh the aggravation, the aggravating circumstances. If the answer is yes, then you would vote for life; if the answer is no, the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravators, then you're in a position where you legally can return a recommendation for the death penalty to the Court.

The Court's going to tell you that you're never legally required to. The Court's not going to say, if you find A, B, C, and D, then you must return a recommendation for the death penalty. The Court's not going to tell you that. But when you find those aggravators that justify the death penalty, mitigation doesn't outweigh it, then, if you feel it's justified,

that's when you can legally recommend to the Court a sentence of death. Are you comfortable with that process?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Sure.

MR. BROWN: Knowing that process, do you think -if you feel that the aggravators have been proven that
justify the death penalty, and it's an appropriate
penalty, can you recommend the sentence of death?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I can.

JUROR NUMBER 58:

MR. BROWN: Now, one other area I just want to cover briefly, whether it may affect you, or if you see it from other jurors back there, obviously, as I told you, if the verdict comes back for less than first degree murder, death penalty's off the table, and you will not be making a sentencing recommendation. Do you understand that?

Sure.

MR. BROWN: And the concern or question that I have is, knowing that, sitting back there and saying, first degree is proven, but I really don't want to go to the next step, would that influence you at all to return a verdict of a lesser charge simply to avoid facing the next step?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No. It would be based on whatever evidence was presented.

MR. BROWN: So if the evidence proves first degree murder, you would return that verdict?

JUROR NUMBER 58: If that's what the evidence shows, yes.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the defense?
MR. PIROLO: Good afternoon. How are you?

MR. PIROLO: I want to start of by saying, first of all, there are no wrong answers, so don't be nervous about saying anything.

JUROR NUMBER 58: Sure.

JUROR NUMBER 58: Good.

MR. PIROLO: The only answer that's the wrong answer is if it's something that's not true, or if you don't tell us something, if you're holding something back. Just feel free to be honest.

JUROR NUMBER 58: Okay.

MR. PIROLO: What I also want to explain to you is, the way the process works is, we have to pick the jury and get into the death penalty questions before, obviously, ever getting into any facts over guilt or innocence, or coming to a decision over guilt or innocence. So my only concern is, do you in any way feel that, well, we're talking about the death penalty

already, he must be guilty of first degree murder 1 or --3 JUROR NUMBER 58: Do I feel that way? 4 MR. PIROLO: Right. 5 JUROR NUMBER 58: 6 MR. PIROLO: Okay. You understand that it's just 7 the way the process is, this is what we got to do. JUROR NUMBER 58: Absolutely. 8 9 MR. PIROLO: Based on what you heard regarding 10 the media, you told us earlier that you heard a couple 11 things, and some were from -- your husband told you, 12 correct? JUROR NUMBER 58: He heard that something had 13 14 happened close to my work. 15 MR. PIROLO: And have you formed an opinion as to 16 quilt or innocence based on what you heard from your husband and/or the media? 17 JUROR NUMBER 58: 1.8 19 MR. PIROLO: Do you have any -- well, what does 20 life without parole mean to you? 21 JUROR NUMBER 58: What does it mean to me? 22 would be -- that person would be incarcerated for the 23 remainder of their life without any release on any 24 kind of parole. There's no possibility that they

25

would get out.

MR. PIROLO: Do you have any doubts about this?

Someone who's sentenced to life without the possibility of parole dies in prison, do you have any doubts about that?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No.

MR. PIROLO: You accept --

JUROR NUMBER 58: I accept it at face value, that's what I understand it to be. I'm not an authority on it, so I don't know if that could possibly change. I don't know.

MR. PIROLO: Can you -- earlier, I believe it was during the questioning of the State, the term "ordinary decision" came up in weighing things, like you would in your everyday life. Do you acknowledge that this would not be just any ordinary decision?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No, it's not an ordinary decision at all.

MR. PIROLO: Do you consider all life being sacred?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Absolutely.

MR. PIROLO: Do you believe that a person, any person, is a product of life experiences?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Aside from the DNA, we can't pick who our mom and dad are, can you think of other things

in the course of someone's life that shapes that person as they grow up?

JUROR NUMBER 58: It happens every day.

MR. PIROLO: What kinds of things occur in someone's life that shape the person the become, who they are?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Well, most anything. The people that they're around, the loss of somebody close to them, different influences in their life. I mean, there's so many things that can change or influence what happens to you or what direction you go. And things change on a moment's notice. Nothing is impossible to happen, anything can happen.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to throw some questions at you regarding the death penalty. Specifically, I know you said earlier you're sort of on the fence. If I gave you -- not opposed to it, you're not -- if we gave you a scale, a 1 to 10 scale, or even 0 to 10, with 10 being a strong supporter of the death penalty, 0 being not a supporter of all, maybe even oppose it, where would you put yourself on that scale?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I honestly think it's a case-by-case situation. That's really hard to say, because -- again, I believe there's a place for it, and at the same time, it depends on the circumstances,

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Once we get into that phase, then we would start weighing the aggravators and the

it depends on whether or not I feel it would be appropriate. So I don't know if that kind of, sort of answers your question. I really do believe it's a case-by-case situation based on the situation and the facts and gravity. A lot of things come into play, so to say -- it depends on the circumstance.

MR. PIROLO: I've got a follow-up question, but I want to kind of back up for a little bit before I get to the follow-up question. You've heard now from the Judge and the State how the process goes. We have a guilt or innocence portion of the trial. If, and only if, the jury comes back with a guilty verdict of first degree premeditated murder, then we move to the second part. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I do, yes.

MR. PIROLO: If the jury as a whole has a unanimous verdict, 12-0, either of not guilty or of second degree murder or manslaughter, you're thanked for your time, you're released, there's nothing that you need to do beyond that. We only get to this phase if there's a guilty verdict of first degree murder. Do you understand that?

mitigators. But before we get to that, can you think of a type of first degree murder where you would say, the death penalty is almost automatic?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No.

MR. PIROLO: What about the death of a child?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Again, it depends on all the circumstances.

MR. PIROLO: And, in our case, the death of a law enforcement officer, still need --

JUROR NUMBER 58: Same thing.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Do you understand in the first phase, the verdict has to be unanimous?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Correct.

MR. PIROLO: All 12 have to agree for not guilty or guilty of first degree murder or whatever. The second phase is not unanimous. It means the vote can be 12-0, it could be 7-5, it could be anything. Do you understand now, if you didn't before, that the second vote does not have to be unanimous?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I do know that.

MR. PIROLO: Now, it's an extremely important decision because the judge cannot impose a sentence without your recommendation. She's got to give your recommendation great weight. The law tells the judge what they have to do with the recommendation.

It starts with aggravating circumstances. The State has to prove to you at least one aggravating circumstance beyond a reasonable doubt. You understand that as well, correct?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: If they haven't proven any aggravating circumstances to you, it's a life sentence, a life recommendation. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: If, and only if, they prove at least one aggravating circumstance, then we move onto the next step, and that's considering and weighing mitigating circumstances. You understand that even after weighing all the mitigating circumstances, say you find no mitigating circumstances, you still are not required to return a death recommendation. Even if the State's proven to you one or more aggravating circumstances, and no mitigating circumstances have been proved to you, you're not required to return a death recommendation. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Would you feel compelled in any way to return a death recommendation just because they proved at least one aggravator and no mitigators were

proved?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No.

MR. PIROLO: Now, if you -- we're going to get to mitigating circumstances in a minute, but the aggravating circumstances are limited in number, what can be presented to you. By law, it's just a list of them, and you can't go outside of that list.

Mitigating circumstances are unlimited, and it's more than just the background of Mr. Bradley. Some of it would be things having to do with his background, life experiences growing up, household environment, things like that, but it's much more than that. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: As I said before, State's got to prove the aggravating circumstances beyond and to the exclusion of every single reasonable doubt. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Mitigating circumstances, we don't have that burden, it's a much lesser burden, it's a reasonably convinced burden. So if you find -- if you're reasonably convinced that we've proven to you one or more mitigating circumstances, then you take those and weigh them against the aggravating

circumstances. If you find the mitigation outweighs the aggravation, then it would be a life recommendation. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Now, you seem to be a pretty intelligent person, do you understand the terms "aggravators" or "aggravation," and "mitigation"?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Aggravation makes things worse, mitigation sort of lessens it, right?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Correct.

MR. PIROLO: If you're selected as a juror -- and I want to get to this instruction, because we always have concern on this, but there's something that you may hear during the penalty phase that's called the impact evidence, or victim impact statement. The jury -- the judge will instruct you that it is not an aggravating circumstance, and not to treat it as an aggravator. But let me read you this first, and then I have a question that goes with it. The instruction you'd be given will read, "you have heard evidence about the impact of this homicide on the family, friends, and community of Deputy Pill. This evidence is presented to show the victim's uniqueness as an individual; however, you may not consider this

evidence as an aggravating circumstance." Now, my question is, if you've heard friends, family, co-workers give a statement about Deputy Pill's life and what her life meant to them, could that impact you in such a way that you would turn it into an aggravator, even though the Court's telling you it's not an aggravating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No.

MR. PIROLO: You'd be able to set aside -- and you would agree that statements like that could be very emotional, and even with the emotions coming from friends, family, and co-workers would still not treat it -- you'd set it aside in terms of aggravating circumstances and not count it or weigh it as an aggravating circumstance, correct? Yes?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes. I'm sorry.

MR. PIROLO: We just need you to -- because this is for the record -- it's okay.

JUROR NUMBER 58: I'm sorry.

MR. PIROLO: It's okay. You're doing fine. And I told you before, when it comes to the aggravators, the State has to prove at least one for you to even consider -- to continue considering the death penalty. My question is, is there a number of aggravators that, let's say, the State proves to you, that at some

point, you just turn off the mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 58:

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

understand it all to make an informed decision. You're talking about somebody else's life as well. MR. PIROLO: Okay. Just hypothetically speaking,

say you hear and you find that the State proved beyond a reasonable doubt five aggravators. hypothetically, just throwing a number at you, five. Can you still then go to the next step and start to listen to and consider the mitigation?

No.

I think you have to

JUROR NUMBER 58: You'd have to, yes.

MR. PIROLO: No wrong answers.

JUROR NUMBER 58: I know. I come from an analytical background, so I know you have to listen to everything and look at everything before you make a decision.

If you were presented photographs MR. PIROLO: that would be considered highly graphic, would the photographs on their own turn you off to whatever mitigation that may follow?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No.

MR. PIROLO: How about videotapes, something graphic on a videotape, would actually seeing something turn you off and say, I just can't consider mitigation after seeing that?

2

JUROR NUMBER 58: No.

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. PIROLO: If there was a qualified expert that testified regarding the readings or images from an

MR. PIROLO: All right. We've talked about -we're going to switch over to the mitigation. talked about that it's unlimited, we talked about the burden is less than beyond a reasonable doubt, it's reasonably convinced. You have to be reasonably convinced that these mitigators exist. Could you be open -- well, let me start off by this, do you think mental illness is someone's choice?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No.

JUROR NUMBER 58:

MR. PIROLO: In the arena of psychologists, psychiatrists, neuropsychologists, neuropsychiatrists, do you find those studies, those professionals, as legitimate, their practice being legitimate?

MR. PIROLO: And can you -- are you open to and would you consider any type of evidence that's presented to you concerning mental illness?

Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: And would be open to and consider any evidence that was presented to you in terms of MRI -- do you know what an MRI is?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I do.

1 MRI, explained them to you --JUROR NUMBER 58: Yeah, if they explained them to me where I could understand them. 3 MR. PIROLO: Right. Someone's actually going to 4 5 explain them to you --JUROR NUMBER 58: Right. I don't read MRI's. 6 MR. PIROLO: You'd be open to that, and you'd 7 consider that kind of --8 9 JUROR NUMBER 58: As part of the evidence? MR. PIROLO: Yes. 10 JUROR NUMBER 58: Sure. 11 12 MR. PIROLO: All right. How about a PET scan, have you ever heard of a PET scan? 13 14 JUROR NUMBER 58: I've heard of it, yes. 15 MR. PIROLO: Same question, if a qualified expert testifies and explains to you what's depicted on that, 16 can you consider that as well? 17 JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes. 1.8 MR. PIROLO: Could you be open to considering 19 20 brain damage or brain injury as a mitigating circumstance? 21 22 JUROR NUMBER 58: Yeah. MR. PIROLO: Again, qualified expert --23 24 JUROR NUMBER 58: Qualified -- yeah, sure.

MR. PIROLO: How about -- I'm going to ask about

25

two topics, drug abuse and drug addiction. Do you think drug addiction is a choice, as opposed to drug abuse?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No, it's not.

MR. PIROLO: Would you be open and would you be able to consider drug addiction as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Depending on the circumstance.

MR. PIROLO: Let me flip it around. If you heard evidence of drug addiction, would you consider that as an aggravator? If you heard someone was addicted to whatever the drugs are?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Again, it just depends on the circumstance. A lot of factors would come into play. In some cases, it may not be an aggravator.

MR. PIROLO: If the Court did not instruct you that the drug addiction would be an aggravator, would you still consider it as an aggravator?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I'm sorry, what was that?

MR. PIROLO: If the Court -- you didn't get instruction on drug addiction being an aggravator -- now we're going back to earlier, that the aggravators are limited. The mitigation is unlimited. Now, if the Court never instructs you that drug addiction is an aggravator, would you still consider it to be an

aggravator, even though the Court doesn't tell you it's an aggravator?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I don't --

MR. PIROLO: No wrong answers here.

JUROR NUMBER 58: Again, these are hypothetical, and without all the information, it's hard to give you a definitive answer.

MR. PIROLO: How about physical and emotional abuse, would you be open -- would you consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Now, I'll read you two potential instructions that may be read to you if you're selected on this jury. I'm going to follow each one by saying, would you be able to consider this as mitigation. First one, "the capital felony was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance." Would you be able to consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Possibly, yes.

MR. PIROLO: Next one, "the capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law was substantially impaired." Could you consider

as a mitigating circumstance a circumstance like that?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I believe so.

MR. PIROLO: Do you consider mitigating circumstances as explanations for someone's conduct, or do you look at it as an excuse?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I think in some cases they are excuses, and in other cases they are explanations.

MR. PIROLO: Would certain mitigators, to you, be, by themselves, considered just excuses, and some explanations? Would you explain that a little bit more? What -- and this is all hypothetical, it's really hard to just --

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yeah, it really is.

(Unintelligible). You know, in some cases they are excuses; but, in other cases, they're not. There are circumstances that, in some cases, have contributed to it.

MR. PIROLO: If you're selected in this process, and we get to the second phase, hypothetically speaking, we get there, when you and 11 other people are in a room, do you feel that your vote and recommendation would be affected by someone else?

Could someone else twist your arm to voting one way?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No.

MR. PIROLO: And with the same respect, would you

13¹

respect someone else's decision, even if you don't agree with it, would you hold yourself back from bullying them or --

JUROR NUMBER 58: Sure.

MR. PIROLO: All right. And you understand that the -- that portion, that recommendation, does not have to be unanimous?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, can I have a minute?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. PIROLO: I want to -- earlier on we talked about life without parole, what are your thoughts about someone spending the rest of their natural life in prison?

JUROR NUMBER 58: What are my thoughts on it? I think it's horrible that somebody has to spend the rest of their life in prison. But in some circumstances, that -- I mean, if that's what's required by the court system, then that's it.

MR. PIROLO: We were talking about the drug abuse and drug addiction, you said that possibly -- you're not sure because we're not there yet -- but you could potentially view it as an aggravating circumstance.

If you're told that drug abuse and drug addiction is never an aggravating circumstance, what does that mean

2

for you?

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

24

I wouldn't be considering it as an aggravator. I'm being told by the Court to consider it that way, right, or not to consider it?

JUROR NUMBER 58: If I'm told that it's not, then

MR. PIROLO: Drug addiction and drug abuse is never an aggravator. Does that help you out with that, or is it still troubling for you?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No, it's not an aggravator, it's not to be considered an aggravator, then you can't consider it as an aggravator.

MR. PIROLO: Do you have any doubts about your ability not to consider the drug abuse as an aggravating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 58:

MR. PIROLO: Remember that scale I asked you about earlier, to give us a number? I'm going to be difficult about that.

JUROR NUMBER 58: The death penalty number? You want that, really?

MR. PIROLO: After talking about this a little bit more, do you think you could put yourself somewhere on that scale? Remember, 10 is strongly agree with the death penalty, 0 is strongly oppose it. Can you put yourself anywhere in there? Let me ask

you this --

JUROR NUMBER 58: I'm going to go 5, I'm going to go middle of the road, because I honestly think it depends on the situation. If we come back with that as a verdict, it needs to be warranted. But I wouldn't just hand it out whenever.

MR. PIROLO: Can you tell us why in a circumstance you would be for the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 58: I mean, I -- I never -- I don't know. I never -- I've never been in a situation where I've had to make that decision, and I would have to go with the instructions of the Court and based on all the evidence and, you know, so many things come into play.

MR. PIROLO: Could you give us a reason why you'd be opposed to the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 58: If I didn't feel it was proven.

MR. PIROLO: You mean the --

JUROR NUMBER 58: The charge. You know, maybe it wasn't quite proven to where I felt strong enough -- again, it's the evidence that's presented.

MR. PIROLO: Right. You understand you never get to that phase if the charge isn't proven?

JUROR NUMBER 58: Right. Okay

MR. PIROLO: We only start considering the

2

3

5

7

9

8

10

12

13 14

16

15

18

17

19 20

2122

23

24

25

aggravating circumstances if first degree premeditated murder is proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

JUROR NUMBER 58: Right.

MR. PIROLO: Is there another reason why you'd be opposed to the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 58: One of the circumstances of the situation. Less aggravators. Not as many aggravators.

MR. PIROLO: Your Honor, I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 58, you're going to be released for today. You are still being considered as a potential juror for this case. What I'm going to have you do is, you're going to go downstairs, they're going to give you more information about what I'm just about to tell you. You're going to go downstairs, you're going to report to the jury clerk, tell them that -- when you go downstairs, they're going to give you a phone number, they're going to tell you to call this phone number next Wednesday between 1:00 and 5:00, and then you're going to need to report back. Most likely, you will report back either -- that next Wednesday is the 5th of March, most likely you will report back the next day, which is the 6th, or the following day, the 7th.

then we'll continue with the second phase of the questioning of the jury. So you'll be in recess from now until that time period. During this recess, you must continue to abide by your rules governing your service as a juror. Specifically, do not discuss this case with anyone. Do not speak to the lawyers, the parties, or the witnesses. Avoid reading newspaper headlines and articles relating to this trial or its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio, or Internet comments about this case. Do not conduct any independent research yourself concerning this case or any of its participants. Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 58: No.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll have you report downstairs, but you're released for today. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 58 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, Juror Number 61 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Juror Number 61.

JUROR NUMBER 61: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: The first thing I want to do is thank you for being here, and thank you for being patient with this process. When we broke on our recess, I

told you there were some rules governing your service as a juror. Those rules start then. Those rules -- so I'm going to ask you about that. Since that time, have you read or been exposed to reading any newspaper headlines and/or articles related to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 61: No.

1.0

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 61: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 61: No.

THE COURT: Have you discussed with any other jurors or with anyone else, or allowed anyone to discuss this case in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 61: No.

THE COURT: Okay. The first question I'm going to ask you -- how this process is going to work is, I'm going to ask you some question, then both the defense and the State will have an opportunity to ask you some questions. The first question I'm going to ask you is, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 61: The death penalty?

2

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 61: Honestly, someone that takes an innocent life, woman, grandma, you know, has grandchildren, I mean, why waste people's time and taxpayers' money to prolong something for 15 years that, you know -- someone didn't get a chance at life or whatnot, so the death penalty, absolutely.

Okay. So if I were to ask you if you THE COURT: were for or against the death penalty, as a general term, you would say you are for the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 61: For sure, yes.

Okay. In this case, how the process works is, there's kind of two phases. There's the first phase, which is called the guilt phase, then there's the second phase, which is called the penalty In the guilt phase, we do that first, if there is a guilty verdict on count one, and in this case count one is premeditated murder of the first degree, then, and only then, do we move on to the second phase, which is the penalty phase. And in the penalty phase, you, as a juror, will be asked to make a recommendation to the Court of the possible penalties, and the penalties for you to consider would be death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole.

So the question I'm going to ask you at this time, and I'll instruct you that you have to consider both those penalties, and then I give you some instructions about how you consider those and what circumstances you consider with regard to both, and give you some guidance with regard to that; but are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree, and is that opinion so strong that you would not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 61: This case here, or just in general?

THE COURT: Well, it appears from what you're saying that you know some things about this case; is that correct?

JUROR NUMBER 61: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay. Most people do know something about the case. Where would you have gained that information? From reading, talking to someone, newspapers?

JUROR NUMBER 61: The day it happened, I live right down the road.

THE COURT: Okay. From the day it happened, you say you live right down the road. So did you -- down

the road from where?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 61: John Rodes.

THE COURT: Okay. And so did you learn about the case -- I mean, have you watched TV? Have you talked about it with your friends? Tell me -- and if all of those, tell me what they are.

JUROR NUMBER 61: TV, news, friends.

THE COURT: Okay. Friends -- so you've discussed it with friends, and you've heard the news accounts.

JUROR NUMBER 61: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And what information do you believe that you know about this case?

JUROR NUMBER 61: What information about it?

THE COURT: Yes. Be specific as to what you believe you know.

JUROR NUMBER 61: I know something happened at EconoLodge, then shot and killed a cop, a woman, a grandmother.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 61: (Unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. And what you are asked to do if you are a juror is to set aside anything that you may have learned about the case, serve with an open mind, and reach verdict based only on the law and the evidence presented in this courtroom at this trial.

Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 61: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So from what you're saying, it sounds like you have a specific opinion about this case.

JUROR NUMBER 61: Absolutely. All the evidence is there.

THE COURT: Okay. Can you tell me -- and I'm just going to go through the process, and I have to put it all on the record, can you tell me what that opinion is?

JUROR NUMBER 61: Guilty.

THE COURT: That the defendant is guilty.

JUROR NUMBER 61: Right.

THE COURT: Okay. Can you set that aside -- if I tell you that that's your job as a juror, can you set that aside and come into this courtroom with kind of clean slate for purposes of determining this case?

JUROR NUMBER 61: No, not somebody that takes innocent life. I'm pretty close-minded on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything I can do or instruct you that would make you feel differently?

JUROR NUMBER 61: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Stipulation?

2

MR. PIROLO: Stipulation.

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. With regard to that, Juror Number 61, I am going to release you from being considered for this panel. Hold on a second. I want to thank you for being here, thank you for your time and your patience. I'm going to have you report downstairs to the jury assembly room, they'll just briefly meet with you, and then they'll send you on your way. Okay. Thank you, sir.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 61 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. For the record, Juror Number 61 has been released for cause. We can bring in Number 62. And then after this, we'll take a break.

MR. BROWN: Judge, Number 62 was the woman who had a business trip and was going to check at lunch.

THE COURT: I didn't have that on my list. Okay. I wrote it down on my sheet of paper though, so you are right.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 62 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Number 62, first of all, I

want to thank you for being here, thank you for your time, thank you for your patience with this process. One of the things we talked about earlier with you, specifically, was that you were supposed to be out of town for two weeks on a conference. You're a resource teacher, that it was a conference kind of paid for by the school board, and that you were going to check to see what your options were with regard to that. Do you have any other information about that?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes. They can either transfer both ticket and conference, or cancel.

THE COURT: And it would be okay?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Not ideal, but okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you okay with that?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I mean, there's no right or wrong answers in here, and you're allowed to say, no way, Jose, Judge, I ain't doing that. What we want to know is -- you know, obviously, this is -- those of us, especially in here, consider that this is a duty as a citizen of the United States, but we also want you to be here and not be here where we're chaining you to the chair, and also be here and, you know -- be here in mind and spirit as well.

JUROR NUMBER 62: I will be.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I appreciate that.

Now, during the recess, I gave some rules, and they

apply to when the recess started. The rules talked

about not being exposed to different things, so I need

to ask you about those. Since those rules have been

in place, have you read or been exposed to reading

newspaper headlines and/or articles related to this

trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

THE COURT: And have you discussed this case with any other potential jurors or with anyone else, or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

THE COURT: Okay. The first question I'm going -- in this process, I'm going to ask you some questions, then each of the attorneys will have an opportunity to ask you some questions as well. The first question I'm going to ask you is a pretty

general question, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 62: I think, in theory, I'm against it, but it's never affected me personally, so it's just -- it's something I've never thought about to a great degree.

THE COURT: Okay. So if I were to instruct you that as a possible penalty in this case that you were to consider death as a possible penalty, would you be able to follow that instruction?

JUROR NUMBER 62: I hesitate, because honestly -- I would like to think I would, but it would be hard.

THE COURT: Okay. And so I'm going to explore that a little further, let me tell you a little bit about how the process works. There's two possible phases to this trial. There's the guilt phase, which is the first part. In the guilt phase, in the event of count one -- and it only pertains to count one, in the event of count one, the jury comes back with a guilty verdict as to that count, which is first degree premeditated murder, then we move on to the second phase, which would be the penalty phase. And in the penalty phase, I will give you instructions about what your job is as a juror. And in those instructions, I do tell you that in the penalty phase, you must

consider as a possible penalty the death penalty and life in prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty. Those are your options. So are you opposed to the death penalty such that you could not consider it as a penalty under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No. I can consider it.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then I'm going to ask you about your knowledge of this case. Do you know anything about this case, either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussion with anyone else, or from the media, radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What information do you believe you know about this case?

JUROR NUMBER 62: What I received is primarily from the media.

THE COURT: From the media. And from what media?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Florida Today, WESH 2 news.

THE COURT: Okay. Newspaper and news reports.

And what specific information do you think you know?

JUROR NUMBER 62: I remember when the event happened. I remember episodes afterwards, there was a sign for the deputy, there was an issue on that. I heard about the girlfriend pleading. I mean, I watch

the news, so I --

2

THE COURT: Okay. So how often do you watch the news?

4

3

JUROR NUMBER 62: Every day.

5

THE COURT: Okay. And how long do you watch the

6

news every day?

evening.

7

JUROR NUMBER 62: Anywhere from an hour to two

8

hours.

9

THE COURT: Okay. Is it like you sit there and

10

watch it, or is it on TV and you're doing other

11

things, or do you watch it?

12

JUROR NUMBER 62: I watch -- I'm doing other

13

things in the morning, I sit down and watch it in the $\,$

THE COURT: Okay. So probably an hour in the

14

L4 |

15

T O

morning, hour in the evening?

1617

JUROR NUMBER 62: Easily.

18

THE COURT: Okay. So the question becomes, can

19

you set aside anything that you may have learned about

2021

this case, you have to put that aside, serve with an open mind, and reach a verdict in this case based only

22

on the law as I instruct you and the evidence which

23

would be presented in this courtroom at this trial?

24

Can you do that?

25

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

2

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Juror Number 62, good afternoon. I want to talk to you a little bit about the death penalty itself. You said that, in theory, you're against it, can you expand on that a little bit for me, please?

JUROR NUMBER 62: The thought of having someone killed, I mean, it's a human being, so it's something to think about.

MR. BROWN: Right. And, obviously, if you're selected in this case and you sit on the jury, you come back first degree murder, then you're going to be faced with that situation. You're going to have to make a recommendation to the Court for either a sentence of life in prison without parole, or the death penalty. And during the entire time that you're here, throughout the guilt phase and throughout the penalty phase, the person who the State has accused of murdering Deputy Pill will be seated over at that So you're going to be seeing that person every table. day. Then, at the end of it, assuming we get to that stage, you're going to be asked to make a recommendation, and we're going to ask you to consider and vote to impose the death penalty. How do you feel

about your being in that situation? Not just in general, you, personally, sitting in that situation.

JUROR NUMBER 62: I think I'll be able to understand the evidence, take it, and then make the appropriate recommendation based on what I've heard.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Could you vote for the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Now, you said earlier that it would be hard to consider, you'd like to think that you would. Can you -- is there a doubt in your mind as far as your ability to vote for the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Based on what I've heard, no.

MR. BROWN: Okay. When you say, based upon what you've heard --

JUROR NUMBER 62: Based on the explanations of it.

MR. BROWN: Do you come in with a concept of, well, this type of case, with a particular set of circumstances, I can vote for the death penalty there, but nothing else?

JUROR NUMBER 62: I don't think so.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Some people (unintelligible), someone who's a mass murderer, and then they say, only that, but nothing below that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 62: Well, yeah, it would be circumstantial, depending on the case.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Let me go through a little bit the process that you have to go through to get to be in that situation. First, obviously, the jury returns a verdict of first degree murder. If that's the case, then we would reconvene, evidence will be presented from both sides, and then the Court would give you a set of instructions. The first thing the Court's going to tell you is, you have to look at -- and she will give you a list of maybe one, maybe more than one, three, four, five, whatever it is -- of what are called aggravating circumstances. Basically, those are statutory lists that increases the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim. It aggravates it from first degree murder to something above. And it's from that list, if the State of Florida proves those, where you can, based on those aggravators, vote for the death penalty. Now, the State of Florida has to prove them to you beyond any reasonable doubt. they're not proven, and there are no aggravators, obviously, your recommendation would be life.

If the State of Florida proves them, then you look at those aggravators, those are the ones that you can statutorily use to justify the death penalty, and

you look at those aggravators and ask yourself, do
these justify the death penalty? If they do, then you
go to the next phase, which is that you look at the
mitigation evidence. That's evidence presented
concerning the defendant's background, life, a broad
range of things from there. You look at that
evidence, and that has to be proven to you as well,
it's a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the
evidence. If something's not proven, you disregard
it; if it's proven, then you consider it.

Then you have to go through a weighing process, and you ask yourself, does the mitigation outweigh the aggravating circumstances. And then if you find that the mitigation outweighs it, your recommendation would be life. If you find that the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravators, then you're in a position where you legally can recommend the death penalty to the Court. The Court's going to tell you that you're not legally required to, she's not going to say, if you find A, B, C, that you must return a recommendation of death. But it's when you get to that point that you find the aggravators, they justify the death penalty, it's not outweighed by the mitigators, that you can, at that point, if you feel it's justified, make that recommendation. Do you

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

22

23

24

25

understand the process?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Again, knowing that's the process, do you come in with, in your own mind, a set of, well, I'd only consider certain aggravators, only a few things to me, in my mind, would justify the death penalty? Do you find yourself in that situation?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No, because I'm aware of (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: Okay. Do you think any aggravators -- can you think of anything out there, in your mind, that would justify the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 62: That could justify the death penalty?

MR. BROWN: In your mind, would justify the death penalty.

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

MR. BROWN: How do you feel about being put in this situation where you might have to make that decision and recommend life or death?

JUROR NUMBER 62: It's a huge burden for anyone.

One that I wouldn't necessarily want to run to.

MR. BROWN: Do you feel comfortable with being in that situation?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And you indicated that, in theory, you're opposed to the death penalty, how would you feel after the fact if you recommended the death penalty? How would you balance that with your internal feelings that are against it?

JUROR NUMBER 62: If I came to that, then all the evidence before me would have to convince me to do so.

MR. BROWN: If you were selected, as we talked about, the jury would have to come back with a verdict of guilty of first degree murder to advance to that stage. If the jury were to come back with a lesser charge, such as second degree murder or something else, then you wouldn't go to that stage, you wouldn't have to make that decision. Do you think that in any way would influence your verdict as far as first degree murder or something lower?

JUROR NUMBER 62: I think the evidence will be what it is. It will lead to the ultimate conclusion, based on the instructions from the judge.

MR. BROWN: Right. I guess where I'm going with that is, knowing in the back of your mind that first has been proven, but if I just come back with second, I'm not going to be put in that uncomfortable situation, I'm not going to be forced to have to make a life or death recommendation, would that affect you

at all?

JUROR NUMBER 62: I don't think so, because the evidence will be the evidence.

MR. BROWN: Okay. You would agree that if you're selected, you're supposed to and should return the verdict that the evidence speaks to.

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

MR. BROWN: If the State has proven first degree murder, then your duty would be to return the verdict for the crime that the State's proven.

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And not compromise down to a lesser charge simply because it might be easier on you.

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. You can see where the State might have that concern, right?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Uh-huh.

MR. BROWN: Judge, I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Questions by the defense?

MR. PIROLO: Good afternoon, Juror Number 62. I want to start by saying that there are no wrong answers. So the only wrong answer, I tell people, is holding it inside and not telling us about it. If you're thinking something or feeling something, just let us know. Okay? It's not a decision that you take

lightly, or that you're going to take lightly, correct?

_

JUROR NUMBER 62: Correct.

MR. PIROLO: If we wind up getting to this part of the trial, you have to come back with a recommendation of life, or death. A fellow human being, right?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Right.

JUROR NUMBER 62:

what you've heard on the news?

MR. PIROLO: You understand what I was just talking about, it's not just some person out there, that person we're talking about in this case is, Mr. Bradley, Brandon Bradley, he's sitting next to me.

MR. PIROLO: Now, based on what you've heard in the media, have you come to a conclusion as to guilt or innocence? Have you reached an opinion based on

Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 62: Again, when you hear something on the news, unless it personally affects you, you don't really think about it, honestly. But then knowing I was coming for jury duty, seeing the headline for it on Sunday, I thought the possibility might be here, so I thought, well, everything I've heard in the media is that he is guilty, based on what I've heard. But I also know that the media twists --

everything I've ever known personally that came out in the media was wrong.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. What is your opinion, as you sit here today -- do you have an opinion?

JUROR NUMBER 62: I don't think I have an opinion.

MR. PIROLO: "Think," or --

JUROR NUMBER 62: Well, I know what I've heard. I haven't seen any evidence other than what the news has said. So my conclusion, it would seem like he is guilty, based on what I've heard, but, again, I'm not in a situation where I'm hearing evidence and making a judgment.

MR. PIROLO: Would the State be starting off at this whole trial with the upper hand, since you've come in with those feelings?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Probably.

MR. PIROLO: Would you say you're biased against Mr. Bradley?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

MR. PIROLO: Now, I mean, biased based on what you've heard, would you consider yourself already voting for guilty?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

MR. PIROLO: But you would agree that at least

the State is starting with the upper hand?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to get back to that in a minute, but I just want to ask you, part of the news stories that you've heard as well, you said it was the day of the event?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Portions of stories that heard. You said you heard something about a girl taking a plea?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Most recently, yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Do you remember any other stories regarding -- that you remember Brandon Bradley's name during this time period and what those stories were about?

JUROR NUMBER 62: As I said, when the event happened, there were stories subsequently about Deputy Pill's husband, I heard those on the news. It's been a couple years, so not really anything until this came about, talking about the jurors, that it was going to take a while to seat a jury.

MR. PIROLO: Getting back to the statement you made that the State may have the upper hand, do you have a doubt as to whether you could be fair and impartial?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

1 MR. PIROLO: You have no doubt? JUROR NUMBER 62: No doubt. 2 MR. PIROLO: You can set all that aside? Or your 3 feelings aside? 4 JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes. 5 Because it troubles me when you say MR. PIROLO: 6 7 the State's got an upper hand. JUROR NUMBER 62: Well, because I've heard their 8 side in the media, I haven't heard the other side. 9 MR. PIROLO: You've heard the media's position on 10 11 it. JUROR NUMBER 62: Yes. 12 MR. PIROLO: Do you have any doubt -- well, what 13 14 does life without parole mean to you? JUROR NUMBER 62: In terms of the person, I think 15 16 it means they have an opportunity to redeem themselves, honestly. 17 MR. PIROLO: Do you have any doubt as to whether 18 19 or not that person is going to get out? 20 JUROR NUMBER 62: Well, it seems like they wouldn't, it's without the possibility of parole. 21 MR. PIROLO: That's in fact what it means, is 22 that life without parole means life without parole, 23 that person dies in prison. 24

I'm going to go back to something you said

25

earlier, that you heard a side, you heard something
that's portrayed from the media, what if you're
selected in this case and you don't hear another side?
Will you still render -- can you still be fair and
impartial, or based on what you've heard in the media,
based on things that you hear at trial, does the
State's upper hand keep adding up?

JUROR NUMBER 62: If I don't hear another side here in court?

MR. PIROLO: Right. The judge will instruct you that there is — the whole burden's on the State, the State has to prove their case beyond and to the exclusion of all reasonable doubt. The defendant doesn't have to prove or disprove anything. The defendant has the absolute right to remain silent. So if you don't hear another side to it, can you still remain fair and impartial? Or are you wanting to hear something from the other side because you're coming in giving the prosecution, sort of, a leg up?

JUROR NUMBER 62: Honestly, I would probably want to hear something.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, can I have just a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. PIROLO: Does Mr. Bradley sit here presumed innocent, in your mind? The law says he is, the judge

says he is, but in your mind, hearing what you've heard, coming in with the State having a leg up?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

MR. PIROLO: He's not presumed innocent?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

MR. PIROLO: That's something that, obviously, the Court instructs you on, he's got that presumption, you appreciate that, but that's just something inside of you, just cannot presume --

JUROR NUMBER 62: I would have to constantly remind myself of that.

MR. PIROLO: But you -- right now, you cannot presume him innocent?

JUROR NUMBER 62: No.

MR. PIROLO: All right. May we approach? THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had before the Court, out of the hearing of any other parties present in the courtroom as follows:)

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to move for cause, before I start asking anymore questions. She's indicated she's formed an opinion based on what she's heard in the media, she said the State would have a leg up, that she cannot presume him innocent, she's presuming that he's guilty in her mind. Even if the Court says

that he is presumed innocent, that he's not in her mind, he is guilty, he's sitting here guilty.

MR. BROWN: The trouble I have is that we've gotten ahead of ourselves. We haven't instructed her on the presumption of innocence, on that whole burden of proof. And so if you ask most people on the street whether they can presume a defendant innocent right when they walk in, most people on the street are either going to say no, or I haven't heard anything, or anything like that. She hasn't been instructed on that, so I think it's a little unfair to -- it's not a fair question at this time until she's instructed by the Court.

THE COURT: I mean, I'd be happy to give her that instruction and have her answer that question.

MR. BROWN: I mean, if she hears the Court tell her that, and at that point she says she just couldn't be --

THE COURT: Because I know Mr. Pirolo said, and the judge instructs you that's what you have to do, and she did say after that that she couldn't. But I can give her that -- I mean, I'd be happy to give her that instruction and then ask her the question myself.

MR. BROWN: Right. I would ask that --

THE COURT: Because, before, she said she could

3

4

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

follow my instructions even with regard to the death penalty, so I don't know if she's -- I mean --

My recommendation, that would be a MR. MOORE: good way to go, read that instruction, and then we'll follow up with questions.

MR. BROWN: Right. I would ask at this point --I would stipulate with her, but I would ask that if counsel is going to get into this with future jurors, that we have the Court instruct them. Because I think it's unfair to the juror --

THE COURT: Well, just anytime it comes up, make an objection, come forward, and I'll give them an instruction --

MR. PIROLO: The problem is, I asked --

-- just like the defense did that. THE COURT: I mean, I think with all fairness to Mr. Pirolo, it just kind of came up, and some of this does come up sometimes. Okay. So we have a stipulation?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

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

Okay. Number 62, I am going to THE COURT: release you from your service as a juror in this case. I'm going to ask you to go downstairs, report to the

jury assembly room, and they'll give you some further information. They're mostly going to take your badge and just send you on your way. But I do want to thank you for being here, thank you for your patience, thank you for being a part of this process.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 62 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we take a ten-minute break. It's 3:35, be back here at 3:45, and we'll continue with the process. So court will be in recess for ten minutes. Thank you.

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

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

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

THE COURT: Okay. We can go back on the record.

Unless I hear something else, we'll bring in Juror

Number 63. Are we good to go?

MR. MOORE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll bring in Juror Number 63.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 63 was escorted into the

_ _

courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 63, first, I want to thank you for being here, and thank you for your patience with regard to this process. It does take some time, but we appreciate you being patient with us. I assure you everyone's working hard. Before the recess, I talked to you about some rules, so I need to talk to you about those, and these rules come into effect when I announced them. So have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles related to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 63: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: And have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 63: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 63: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: And have you discussed this case with any other jurors, or with anyone else, or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 63: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you some questions, then the State's going to have an opportunity to ask you some questions, and then the defense is going to have an opportunity to ask you some questions. My first question is a real general question, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I support the death penalty when, you know, all the evidence proves that it should happen.

THE COURT: Okay. So if someone were to say that you're for or against the death penalty, with that caveat, you would have to say that you're for the death penalty.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

1.8

THE COURT: Let me tell you what happens in this case. There's two phases, there's the first phase, which is the guilt phase, and in the event the jury returns a verdict on count one, which is the only count that's applicable, returns a verdict of guilty to premeditated murder in the first degree, then, and only then, do we move on to the second phase. The second phase is what we call the penalty phase, and in the penalty phase, the jury is asked to make a recommendation to the judge, which would be me, of two possible penalties, and that would be the penalty of

death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Now, if you are for the death penalty, are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree, and is that opinion so strong that you would not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 63: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're saying you would consider --

JUROR NUMBER 63: I would consider other options.

THE COURT: Okay. So if I instruct you that as part of your duties as a juror, you're to consider both penalties, the death penalty and the life sentence, would you be able to do that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm going to ask you what you know about this case. Do you know anything about this case either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, or from the media, radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspapers?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Media.

THE COURT: Okay. And what information do you think you know about the case?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I just know what the biased media presents, so I only know what I read in, I think, last Sunday's paper.

THE COURT: Okay. And you say Sunday's paper, would that be Florida Today?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: So you read -- I believe there was a two-page spread, you read that spread?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: The only reason why I know this is because my mother told me. So you read that spread?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. And so did you -- before that, did you know anything?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Only when it first happened. And then after that, I don't follow the news that frequently, because it's so full of nothing good.

THE COURT: Okay. So when you said "biased media," you understand that media presents things, but, in fairness, it might not always be 100 percent accurate or 100 percent complete?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do in this case is, if you were to be selected as a juror in this case, can you serve with an open mind and reach a

verdict based only on the law and the evidence presented in this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. What I tell you to do as part of your duties as a juror, you have to set that aside — and we're going to talk about the presumption of innocence later, and we're going to talk about the State having the burden of proof, and that burden of proof is beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. Can you set aside what you've learned and give the defendant the presumption of innocence, which you will be instructed that you need to do?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. So at this time you can consider the defendant to be not guilty?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Juror Number 63, good afternoon. Let me start with going over the process as a juror to get to the point where you would be able to consider the death penalty. I know the judge went through it this morning, but she gave you an awful lot of information in a short period of time.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Obviously, the first step would be, if you're selected as a juror, the jury comes back with a verdict of guilty of murder in the first degree. If they come back with a lesser, second degree or something else, or not guilty, obviously, not guilty, you don't proceed to a sentencing phase at all, if there's a lesser, death penalty's off the table, and it's solely up to the judge for sentencing. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: So jury comes back with guilty of first degree murder, then we would reconvene, and we would have what's called the penalty phase. where additional evidence would be provided to the jury, and the judge would then give you a set of instructions. The first step of those instructions would instruct you to look at what are known as aggravating circumstances. The judge will give you the ones that may apply in this case, and it may be one, will likely be more than one that she's going to Those are circumstances that would read to you. either increase the gravity of the crime or the harm that was done to the victim. Aggravating circumstances are the things you can look for, and only to those, to decide whether the death penalty is

232425

justified in this case. So she would give you that list of aggravating circumstances. The State has to prove those to you beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt.

Obviously, if we fail to prove any, your recommendation would have to be life in prison. If we prove at least one, or if we prove more than one, it has to be at least one, but we can prove more than one, then you look at those aggravating circumstances that have been proven and ask yourself, do these justify the death penalty? If you find that they do, you advance in the proceeding, or your analysis, and that's to look at the mitigation circumstances that have been provided.

The Court talked to you a little bit about those this morning, they're basically items that come from the defendant, his background, life history, things of that nature, but it's going to be items and evidence that surrounds and concerns the defendant, himself.

That also has a burden of proof, it's a lesser burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. So these things are presented, if you don't find they're proven, you disregard them. You take all the mitigation evidence that's been proven to you, that's been testified to and proven to you, and you consider

all that. Just like you consider all the aggravating circumstances that have been proven, you consider all the mitigation that's been proven.

Now, during your lifetime, you've probably had to make key, critical decisions in your personal life, work history, you've made important decisions?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: When you make those decisions, you typically look at all the factors involved.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: You look at everything. And then you go through a weighing process, you find some of those factors are very important, you give them great weight. Other factors you look at, well, this isn't very important at all, I'm going to give it little weight. Right?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

MR. BROWN: But you consider everything, and then you decide how much weight to give to everything to arrive at your decision.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Correct.

MR. BROWN: Same process that you go through here. Everything that's been proven, you consider. You may decide to give something -- find it very important, give it great weight, you may find

something to be not important to you, and you give it little weight. You consider it, but you give it little weight. No one can tell you -- the Court's not going to tell you, we can't tell you how much weight -- this is how much weight you give to this, that's a decision for you to make. We can recommend it, but it's a decision for you to make. You just simply have to agree that you will consider everything, how much weight you give it is entirely up to you. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: So you go through that weighing process, and the question that you have to ask yourself is, does the mitigation evidence outweigh the aggravating factors, the aggravating circumstances? And those are the ones we talked about, gravity of the crime, harm to the victim. If the mitigation outweighs the aggravators, then your recommendation would be life. If you find that the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravating circumstances, then you're in a position where you legally can recommend to the Court that you feel the appropriate sentence would be the death penalty. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Now, the Court's not going to tell

2.0

2.0

you if you find A, B, C, and D, that you must return a recommendation for death. The Court's actually going to tell you that you're never required to. So it's not, I'll do whatever the law tells me, if it's A, B, and C, then that's what I must do. The Court's not going to tell you. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: It's a situation where you find the aggravators, find the mitigators, weigh them, and if the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravators, and you feel that the death penalty is justified, that's when you recommend the sentence of death. Any questions about that process?

JUROR NUMBER 63: No, sir.

MR. BROWN: Can you follow it?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Do you understand it?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I understand what you're saying, yes.

MR. BROWN: So given that process, that procedure that you have to go through, can you recommend a sentence of death if you feel it's justified?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Now, the last topic I want to cover, and it may not apply to you, but I cover this with

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

23

22

24

25

everybody, in case you may be back there and somebody else may voice this type of concern, but, obviously, if you were to return a verdict of something less than first degree murder, say second degree, you would not have to be in the position of recommending a sentence to the Court, you wouldn't have to make that decision of life or death, do you think that in any way would affect your deliberation in deciding whether the defendant is guilty of first degree murder?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I'm sorry, I don't understand what you're asking.

MR. BROWN: Knowing that if you were to come back with a lesser charge, that you wouldn't be in the position of having to decide life or death, would that fact cause you to say, well, you know, even though they've proven first, it's easier for me to just go second, I'm going to go with second.

JUROR NUMBER 63: No, I wouldn't do that.

MR. BROWN: You agree that you ought to return a verdict for what the evidence proves?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Can you see why the concern we have for that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Absolutely.

MR. BROWN: And that's why I just wanted to make

sure that you would assure us that you're going to return the verdict that the evidence speaks to.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the defense?

MR. PIROLO: Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon, Juror Number 63. How are you? I just want to let you know there are no wrong answers you can give. We just -- if you're thinking of something, you have a feeling about something, just let us know. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Okay.

MR. PIROLO: I want to start -- you indicated earlier -- you described the media as being biased.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. And I know you read an article, I believe, on Sunday in Florida Today. And you also had said you heard stuff, or read something, when it first happened. Do you remember any of those things you read or saw when it first happened?

JUROR NUMBER 63: When it first happened, I just remember seeing the blurb go across the TV, and then I said, oh, I can't watch this. So, you know, at that point I just didn't follow it, I had no desire to

follow it.

MR. PIROLO: Do you remember what the blurb said?

JUROR NUMBER 63: You know, it's been so long

ago, and I --

MR. PIROLO: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 63: All I know is, I remember it was a deputy that was shot, I think, and then, after that, oh, I just want to be done with this, and turned the channel.

MR. PIROLO: And then, when you were reading the Florida Today, did that spark your memory back to having seen that on the TV?

JUROR NUMBER 63: A little bit.

MR. PIROLO: Did you form any opinions when you read that article?

JUROR NUMBER 63: No, sir. It probably raises more questions of how does this happen, what happened, those kinds of questions.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. So as you sit here today, you don't have any opinions as to guilt or innocence?

JUROR NUMBER 63: No, sir.

MR. PIROLO: You've heard the judge mention this a couple times already, the fact of life without parole, do understand that life without parole means that if someone is sentenced to life without parole,

they never leave prison, they die in prison.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes. I understand that.

MR. PIROLO: And Mr. Brown mentioned earlier important decisions, do you acknowledge that if you're chosen for this, this would be an extremely important decision?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Absolutely.

MR. PIROLO: If you get to this point, you're literally considering life or death of somebody.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: It's not just any person, but it's Mr. Brandon Bradley, this individual sitting here (indicating). You indicate that you support the death penalty.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Can you give us -- if I'd say, on a scale of 0 to 10, 10 being you are extremely supportive of the death penalty, 0 being don't really support it, maybe almost opposing it, where would you put yourself?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Like I said, with the circumstances and all that, but I'd say I'm probably at a 7.

MR. PIROLO: In what circumstances (unintelligible).

JUROR NUMBER 63: Well, (unintelligible) what happens, what happened when it was happening, all this stuff that has to do with what these people did, is important. You have to have all the facts before you make a decision.

MR. PIROLO: Sitting here right now, you give me a lot of concern based on what you just said.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Okay.

MR. PIROLO: You said "what these people did."

JUROR NUMBER 63: I'm talking about in general -no matter what the circumstances, whether it's this,
or what's going on down the hallway that way, or going
on down the hall -- whatever is presented is how you
form your opinion, your decision, your opinion. I
don't mean right here, I'm just talking in general.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Can you tell us why you support the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I believe in -- I guess part of my belief is an eye for an eye. If that is what is qualified, if that is what is proven, that's the price you pay. But you have to prove, first, what happened, why it happened -- you know, what I'm saying is, just give me everything I need to know to make that decision, if it doesn't deserve the eye for an eye.

MR. PIROLO: Could you think of first degree

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

murders that -- let me start off this way, can you think of first degree murders where you would deem the death penalty very deserving, almost automatic?

JUROR NUMBER 63: (Unintelligible), is that what you're asking me?

MR. PIROLO: Well, some people will say the death of a child, if someone intentionally meant to do it, intentionally did it, killed a child, no doubt --

JUROR NUMBER 63: Oh, absolutely, the death of a child. No doubt.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. All right. Can you think of any other ones like that? What about the death of a police officer? Is that one --

JUROR NUMBER 63: Like I said, the mitigating circumstances -- I know law enforcement officers, I'm not going to base an opinion based on that I have -that I know someone that was in law enforcement. You can't base that decision on that.

MR. PIROLO: The position you hold right now, that you do support the death penalty, have you always had that view, have you considered it a lot before today?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Truthfully, it's not something that I think about on a daily basis. There's certain times, like I said, with what you -- you know, things

that I've read, things that I've seen in the past, and I'm talking a long time ago, that I said, that person deserved to die, that person deserved that sentence. But that's reading books, you know, not any specific, you know, case, it was just a book, that happened in the book, and I thought they were right.

MR. PIROLO: What book are you talking about?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Oh, I don't remember. I love to read fiction, I love to read nonfiction. I can't give you a specific title.

MR. PIROLO: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 63: I read a lot. You should see my library at home.

MR. PIROLO: All right. You understand, the judge has already stressed it to you, the decision that you make -- you only get to the second part of this trial if, and only if, the jury comes back with a guilty verdict of first degree murder. That's the only time we consider the death penalty. You understand that once -- if the State has not shown you any aggravating circumstances, they've got to show you the aggravating circumstances, prove them to you, beyond a reasonable doubt. Each one, if there's more than one, that they're trying to present to you has to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. If they fail to

2

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

do that, you don't even consider the death penalty then, it's a life recommendation.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Right.

MR. PIROLO: You only start considering, and consider, the death penalty if at least one of the aggravating circumstances has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Then we start looking at the mitigating circumstances. And the State can only present a limited number of aggravating circumstances to you. By law, this is a list, and they can only go with what's on that list. Mitigating circumstances are unlimited. It can be anything to do with the person's background, Mr. Bradley's background, how he grew up, where he grew up, any -- we'll get into some more specifics as well. And mitigating circumstances, you understand, don't have to be proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt, it's less of a burden, it's reasonably convinced. You've got to be reasonably convinced that this mitigating circumstance has been proven to you. And you kind of understand why the burden is much higher for an aggravating circumstance, and less for mitigating, because, again, we're dealing with life or death of a fellow human being.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Right.

MR. PIROLO: You understand that, say, the

State's proven to you at least one aggravating circumstance, or more, and no mitigating circumstances have been proven to you, this judge, no other judge, will ever tell you that you have to vote for death.

You can still recommend life. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Let me get to the mitigating circumstances, then I want to come back to the aggravating and ask you a question. I told you before that they are unlimited, the burden is reasonably convinced, can you tell us something that you would think you want to hear about the person's background to consider mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I guess just their basic history, how were they in school, you know, what happened during school, what happened in their interactions with other people.

MR. PIROLO: Would you be open, and would you consider, physical and emotional abuse, if that was presented to you?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Fortunately, unfortunately, I don't know which way you want to put it, I couldn't, because I was abused as a child, and I made good

choices as an adult. So that would be -- I would be unable to get past that.

MR. PIROLO: It would be difficult for you to sort of take yourself out of the situation, since you unfortunately went through that.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yeah.

MR. PIROLO: You couldn't set your personal history, feelings, aside on that subject? Would you -- you'd be turned off to it, you wouldn't be --

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yeah. It would just shut me down. Because I -- like I said, I know what I suffered as a young -- even as an adult, and that just could not be used as a reason for doing something wrong.

MR. PIROLO: There's pretty much nothing about that particular thing that would make you consider it? How much, how long, or --

JUROR NUMBER 63: No. Because how do you argue with a lifetime.

MR. PIROLO: I understand. How about brain damage or brain injury, would you be --

JUROR NUMBER 63: I could consider that.

MR. PIROLO: Do you think mental illness is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 63: No, absolutely not.

MR. PIROLO: Could you be open to consider 1 testimony regarding mental illness? 2 3 JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes. MR. PIROLO: Obviously, coming from a qualified 4 5 expert, but --JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes. 6 7 MR. PIROLO: I guess you know, you've heard about 8 MRI's? 9 JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes. 10 MR. PIROLO: What they are? JUROR NUMBER 63: I know what they are. 11 12 MR. PIROLO: Would you be open to consider 13 whatever testimony came regarding an MRI and images 14 that -- again, coming from an expert. 15 JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes, sir. 16 MR. PIROLO: You would be open to considering 17 that? 18 JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes. 19 MR. PIROLO: How about a PET scan, have you heard of those? 20 JUROR NUMBER 63: I'm not really sure what a PET 21 scan is. I've heard of them, but I'm not sure what 2.2 23 they are. Okay. Would you be open and would 24 MR. PIROLO:

you consider any evidence that could be depicted in a

25

PET scan? Again, coming from an expert.

2

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Do you have any -- well, do you feel that the mental health field is legitimate? JUROR NUMBER 63: I do believe it is. I worked in it for six years.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Where --

JUROR NUMBER 63: I worked for started out in the (unintelligible) unit, and I ended my career in (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Did anything about working in give you some cause for concern that you would be unable to render a fair verdict in this case? JUROR NUMBER 63: No. Absolutely not.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to read to you a possible instruction that may be read to you if you're selected in this case. It involves a specific mitigator. going to read you the instruction, and then I'll ask you if you could consider that. The instruction would be, "the capital felony was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance." Could you consider that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I could consider it if I understood what was -- you know, I'm sure at some point someone did say, this is this, that's that, so I

could consider it under those circumstances.

_

MR. PIROLO: Next one, "the capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to perform his conduct to the requirements of the law was substantially impaired."

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes. Again, with expert testimony, I would be able to consider it.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Drug addiction, would you be able to consider that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: That's a tough one. We make choices.

MR. PIROLO: Let me ask you this, you would probably agree if somebody picks up a joint, or some other drug, they've chosen to do that.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Correct.

MR. PIROLO: But what about drug addiction, do you believe drug addiction is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I don't know. I really can't answer that question. I don't know. I know that if you use drugs, it's a choice to use drugs, I know if you drink alcohol, it's a choice to drink alcohol, so you become addicted by your choices. So I don't -- that's the best I can answer that question.

MR. PIROLO: Drug addiction is never an aggravating circumstance, but if you heard it, would

it, in your mind, become an aggravating circumstance?
Knowing that it's not, you --

JUROR NUMBER 63: Right. So you're getting at hypotheticals?

MR PIROLO: Yeah. Unfortunately, that's --

JUROR NUMBER 63: Is that what you're doing? I think if it could be explained to me what led to the addiction. You know, I mean, there are circumstances, I guess, that you do come with addictions. So if you explain it, it makes sense.

MR. PIROLO: I know this is very personal to you, do you mind if we touch on the physical and emotional mitigating circumstance for one more question?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Sure.

MR. PIROLO: If you heard that in this case, will it, based upon what you've gone through yourself, almost be turned into an aggravating circumstance? Because like you said earlier, you went through it, and you're sitting here today, a productive citizen, intelligent woman, all that. Could it in some way kind of turn around in your mind and almost become an aggravating circumstance? Again, it wouldn't be one, but we're all human beings, you're in the deliberation room, instructions by the judge do a lot, but when the doors close and it's just, you know, people in there,

your everyday life experiences dictate a lot of what goes on in there.

JUROR NUMBER 63: I could, truthfully, argue the point, you know, debate it, discuss it, maybe come up with some logic about it, but it might -- I have very strong feelings. Like I said, I grew up with a lifetime of it, but I made good choices.

MR. PIROLO: Would you be able to consider mitigation that we talked about in other stuff, because — because mitigation is unlimited, you're in the back thinking about it, going over what you heard, there could be mitigation in your mind that we never touched upon, we didn't discuss; but things that you heard sound important, and in your mind, hey, that's mitigation to me. So that's why it's so unlimited.

JUROR NUMBER 63: Right.

MR. PIROLO: But would you consider mitigation as a explanation for someone's actions, or as an excuse?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Depends on the circumstances.

MR. PIROLO: Does it depend on the particular mitigator, the particular mitigating circumstance that we're talking about, or -- I know it's hard because it's a hypothetical, you --

JUROR NUMBER 63: It's really -- it's tough.

Because I remember using my views as a reason for

doing something. So if that's what you're asking me, the answer is, no, I could not.

MR. PIROLO: No, I'm asking everything.

JUROR NUMBER 63: If it's encompassed in a big circle of things, I would say I could consider it as a mitigator.

MR. PIROLO: Right. But then consider it as an explanation for someone's actions --

JUROR NUMBER 63: I would be willing to be open-minded and discuss it.

MR. PIROLO: Now, going back to when we started talking about the aggravating circumstances. Again, this is hypothetically speaking, but let's say there's a number of aggravators that are presented to you, and you find beyond a reasonable doubt, hypothetically, six aggravators. At that point, because you've found six, are you turned off to mitigation? I don't care what mitigation there is, how much of it there is, six aggravators, I'm done, I'm ready to vote.

JUROR NUMBER 63: No. I will consider all of it.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. So you'd be open to consider all the mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: All right. We talked about the recommendation you give, it does not have to be

unanimous. That means the first part of the trial, you render a verdict as to guilt or innocence, that has to be unanimous, this does not. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: All right. Do you have any concerns that someone could twist your arm to return a certain recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 63: No.

MR. PIROLO: With the same respect, will you respect the decision, vote, of the fellow jurors?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Absolutely.

MR. PIROLO: You're not going to try to twist their arm or browbeat them to --

JUROR NUMBER 63: No.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. The recommendation you give, it's not a suggestion, it's a recommendation. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Under the law, this judge will have to give it great weight. So she can't just look at it and say, well, that's nice, and throw it off to the side.

Judge, can I have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. PIROLO: Going back to your experiences at Devereux, your experiences in the foster care system, how did that experience, that time, shape your opinions (unintelligible)?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I wasn't there for the foster care, and I was just a licensing coordinator, I recruited foster parents. And I did get to see the kids and talk with them and stuff. And it doesn't form any opinions, it's always wanting the best for the children, and putting them in the best possible care.

MR. PIROLO: And earlier you had talked about when the event first happened, you said you saw the blurb on the TV, you couldn't -- you turned away, you didn't watch it.

JUROR NUMBER 63: That's correct.

MR. PIROLO: Why? What was it that you couldn't watch?

news is always so full of bad stuff, it's like, isn't there any good things happening in our world? And I just turned off the TV. I just specifically remember turning off the TV and going outside and smoking a cigarette and watching the cars go by, because, at this point, why bother? So it's just the way I am. I

don't watch the news every day because I get frustrated that the news is full of bad.

MR. PIROLO: In this case, if are given graphic photographs to look at, would that affect your ability to consider mitigating circumstances? If you're given photographs to look at, graphic in nature, would that shut you off to any mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 63: I don't think so.

MR. PIROLO: The word "think" always freaks us out.

JUROR NUMBER 63: It freaks you out, it freaks me out.

MR. PIROLO: And it's hard to say, we can't tell you exactly what you're going to see, or not see, or --

JUROR NUMBER 63: You know, I've seen some pretty graphic stuff in, you know -- like I said, working with kids in group homes and foster care. You see a lot of stuff you wish you never had to see. So could I look at it and say, well, maybe because, yes, I probably could accept it. I know it's -- it's a tough answer, a tough question.

MR. PIROLO: Well, I'm going to give you an even tougher one. Maybe not tougher, I don't know. If you saw a video, and it was a very graphic video, would

that turn you off to any mitigation? You watch the video, it's done playing, you're like, I'm done, I don't care what there is in mitigation.

JUROR NUMBER 63: I think, to be fair, you have to look at all things, and be open to discuss, and not prejudge.

MR. PIROLO: Do you think people who have been abused maybe act differently, one person maybe acts one way, one person reacts a different way?

JUROR NUMBER 63: Absolutely. I -- like I said, I worked with it for six years, I saw it every day. You know, I know how I behaved, and I watched how the kids in my program behaved. You know, everybody acts differently based on different stuff.

MR. PIROLO: Earlier on -- I'm going to back to an eye for an eye. In a Biblical sense, I know what you mean, but what do you mean by that?

JUROR NUMBER 63: If it fits the crime, based on all the facts, and none of the fiction, but the facts, then I would have to support death. Do you understand what I'm saying? But I can't -- you cannot neglect any of the facts that have to do with whatever you're talking about. You have to weigh all things equally.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, I don't have anything else.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 63, you are going

to be released for the day, but you are not released from being considered as a juror in this case. What I'm going to ask you to do is, go downstairs, they're going to give you a phone number to call, you're going to call back next Wednesday, which Wednesday, March the 5th, between 1:00 and 5:00, and they're going to give you information about when to report. I suggest you're going to have to report either the next day, Thursday, which is March the 6th, or the next day, Friday, which is March the 7th. We just don't know yet, it depends on how long it takes for this process. But you are still being considered.

At this time, you must consider to abide by your rules governing your service as a juror. Do not discuss this case with anyone else. Do not -- avoid reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television or radio or Internet comments about this case, should there be any. Do not conduct any research yourself regarding this case or any of its participants. Okay. You can go downstairs, you're released from service for today.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 63 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, Juror Number 64 was escorted into the courtroom by the court

1.7

deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 64, first of all, I want to thank you for being here, thank you for your patience regarding this matter. Before we took a break, I announced some rules, so I need to ask you about those. And those rules really became in effect when I announced them. So since that time, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles related to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 64: No.

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 64: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 64: No.

THE COURT: And have you discussed this case with any other jurors, or with anyone else, or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 64: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you a few questions, and then the State will have an opportunity to ask you some questions, and then the defense will

have an opportunity to ask you some questions. The first question I'm going to ask you is pretty general, and it's, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 64: My views about it?

Consequences for your actions sometimes deserve some severe penalties.

THE COURT: Okay. So if I were to kind of characterize you as either for or against, I would have to say that you are for?

JUROR NUMBER 64: For, yes.

I'm going to talk to you a little bit about what this case involves, and I'm going to follow up on some questions about that. In this case, there is two phases, there's the guilt phase, and if there's a guilty verdict of count one, then we move into the penalty phase. So in the guilt phase, if the jury recommends a guilty verdict as to count one, and count one is premeditated murder in the first degree, if there's a guilty verdict to that count, only on that count, then we move into the penalty phase. In the penalty phase, the jury is instructed to make a recommendation to the Court of a possible penalty, either death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. So are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for

murder in the first degree, and is that opinion so strong that you would not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 64: That's a very strong answer.

THE COURT: And there's no right or wrong answers in here, we're just trying to get your views.

JUROR NUMBER 64: Like I said, I've always been taught, and taught my children, there's consequences for your actions, and I've never let them get out of their consequences, so I think it would have to be, you know, the full extent of the law.

THE COURT: Okay. And if I instructed you -because what I'm going to instruct you is that, as
part of this case, the death penalty is an option, but
I would instruct you on when you would consider that,
you know, what goes into that consideration; but you
would also be instructed that you do have to consider
life in prison without the possibility of parole as a
possible penalty as well. Would you be able to do
that?

JUROR NUMBER 64: I would consider it, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now this case, I'm going to talk about this specific case, do you know anything about this case, either from your own personal

knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, 1 2 from the media, radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspaper? Do you know anything 3 4 about this case? 5 JUROR NUMBER 64: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Can you tell me what 6 7 information you believe you know? JUROR NUMBER 64: Basically, just everything 8 you've stated. I don't know what I'm allowed to say, 9 but --10 THE COURT: You can say -- there's no right or 11 12 wrong answers, you can say anything you want. JUROR NUMBER 64: I know that, I guess, his 13 girlfriend is going to plea bargain, and testify 14 15 against him. THE COURT: So you know there was a death of a 16 police officer. 17 JUROR NUMBER 64: Yes. 18 THE COURT: You know that the defendant has been 19 charged with that? And you're saying you know there 20 was a co-defendant that pled? 21 22 JUROR NUMBER 64: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. What else? 23

JUROR NUMBER 64: That's about it. You know, I

seen the stuff on Facebook, and just comments and

25

24

stuff. You know, nothing that's credible. 1 THE COURT: Nothing that's --JUROR NUMBER 64: Credible. 3 THE COURT: Okay. So you recognize that 4 5 sometimes those things on Facebook, or the media, may not be 100 percent accurate? 6 JUROR NUMBER 64: Correct. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Now, you say Facebook, would 8 you have gained this information that you learned from 9 what source? Would it be Facebook, or other sources 10 as well? 11 JUROR NUMBER 64: News media. 12 THE COURT: Okay. So do you watch television and 13 14 watch the news? JUROR NUMBER 64: Via Internet. I don't really 15 watch TV. 16 THE COURT: Okay. So the information that you 17 would have is --18 JUROR NUMBER 64: News articles. 19 THE COURT: By way of the Internet? 20 JUROR NUMBER 64: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Okay. And how often would you do 22 23 that? JUROR NUMBER 64: I read news daily. 24

THE COURT: Okay. Do you read, like, the whole

25

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

paper, or do you get the headlines, or what do you do? JUROR NUMBER 64: Major stories, local news.

THE COURT: As a juror, you would be requested to set aside anything that you may have learned about this case, serve with an open mind, and reach a verdict based only on the law as I instruct you and what evidence you learn about this case, in this courtroom, at the trial. Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 64: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So if you heard something by way of some other source, and the State has the burden to prove this case beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt, and you heard something, and the State didn't present that as evidence, could you set that aside and not consider it?

JUROR NUMBER 64: I'd say yes, but I'm sure somehow it's going to be in my memory. But, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And when you say -- there's some hesitation there, I mean, obviously I can't erase your memory, but could you, for purposes of reaching a verdict of guilty or not guilty, and reaching a recommendation of death or life in prison without the possibility of parole, could you set that aside? Could you say, no, I'm not going to consider that? Because I didn't hear about that here in this

courtroom.

JUROR NUMBER 64: I just -- it's kind of a personal problem that I have with all this right now, really.

THE COURT: You know what, that's what we need to know, so if there is a personal problem, you just need to tell us.

JUROR NUMBER 64: My son wants to be a police officer, so this is kind of not sitting very well right now.

THE COURT: Okay. That's the stuff that we need to know. So don't be -- there's no right or wrong answers, nobody is happy or sad depending on your answers, we just need to know what you're thinking. So tell me what you're thinking about that.

JUROR NUMBER 64: I don't want him to be one. He's in the Navy right now, and he wants -- when he gets out in August, he wants to go in the police force. So I'm hoping he changes his mind, but, you know, he's always done what he wanted to do anyways.

THE COURT: Isn't that the sad thing about kids, they always do what they want to do anyway. But, in this case, I mean, obviously there was a death of a law enforcement officer. With all due respect, you may see some pictures or some videos with regard to

that. Is that going to -- is that going to be something that's going to weigh heavy on your mind, that you're not going to be able to be fair and impartial to the defendant?

JUROR NUMBER 64: I think so.

THE COURT: Okay. Because what we're going to ask you to do is to -- the defendant is presumed to be innocent, the State has the burden of proof, the defendant does not have to prove anything. But you are -- I suspect you're going to see some things that may be graphic. So do you think this would be the type of case, because of your son going into law enforcement, that it would be best if you didn't serve on this jury?

JUROR NUMBER 64: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: Nothing, Judge.

MR. MOORE: Stipulate.

MR. BROWN: Stipulate.

THE COURT: Okay. Number 64, I want to thank you for being here, thank you for your service. We appreciate your candor, that's what we need you to do. I am going to release you from service on this jury at this time. So what I'm going to have you do is, go downstairs, report to the jury assembly room, tell

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, ma'am.

them that you've been released, they're going to give you some brief information, and send you on your way. Thank you, sir.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 64 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Just for the record, Juror Number 64 was released for cause. If we can bring in Juror Number 65.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 65 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Juror Number 65, come on in and have a seat. Okay. Juror Number 65, first, I want to thank you for being here, thank you for your patience with this process. It is a long process, but we are all doing the best that we can, and I thank you for being patient with us.

When we broke before, I announced some rules, and those rules kind of came into effect at that time. So I'm going to ask you some questions about that first. Have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

1 | 2

THE COURT: Okay. Have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. And have you discussed this case with other jurors, or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. First, I'm going to ask you some questions, then the State will have an opportunity to ask you some questions, and the defense will have an opportunity to ask you some questions. So the first question I'm going to ask you is, what are your -- and it's a pretty general question, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 65: I have an open mind on the death penalty. I'm not against it, if it's warranted (unintelligible) and everything, I'm not against it.

THE COURT: Okay. So if I had to say you were for the death penalty, or opposed to the death penalty, I'd have to say that you're for the death

penalty, but under certain circumstances?

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes.

I'm going to tell you how this THE COURT: Okay. process works, and then I'm going to ask you some more questions about that. We have two phases of the trial, possibly two phases of the trial, and the first phase is the guilt phase. In the guilt phase, in the event the jury returns a guilty verdict on count one, and count one is the premeditated first degree murder count, if there's a guilty verdict on that, then we would move to the second phase. And we only move to the second phase if there's a quilty verdict on count one, and we only move into the second phase with regard to count one. So if there is a guilty verdict to that count, then we move into the penalty phase. In the penalty phase, if you were to be chosen as a juror in this case, you would be instructed to make a recommendation to the judge of a possible penalty. And the penalties are death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. So are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree and is that opinion so strong that you could not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, ma'am. I would have to

hear both sides first.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

2.0

2122

23

2425

THE COURT: Okay. So you would be -- if I instructed you that you do have to consider life as a possible penalty, you would be able to do that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you what you know about this case. Do you know anything about this case from either your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussion with anyone else, from the media, television, radio, Internet comments, or newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 65: When it happened at first, I did see a news flash when I was watching the weather about it, but I have never followed it or anything.

THE COURT: Okay. So you -- at the time of the event, you heard something about it?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes.

THE COURT: And have you heard anything since then?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No.

THE COURT: What information do you think you know about this case?

JUROR NUMBER 65: I just remember a shooting, and the deputy lost her life.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: And how did you gain that information?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Watching TV, it was a news flash.

THE COURT: Okay. And have you seen anything in detail about the case, or read about the case?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: If you were chosen as a juror in this case, can you set aside anything that you might have learned about the case, serve with an open mind, and reach a verdict based only on the law and the evidence presented in this courtroom, in this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor. Juror Number 65, good afternoon. I'm going to talk to you a little bit about the process and the procedure for a death penalty type of case. The judge talked to you a little bit about it this morning, read it to you, went through it, but she went through an awful lot of information to digest in a small period of time.

The first step is, the jury would have to come back with a verdict of first degree murder. If it's a lesser charge, or not guilty, then the death penalty's off the table. Do you understand that?

2 3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And the jury does come back with that verdict of guilty of first degree murder, we would reconvene, and at that time additional evidence is going to be presented to the jury. Then the judge would give a new set of instructions on what to do with that evidence, what to look at, and how to evaluate it. The first step she's going to tell you is, you would look at what are called aggravating circumstances; and she would give you a list, and it's likely to be more than one type of aggravating circumstance. And what aggravating circumstances are, are things that increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim.

So she's going to give you that list, and it's to that list you can look at, and only to that list, that would justify the imposition of the death penalty. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Now, the State, we have to prove those to you beyond any reasonable doubt, just like in the quilt phase, beyond and to the exclusion of any reasonable doubt. So if we fail to prove to you any aggravating circumstances, then your recommendation has to be life in prison. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: If we prove to at least one, we may prove more than one, but we have to prove at least one aggravating circumstance before you can consider the death penalty. When you mentioned earlier about if it's warranted in certain circumstances, kind of these aggravating circumstances is part of those certain circumstances. So you would look at whether we've proven any of those aggravating circumstances, and ask yourself, do these justify the death penalty? If you find that they do, you go to the next step in the analysis, and that's where you would examine the mitigation, or the mitigating circumstances that have been presented.

As the Court told you earlier this morning, those are circumstances based on the defendant's character, his life, things about him. And those also have to be proven to you, it's a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. So, obviously, if they present evidence concerning mitigation, and you find that some of it's not proven, you disregard that, since it's not proven. You take what's been proven, whatever mitigation evidence that's presented that you find to be proven, and you consider all of that, just like you would consider all of the aggravating

circumstances that have been proven.

2

3

Now, you've had to make, in your personal life, your business life, important decisions, right?

4

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

5

MR. BROWN: When you've made those important decisions, you look at all the circumstances, all the

7

6

factors involved in that decision.

8

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir. I consider

9

everything.

10

and you kind of decide, okay, some of these

11 12

circumstances, or some of these factors, are very

MR. BROWN: Right. So you look at everything,

13

important, and you give them great weight in your

14

thought process, right?

right?

15

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes.

16

MR. BROWN: Other circumstances you find to be

17

not that important, and you give them little weight,

18

JUROR NUMBER 65: Right.

20

19

MR. BROWN: And that's how you come to a

21

decision, you kind of weigh all the factors,

22

circumstances; and, you know, some things are

23

important, great weight, other things, little

24

importance, you give them little weight. Right?

25

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: You go through the same process here. The judge is going to tell you, you have to go through a weighing process of those aggravating circumstances and weigh them against the mitigating circumstances. Just like you would any other important decision, you go through that weighing process. And the question that she will pose to you in the instructions will be, does the mitigation outweigh those aggravating circumstances? If you find that the mitigation outweighs those aggravating circumstances, then your recommendation is going to be life. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: If you find that the mitigation does not outweigh those aggravating circumstances, then you're in a position where legally you can recommend to the Court the sentence of the death penalty. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Now, the Court's going to tell you that -- or what she's not going to tell you is, if you find A, B, and C, then you must recommend the death penalty. She's never going to tell you that, it's never going to be automatic. She's going to tell you that it's always -- you are never required to return

that verdict. Okay? But what she is going to tell you is, you go through that process, find the aggravators, weigh them against the mitigators, and if you find the mitigators do not outweigh the aggravators, and if you feel the death penalty is justified, that's when you can legally recommend to the judge a sentence of the death penalty. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Excuse me. Juror Number 65, can you speak up just a little bit. There is a microphone right next to you, and they're having a little trouble hearing you even with it right next to you. So they're telling me they need you to speak up a little bit. So if you could do that, I'd appreciate it.

MR. BROWN: Any questions about that process, weighing, what you have to consider, anything of that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir.

MR. BROWN: You understand?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, ma'am.

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Are you comfortable with that process?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Now, going through that process, if

you feel the death penalty is justified, can you recommend a sentence of death?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Do you come into court today with an idea or concept of, well, you know, there'd only be one or two circumstances that I would recommend death, everything else, I would --

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir.

MR. BROWN: You would be open to and listen to what the Court lists as those aggravating circumstances and look at those?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Now, the next topic I want to cover is -- and it may not apply to you, but I've got to bring it up with each person, just so you're aware if you're selected and if anyone else starts going down this path. Obviously, if the jury would come back with a verdict of something less than first degree murder, such as second degree murder, you would be in the situation where you'd have to make any sentencing recommendation to the Court. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: So my question is, if first degree murder is proven to you, would you let it enter into your thought process of, well, the State proved first

degree murder, but I'm only going to do second because 1 2 I don't want to be put in the situation of having to decide life or death? 3 JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir. 4 MR. BROWN: Okay. You accept that your verdict 5 ought to be what the evidence dictates to you? 6 JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir. 7 MR. BROWN: And that's the just verdict? 8 JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir. 9 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Your Honor, I have no 10 11 further questions. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the defense? MR. PIROLO: Thank you, Your Honor. Juror Number 13 65, how are you? 14 JUROR NUMBER 65: Good. 15 MR. PIROLO: Sir, any questions we've got, there 16 are no wrong answers. We ask that you tell us what 17 you're thinking about the questions we have for you. 18 19 Okay? JUROR NUMBER 65: (Unintelligible). 20 MR. PIROLO: And, if you can, just continue to 21 22 speak up. 23 THE COURT: You need to speak up. JUROR NUMBER 65: I will. 24

25

THE COURT:

Okay.

1 MR. PIROLO: Because I'm bad at reading lips. Ι 2 can't do it. Can I ask where you're from? 3 JUROR NUMBER 65: I'm from Florida here, Palm 4 Bay. 5 MR. PIROLO: Okay. The accent, what --6 JUROR NUMBER 65: Jamaica. 7 MR. PIROLO: And do they have the death penalty 8 there? 9 JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir. MR. PIROLO: All right. You've heard the term 10 life without the possibility of parole. What that 11 12 means is someone is sentenced to prison for life 13 without parole, it means they never get out of prison, 14 they die in prison. JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir. 15 16 MR. PIROLO: Do you accept that? JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir. 17 18 MR. PIROLO: And earlier on it was mentioned that 19 in your life you may make, or have had to make, a lot 20 of important decisions. Do you understand that this is only one of those important decisions if we get to 21 22 the second part of this trial? 23 JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: It's not just some abstract or some important decision without a name or a face, you see

24

25

the person, we're talking about Mr. Brandon Bradley, sitting next to me earlier.

3

2

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

that decision.

mitigating circumstances?

4

MR. PIROLO: Or I was sitting next to him earlier.

5

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

7

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Now, earlier you said that you have an open mind to the death penalty.

9

8

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

10

11

MR. PIROLO: If I were to give you a scale, a scale of 0 to 10, with 10 being you strongly favor the death penalty, 0 being you pretty much oppose the

12 13

death penalty, what number would you give yourself?

14

number, I would have to listen to the prosecutor's

15

16

side, and the defense side, and what they present, and

JUROR NUMBER 65: I don't know if I really have a

17

the instructions from the judge, before I could make

18

MR. PIROLO: Now, when you say that you want to

20

19

listen to the defense side, does that mean, assuming

21

we get to the second part, the State's given -- you've

22

heard aggravating circumstances from the State, you

23

want to hear what the defense would have for

24

JUROR NUMBER 65: It first depends on when the

25

case starts, what they present, and what they

(unintelligible) the first phase; then the second

phase, then I would be able to make a decision on what

happened first.

MR. PIROLO: Can you tell me why you favor the death penalty, your reason why you favor the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Well, if it's proven that it's required, the death penalty, then I would favor the death penalty.

MR. PIROLO: Could you think of a first degree murder that you would say in your mind, the death penalty would have to have to happen, almost automatic?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir.

MR. PIROLO: One involving the death of a child, would that be automatic for you, or you would still weigh --

JUROR NUMBER 65: Still have to look at the evidence.

MR. PIROLO: More specifically, what we're concerned about in our case, the death of a police officer, is that one also that you'd be open to -- have to listen to the aggravating circumstances and the mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir. (Unintelligible)

MR. PIROLO: So that would not be one that you would automatically vote for the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Have you always had that opinion? Your opinion that you have today about the death penalty, have you always had it, or did you have a different opinion before today?

JUROR NUMBER 65: I never always (unintelligible). I never really think about it being cases or anything, I just listen to the instructions from the judge as to how (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: What I'm saying is, before you came here today, did you think about the death penalty much?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No. No, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Pretty much started thinking about it today once you found out it would be an issue in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Since the judge instructed -told us the case, what it's about, how it's going to
work, and I will listen to everything, and I will
weigh both sides.

MR. PIROLO: Have you ever heard of the

_

expression "an eye for an eye"?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, I have heard that before.

MR. PIROLO: And what is your opinion on that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: I don't believe really an eye for an eye.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. You understand the -- if we get to the second part, it does not mean -- the recommendation that's given to the judge does not have to be unanimous. Do you know that? Did you know that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir, I didn't know that.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Now you know that the vote between the 12 people does not have to be unanimous. You don't have to have all 12 people voting one way. You can have 10-2 vote, 8-4 vote, 7-5 vote, and so on. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: The decision you make, the recommendation that you as a jury would make to the judge, that's very important. The Court has to give it great weight. What that means is, she can't just look at your vote, your recommendation, and say, well, that's nice, and just kind of throw it aside. Do you understand it's very important to the judge?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: She cannot impose a sentence in this case without your recommendation. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: We only get -- if we get to the second part, you'll only start considering the death penalty, really, if the State has proven to you an aggravating circumstance. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: If they prove no aggravating circumstances to you, it's a life recommendation. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Now, if they prove one or more, then we move on to the mitigating circumstances.

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Before we get to the mitigating circumstances, I want to stay on the aggravating circumstances. Those aggravating circumstances are limited. That means that the law has only set aside certain kinds of aggravating circumstances. Those are the only ones that you would be able to consider as aggravating circumstances. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Now, let's say, for instance, just to give you an example, hypothetically, the State

presents to you six aggravating circumstances. They present six to you, and you believe them -- beyond a reasonable doubt they've been proven to you, all six. Can you still keep an open mind and wait for the mitigating circumstances to be presented to you?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: And still listen to them, consider them, and weigh them?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. You may be presented with some graphic photographs, graphic pictures, they would show what happens to a human, and in our case, Deputy Pill, after being shot. Do you think those aggravating -- or those graphic pictures would turn you off to any mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir.

MR. PIROLO: If you saw a video, the video shows Deputy Pill being shot and killed, would that turn you off at that point to any mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir.

MR. PIROLO: You could still keep that open mind and consider and listen to all the mitigating --

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: The mitigating circumstances are unlimited. It means it's -- anything can be

presented. It can be things in a person's background, Mr. Bradley's background, his life, what happened while he was growing up, family situation, and some more things that we'll get into greater detail. Do you accept that, that mitigating are unlimited?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: And we talked about aggravating circumstances the State has to prove, they've got to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt.

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Mitigating circumstances, the burden is less. We've got to show -- you've got to be reasonably convinced. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: And you kind of understand why the aggravators have to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt, a high burden, and why the mitigating circumstances have a lower burden, because, again, we're talking about someone's life here.

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Do you believe that mental illness is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Do you consider mental health professionals, do you consider their field as being a

legitimate field?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: So would you be open and able to consider testimony regarding mental illness in this case as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to guess you've heard of an MRI?

JUROR NUMBER 65: I have (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Okay. If you -- would you be able to consider evidence -- again, it would be from an expert in that field -- regarding things that are on an MRI that would be mitigating circumstances in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: How about a PET scan? Have you ever heard of that?

JUROR NUMBER 65: I have.

MR. PIROLO: You have, okay. Again, coming from an expert who's qualified to give an opinion as to what's shown on a PET scan, would you be open and able to consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 165: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: How about brain damage or brain injury, if you heard evidence of that, would you

consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

2

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

3

MR. PIROLO: How about physical or emotional abuse, would you be, again, open to that, would you be able to consider that as mitigating?

5

6

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

7

MR. PIROLO: How about drug addiction? First, do you think drug addiction's a choice?

8

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir.

9 10

MR. PIROLO: If you heard evidence of drug

11

addiction, would you be able to consider that as a

12

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

mitigating circumstance?

13 14

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to read to you

15

instructions that you might hear if you're selected on

16

this jury; and I'll read one, and I'll ask you would

17

you be able to consider it as a mitigating

18

circumstance. Some of these get a little technical,

19

so if you need me to repeat anything, just let me

2021

know. First one would say, "the capital felony was

committed while the defendant was under the influence

22

of extreme mental or emotional disturbance." Would

23

you be able to consider that as a mitigating

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

circumstance?

MR. PIROLO: The next one is, "the capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law was substantially impaired." Would you be able to consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: Do you believe that any of the mitigating circumstances are explanations for someone's behavior, can you consider that as --

MR. PIROLO: Would you look at it as an excuse, instead of an explanation? Do you think that --

JUROR NUMBER 65: I will look at it as an explanation.

MR. PIROLO: You would not?

JUROR NUMBER 65: (Unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: All right. Would you consider it as an explanation why someone did something?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Do you understand that your vote should be respected?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: No juror should try to, while you're in the deliberation room, try to change your mind about what your vote should be.

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

2

MR. PIROLO: And, in the same sense, you also would have to respect the other jurors'

4

recommendations.

5

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

6

MR. PIROLO: You can't browbeat them or try to change their vote.

7

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

9

MR. PIROLO: Do you believe someone is a product

10

of past life experiences? Forget about DNA, forget

11

about who your mom and dad are, we can't pick who our

12

mom and dad are; but do you believe that other things

13

that happen throughout someone's life shapes a person?

14

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, sir.

15

MR. PIROLO: Why not?

16

JUROR NUMBER 65: Because I have many members of

17

my family who are different from me, we have the same

18

mother and father (unintelligible).

19

at you. Let's say you've got two siblings, a brother

MR. PIROLO: Let me throw a little hypothetical

2021

and sister, one grows up in a very nurturing family,

22

has everything and everything they need, and is loved

23

and cared for, educated; and the other person winds up

24

in a home that's not loved, not cared for, not looked

25

after. Can you see that -- and they have the same

DNA, but now they're in two different environments. 1 Would you expect them to grow up and be exactly the 2 same person, or would those life experiences shape 3 each one differently? 4 5 JUROR NUMBER 65: It would shape each one 6 differently. MR. PIROLO: The one in the loving, nurturing, 7 would probably have, you would expect, the more 8 positive life, and the other, not so much. JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, that's correct. 10 MR. PIROLO: Judge, may I have a minute? 11 12 THE COURT: Yes, you may. MR. PIROLO: Juror Number 65, could you return a 13 life without parole recommendation? 14 15 JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, I could. MR. PIROLO: Do you think it's an appropriate 16 17 penalty to return? JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir. 18 MR. PIROLO: Forgive me if I asked you this 19 20 earlier, why are you for the death penalty? JUROR NUMBER 65: As I said before, I have to 21 22 listen to both sides, both the prosecution side, the 23 defense side, and the instructions from the judge before I could really come to a conclusion. 24

MR. PIROLO: But in terms of why you would

1 |

vote --

JUROR NUMBER 65: It's based on the instructions from the judge, and I would do what I need to do. From what the prosecution presents and from what you are going to present, and the instructions from the judge.

MR. PIROLO: And when you say what I'm going to present, you're talking in terms of possible mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 65: Yes, sir.

MR. PIROLO: What kind of sentence do you believe life without parole is?

JUROR NUMBER 65: It's someone locked away for the rest of their life. (Unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Nothing else, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Number 65, you are excused for today, but you are still under consideration for a possible juror in this case. What I'm going to have you do at this time is, go downstairs, report to the jury assembly room, and they're going to give you a phone number. You need to call that phone number next Wednesday, and they're going to give you these instructions downstairs, but call that phone number next Wednesday, and that is March the 5th, between 1:00 and 5:00, and they're going to tell you when to

report next. I suspect that's either going to be the next day, Thursday, or the next day, Friday. And then at that time, we'll go into the second phase of the jury selection process.

But during this recess, you must continue to abide by the rules governing your service as a juror. Specifically, do not discuss this case with anyone else. Do not -- avoid reading newspaper headlines and articles relating to this trial or its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial. And do not conduct any research yourself regarding -- or be exposed to any research regarding any matters concerning this case.

Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 65: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you, sir.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 65 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, Juror Number 69 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 69, the first thing I want to do is thank you for being here, thank you for being patient with us regarding this process. It is a long process, it's long for us, and we know it's long for you, so we do appreciate you being here.

I need to ask you some questions. Right before the break this morning, I imposed some rules, I've got to make sure those rules were followed. Have you read or been exposed to any newspaper headlines or articles related to this trial or is participants?

JUROR NUMBER 69: No.

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 69: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 69: No.

THE COURT: Have you discussed this case with any other jurors, or with anyone else, or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 69: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Before we broke, you talked about having processed, I believe, a Social Security application for Mr. Pill.

JUROR NUMBER 69: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And you said during that time, you kind of had an extensive conversation, but that was shortly after the death of his wife.

JUROR NUMBER 69: Yes.

THE COURT: So I think you said about three weeks?

JUROR NUMBER 69: Yes.

THE COURT: And that you had had a conversation with him about what he was going through.

JUROR NUMBER 69: Right.

THE COURT: Okay. Can you tell me a little bit about that conversation, how long it lasted, and the nature of the conversation?

minutes. He just came for a Social Security card, he said he needed, I guess, for insurance purposes. And then I started to process it, and I noticed his name; and I'm like, oh, I'm sorry, how are you, and everything. He just starting ranting about how he hates -- how everything is not coming together quick enough for him. He was pretty upset about him being able to see his wife shortly after. He was upset about --

THE COURT: Being able to see her, or not being able to see her?

JUROR NUMBER 69: Not being able to see her. He was just, basically, ranting about how the whole process is, and how he was angry about the whole system. He didn't know that -- he explained that he

didn't know how the system truly worked until he affected him, basically.

THE COURT: Okay. How did you feel about that conversation?

JUROR NUMBER 69: I guess I sympathized with him.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 69: Considering what he was going through. And then I, you know, kind of understood, you know, you go through an up and down emotion, and everything is still kind of fresh. So I just kind of understood what he was going through and just gave him a listening ear, basically.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me tell you, first of all, in this process, there's no right or wrong answers. We're just asking you to tell us what you think, tell us your views, and be honest with us. Have you talked to him since then?

JUROR NUMBER 69: No.

THE COURT: Okay. And I'm going to ask you about your knowledge of the case before coming here. Did you learn anything about this case from any source? I know you might have learned something that day, but what about other information that you may have gained from the media, from anyone else, from television, radio, or Internet, newspaper, things of that nature.

JUROR NUMBER 69: Actually, yes. The day of the incident, I got held up in traffic because I work in Melbourne, leaving and trying to go home. So, of course, when I got home I turned on the news to try and find out what was going on.

THE COURT: Okay. And so you learned that something happened that day?

JUROR NUMBER 69: Yes.

THE COURT: So what information do you believe you know about the case at this time?

JUROR NUMBER 69: That, I guess, the officer,
Barbara Pill, was pursuing a gentleman driving a car,
and he had a lady that was with him, and that he shot
and killed her.

THE COURT: Okay. And since that day, have you been exposed or heard or seen anything else with regard to this case?

JUROR NUMBER 69: I mean, watching the news, for about a month, and it kept coming up; but other than that, no, I didn't do any extensive research or anything like that.

THE COURT: Okay. That would have been the news on TV?

JUROR NUMBER 69: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you watch the news on TV

regularly?

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 69: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And tell me your habits with regard to watching the news.

JUROR NUMBER 69: Pretty much, in the morning when I wake up, and sometimes in the evening. I try and catch a lot of the weather reports, what's coming up for the following day, being that I get the kids ready for school and stuff.

THE COURT: Okay. So are you sitting down watching it, or do you turn it on and you're listening to it while you're doing other things?

JUROR NUMBER 69: In the mornings, I'm doing other things; but, usually, if I'm watching it in the evenings, I'm sitting down watching it.

THE COURT: Okay. And is that -- in the evening, is that a daily routine, you know --

JUROR NUMBER 69: No. Probably every other day.

THE COURT: Okay. I know you have three kids, so I expect nothing is too routine.

JUROR NUMBER 69: Oh, no. No. Of course not. You know, usually when I get home, the kids are pretty tired, one has karate, so if he's pretty tired about that, and everyone just wants to go bed, then I'll just sit around and watch 30 or 40 minutes of news.

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do if you are chosen as a juror in this case, you're instructed by me that you need to set aside anything that you may have learned about this case, serve with an open mind, and reach a verdict based only on the law and the evidence presented in this trial. Do you think you could do that? Could you follow that instruction?

JUROR NUMBER 69: Not watch anything or --

THE COURT: Well, to set -- first of all, that's going to be one of the instructions, to not watch anything else, but this is based on what you've already learned. Can you set that aside, the experience that you may have had with Mr. Pill, anything you know about this case, can you set that aside, serve on this jury panel with an open mind, and reach a verdict based only on the law as I instruct you and the evidence that's presented in this trial, in this courtroom? Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 69: It's kind of hard, because hearing, you know, the conversation, and seeing and speaking with the expression Mr. Pill had that day, that kind of resonated with me for a while.

THE COURT: Like I said, there's no right or wrong answers, we just want you to be -- tell us your views and be truthful.

2

3

5

7

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16 17

18

20

2.1

19

22

23 24

25

JUROR NUMBER 69: Yeah. It'll be kind of difficult, knowing that --

THE COURT: Let me tell you something else that may happen, just because you need to know. It's highly likely that Mr. Pill will be here and in the audience as part of the trial.

JUROR NUMBER 69: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 69:

THE COURT: And you would be sitting in this box in here, and most likely he would be sitting in the first row behind the State. Now, is that going to -- are you going to be able to set this aside and --

THE COURT: Okay. I just -- I was telling you where most likely people would sit because I wanted you to know, you know, what the dynamics would be.

No.

JUROR NUMBER 69: No. I --

THE COURT: That would be difficult for you.

JUROR NUMBER 69: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything I can say to make you -- to say, if I instruct you to set aside that experience, could you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 69: I guess I would have to try.

If that's the instructions for me to do. Yeah, I

would have to try. But if every time I see him, then,

you know, that's the first thing that comes to my

mind, the conversation we had.

THE COURT: Okay. If I could have a bench conference.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had before the Court, out of the hearing of any other parties present in the courtroom as follows:)

THE COURT: Do you wish to inquire? I haven't even gone into the death penalty part.

MR. PIROLO: Move for cause.

MR. BROWN: No objection.

THE COURT: Okay. That's a pretty significant connection. Thank you.

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

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 69, thank you for your patience. Thank you for being here all day, we do appreciate it. I couldn't ask you those questions in front of the other jurors. I didn't want to call you out of order because I feel it's important to go in an orderly manner.

JUROR NUMBER 69: I understand.

THE COURT: So I have to do everything to be fair and impartial so that no one -- if I were to call you out of order, someone in front of you might have said I was doing something I shouldn't have been doing, so

I wanted to make sure to call you in order. But I do appreciate you being here, everyone appreciates you being here. I am going to release you from this panel at this time. So you can go downstairs, report to the jury assembly room. They're just going to take your badge, give you some information, and you will be released. So once again, thank you for being here, I appreciate you coming to serve. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 69 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Just for the record, Number 69 was released for cause. Now, 71 is the one that talked about the cruise, so I will talk to her about that first, and see if we can address that. So we'll bring in 71.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 71 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Number 71, the first thing I want to do is thank you for being here, thank you for your patience. This is a long process, this is long for you all, it's long for us too. When you were with us earlier, you talked about a cruise for one week on March the 30th. Tell me what information you've

1 learned about that cruise. JUROR NUMBER 71: So if we cancel, I would lose 2 3 \$1500. 4 THE COURT: Okay. How does that make you feel? 5 JUROR NUMBER 71: Not good. THE COURT: Okay. \$1500 is somewhat significant. 6 7 Where are you going on the cruise? JUROR NUMBER 71: Eastern Caribbean. 8 THE COURT: Okay. So that's -- is that the Bahamas, or the Mexican --10 11 JUROR NUMBER 71: St. Thomas. THE COURT: Okay. And is it you -- it's you, and 12 who is going with you? 13 14 JUROR NUMBER 71: My husband. THE COURT: Okay. And is this something -- I 15 16 mean, does your husband work? JUROR NUMBER 71: He just got laid off, so that's 17 his going away gift, per se. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Do you work? 19 JUROR NUMBER 71: Yes. 20 THE COURT: And did you take the time off work to 21 22 go on the cruise? 23 JUROR NUMBER 71: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. And that's your vacation time? 24

JUROR NUMBER 71: 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

THE COURT: Okay. If I could have a bench conference.

MR. MOORE: Can we just stipulate?

MR. BROWN: Stipulate.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Number 71, thank you for your patience. I wish I could have called you earlier, I'm trying to go in a orderly fashion, I don't want anyone to think that I'm playing preference to anyone. I'm glad we got to you this afternoon. But I am going to release you. Thank you for being I'm going to have you report downstairs to the jury assembly room. They will give you some brief information, and then they'll send you on your way. Thank you. Okay.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 71 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

Okay. Just for the record, Number 71 THE COURT: was released for cause. Actually, that would be hardship, I guess. Okay. If we could bring in Number 75.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 75 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

Okay. Number 75, thank you for being THE COURT:

here, thank you for your patience. I know it's been a long day for you, I assure you it's been a long day for us, but we do appreciate you being here.

When we broke, there was some rules that I put in place, and those rules kind of started at that time. So I'm going to ask you, since those rules were in place, have you been exposed to reading newspaper headlines or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 75: No.

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 75: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 75: No.

THE COURT: And have you discussed this case with any of the other jurors, or with anyone else, or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 75: No.

THE COURT: Okay. How this process works is, I'm going to ask you some questions, then the attorneys have an opportunity to ask you some questions as well. So my first question is a pretty general question,

2

3

5

7

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 75: No, I would go for death

just to get some opinions from you, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 75: I'm for it.

So let me tell you a little THE COURT: Okay. bit about the process, and then I'll follow up with There's two phases to the trial, the some questions. first phase is the guilt phase. In the event there is a guilty verdict on count one, and count one is premeditated murder of the first degree, then, and only then, we would move into the second phase, which is the penalty phase. Count one is the only count that would -- if there's a guilty verdict would lead to a penalty phase. If the jury returns a verdict on count one, a guilty verdict, then we move to the penalty phase. In the penalty phase, as a juror, you would be instructed to make a recommendation to the Court, which would be me, of a possible penalty. The penalties that you are instructed to consider are death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree, and is that opinion so strong that you could not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole under any circumstances?

penalty.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you know anything about this case?

JUROR NUMBER 75: Just what I read in the paper.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're saying if there was

-- if I instructed you, as part of your instructions,
as part of your duty as a juror in this case, that you
would have to consider life in prison without the
possibility of parole, would you be able to follow
that instruction?

JUROR NUMBER 75: Probably not.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 75: I would -- I feel too strongly on the death penalty.

THE COURT: Okay. If I were to ask you to give me an opinion -- give me a number on how you feel about the death penalty, 10 being, you know, strongly in favor of the death penalty, 0 being that you're opposed to the death penalty, how would you say you rate in that scale?

JUROR NUMBER 75: Probably 8 or 9.

THE COURT: Okay. And you say you're strongly in favor of the death penalty.

JUROR NUMBER 75: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you -- how long have you held

that opinion? 1 JUROR NUMBER 75: I don't recall. Quite a while. 3 THE COURT: Okay. In this case, you may have learned that it does involve the death of a police 4 officer. I assume you were aware of that? 5 JUROR NUMBER 75: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Have you formed an opinion 7 about this case? 8 JUROR NUMBER 75: Yes. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what that opinion would be. 11 12 JUROR NUMBER 75: Guilty. THE COURT: Okay. And what it is that you 13 believe you know about the case? 14 JUROR NUMBER 75: Just what I read in the paper, 15 and heard. 16 THE COURT: Okay. And when you read it in the 17 paper -- do you read the paper frequently? 18 JUROR NUMBER 75: Yes. Every day. 19 THE COURT: Okay. And which paper is that? 20 JUROR NUMBER 75: Florida Today. 21 22 THE COURT: So anything that was published in Florida Today, you would have read that regarding this 23

JUROR NUMBER 75: Yes.

case.

24

THE COURT: Including -- there was a two-page spread on Sunday, did you read that?

JUROR NUMBER 75: I don't recall. This previous Sunday?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

JUROR NUMBER 75: I probably read it, I jut don't recall.

THE COURT: Okay. So if I were to instruct you that you had to set aside anything that you may have learned in this case prior to coming here, serve with an open mind, and reach a verdict only on the law as I instruct you and the evidence presented in this trial, in this courtroom, would you be able to do that?

JUROR NUMBER 75: I don't think so.

THE COURT: Okay. Some people say "I don't think so," meaning that -- people talk that way as a matter of speaking. Sometimes it just means, you know, that's just the way they talk; other times it means that they think they can and they think they can't.

So, I mean, if you could be more definite, Judge, I can't do that, or, Judge, I think I could do that, I'm just not sure.

JUROR NUMBER 75: I would say, no, I don't think I can do that.

THE COURT: Okay. You said "think" again.

JUROR NUMBER 75: No, I will not do that.

THE COURT: Okay. Because what you're asked to do is, kind of, come in here with a clean slate. If it was a scale, you can't tip the scale in the very beginning in favor of the State. Do you think you could do that?

JUROR NUMBER 75: No. I already think I made my decision.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: No, Your Honor.

MR. MOORE: Stipulate.

THE COURT: Okay. Number 75, at this time I am going to release you from your service as a juror in this case. I do appreciate your patience with regard to this matter. You are released from Judge Reinman's courtroom. I'm going to ask you to go downstairs, speak to the jury assembly clerk. They're going to take your badge, give you some general instructions, and you can be on your way. Thank you, sir.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 75 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. With regard to this case,
Number 75 was released for cause. Okay. If we could
bring in Number 76.

_

(Thereupon, Juror Number 76 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Number 76, the first thing I want to do is thank you for being here. We do appreciate you coming to serve. We also appreciate you being patient. It's been all day, we've been here all day too. We appreciate you being patient with this process.

When we talked to you earlier, you talked about your two children, six and seven year old, with regard to dance. I assume they are -- I think you said they are both girls?

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yeah.

THE COURT: Two girls, with regard to dance, and that they had dance on Thursday and Friday from 3:00 to 6:00. And I think you said Viera --

JUROR NUMBER 76: Dance Conservatory.

THE COURT: So have you talked to anyone or had conversations about if you could accommodate that schedule if you were chosen as a juror in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yeah. I mean, I talked to my mom and, you know, she said that she would help. I mean, again, I don't know how comfortable I am with the situation, but she said she would -- you know, she

works too, so I don't know -- you know, she said she would do everything she could to help out. So, I mean, if push came to shove, I would say, yeah, we can probably make it happen.

THE COURT: Okay. What I heard you say previously is that you don't normally -- no one normally does this duty for you, you normally do it yourself.

JUROR NUMBER 76: That's correct.

THE COURT: And so one of the issues I want to ask you about is, when you're here, you have to give it great attention, pay attention to the details, pay attention to the evidence. Sometimes the evidence is more stirring as to your attention, other times it's not, depending on who may be testifying. I don't know how to put that in a better term. Is it going to be —— and you have to help us with this, are you going to be able —— knowing that, you know, something may be out there and what your kids may be doing, are you going to be able to give this case the attention and the time that it deserves, or do you think that you may be distracted, thinking about the responsibilities that you may have with the other children?

JUROR NUMBER 76: No, I wouldn't be distracted.

THE COURT: Okay. So you could do that?

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

There's no right or wrong answers in here. The only thing we ask you to do is to be honest, be forthcoming, but understand that there's no right or wrong answers.

The first thing I'm going to ask you about is, when we took a break, I announced some rules, so I need to ask you about those. Those rules kind of came into effect at that time. Have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 76: No.

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 76: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 76: No.

THE COURT: And have you discussed this case with any other jurors, or with anyone else, or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 76: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you some

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

1516

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

questions, and then the State has an opportunity to ask you questions, then the defense has an opportunity to ask you questions. The first question I ask you is kind of a general question, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 76: I believe in it.

THE COURT: Okay. So if I were to ask you if you were, more or less, opposed, or for, you would say you were for?

JUROR NUMBER 76: I am.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to tell you a little bit about the process. There's two possible phases in this trial. The first phase is what we call the guilt In the guilt phase, if the jury were to return phase. a guilty verdict on count one, and it only pertains to count one, if there was a guilty verdict on the premeditated murder of the first degree, then, at that time, we would move into the second phase. The second phase is what we call the penalty phase. In the penalty phase, as a juror, the jury would be instructed to give the Court, which would be me, a recommendation as to a possible penalty, and that would be a penalty of death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole.

Now, I would instruct you that you would have to

consider life in prison without the possibility of parole as a possible penalty, and I would give you instructions about how -- what circumstances you use in order to guide you in making that recommendation to the Court. But are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree, and is that opinion so strong that you would not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 76: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So you would consider -- you would take that under consideration?

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm going to ask you what you know about this case. Do you know anything about this case, either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, from the media, television, radio, Internet, newspaper, or anything you can think of? Do you know something about this case?

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. There's no right or wrong answers --

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yes.

THE COURT: Most people say yes to this question,

1 so that's why we're here. What information do you believe that you know about this case? 2 JUROR NUMBER 76: I mean, just that a deputy was 3 That's it, basically. I mean, there shot and killed. 4 5 was --THE COURT: Okay. That would have happened at 6 the time of the event, you would have learned that 7 information? 8 JUROR NUMBER 76: At the time of the -- like when 10 it happened? THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. 11 JUROR NUMBER 76: Yeah. I mean, I'm up on the 12 13 news and, you know, I read news articles in the newspaper and stuff, so yes. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Do you watch the news on a 15 16 regular basis? JUROR NUMBER 76: I can't say I watch the news, 17 but I have the app on my phone and I check it daily. 18 THE COURT: When you say you have the app on the 19 2.0 phone, is it from Florida Today? JUROR NUMBER 76: No. It's the Channel 9 news 21 22 app, it's the only one that I have. 23 THE COURT: Okay. JUROR NUMBER 76: That's pretty much the only 24

news that I watch.

THE COURT: Do they give you, like, the highlights of the day?

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yeah, I think so. Yeah.

THE COURT: So you -- is it snippets, or is it where you can -- I'm not -- I haven't seen that app. What is it? What do they have?

JUROR NUMBER 76: Well, it's just like any normal news app. You know, they have, like, local news, national news.

THE COURT: I know, like, Florida Today gives you the top five news stories and a little snippet underneath it.

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yeah. I mean, it's basically the three, or two, most popular or most current for the local. And you have to, like, click on it to read about it, or whatever. If something happens that's a big story or something, I would get, like, an alert or something like that.

THE COURT: Okay. So you have that app on your phone, and this case has been part of that on occasion.

JUROR NUMBER 76: I've seen it, yeah. I've seen it on there.

THE COURT: Now, what you're asked to do if you are chosen as a juror in this case, you're asked to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

11

14

16

15

17 18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

set aside anything that you may have learned about the case, serve with an open mind, and reach a verdict based only on the law that I instruct you, on the evidence presented at this trial, in this courtroom.

Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 76: I honestly don't think so.

THE COURT: Okay. You say, I don't think so, and whenever people say "think," we question you more. Because with "think," some people talk in a form of speech and say "think," and for some people that means that they're just not sure. So that's why -- a lot of people say "think" as part of their -- I realize I even say that sometimes. So we're going to ask you questions about that. Do you -- what you're going to be asked to do is to -- the State has the burden of proof, they have to prove the counts beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. The defendant is not required to prove anything; and, in fact, there's a presumption of innocence. So as you sit here today, the defendant -- because you haven't heard anything, the defendant is presumed to be innocent. Could you sit there and make the State prove their case and give the defendant the presumption of innocence?

JUROR NUMBER 76: Honestly, I -- no. No. I don't think so.

THE COURT: Okay. There's no right or wrong answers, you don't need to be afraid of your --

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yeah. No, I'm not afraid, that's just, like, the thing I struggle the most with, and I've been thinking about it most of the day. I just don't -- I don't think I can.

THE COURT: Okay. So you think that if you were to come in here, you would give the State -- you'd say if there's a scale of justice, there needs to be nothing on those scales, and you would give the State -- you'd weigh that in favor of the State at this time?

JUROR NUMBER 76: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: No, Your Honor.

MR. MOORE: Stipulate.

MR. BROWN: Stipulate.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 76, I appreciate you coming here to serve. I thank you for being a part of this process. I am going to release you from consideration. If you could go downstairs, talk to the jury clerk down there, they'll take your badge, and send you on your way. Thank you very much.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 76 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings

were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. For the record, Juror Number 76 was released for cause. Okay. Can we bring in Juror Number 78? I think I should have two out there, if I'm right.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 78 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Juror Number 78, thank you for being here. I want to thank you for your patience, thank you for being a part of this process. I know it's been a long day, it's been a long day for us too, but we appreciate you being here.

Before we broke, I talked about some instructions, some rules, that govern your service as a juror, so I'm going to ask you about those rules. And they kind of came into effect at that time. Have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

THE COURT: Have you heard or seen television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

THE COURT: Have you conducted or been exposed to

any research regarding any matters concerning this case?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

THE COURT: And have you discussed this case with any of the other jurors, or with anyone else, or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you some questions, then the State has an opportunity to ask you some questions, and then the defense has an opportunity to ask you some questions. My first question is a very general question, and there's no right or wrong answers in here. We just ask you to be honest, frank, and have candor with the Court. That's all we ask. So the first question is, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 78: It is an extreme, sometimes necessary, punishment.

THE COURT: Okay. So if I were to say, are you for or against, you would have to say you were for, but you have some reservations.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Right.

THE COURT: Okay. How this process works is, there's two possible phases to a trial. In the first phase, which we call the guilt phase, if the jury

returns a verdict of guilty on count one, and it only pertains to count one, if you were to return a verdict of guilty on the count one, premeditated murder of the first degree, then we move into the penalty phase.

In the penalty phase, if you were chosen to sit as a juror, you would be instructed that you have to return a recommendation to the Court of a possible penalty of either death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. I would instruct you that you have to consider both possible penalties in your deliberations. Are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree, and is that opinion so strong that you could not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So you could consider both life in prison without the possibility of parole and death?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you what you know about this case. Do you know anything about this case, either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussion with anyone else, or from the media, radio, television, Internet comments, or newspapers?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

JUROR NUMBER 78: I know about the event that took place when the deputy was shot and killed. don't know a lot about it, I do not watch broadcast TV, we do not have it in our home. I don't subscribe to a newspaper and (unintelligible). So I know that happened, I remember her name, I did not remember the young man's name, I didn't recognize that. And that's the extent of it.

THE COURT: Okay. You say you don't have broadcast TV in your home, tell me what that means.

JUROR NUMBER 78: We only watch prerecorded videos, movies.

Okay. So you remember seeing THE COURT: something, but you don't remember the source?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No. Well, probably on a -walking by somewhere, on a TV, or stopping by somebody's house and saw something on TV.

THE COURT: But you say, as a part of your routine, you don't normally watch the news? JUROR NUMBER 78: Correct.

THE COURT: And I didn't quite catch what you said about newspapers, do you have newspapers that come to your home, and do you read newspapers?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Online sometimes. Very rarely do I read the local newspaper online, usually it's

21

22

23

24

25

just the national or world news.

read

THE COURT: Okay. So you wouldn't -- did you read anything about this case in the newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No. I think I heard -somehow, either I glanced at it, or somehow I knew
that a trial was going to take place or -- because I
recognized Deputy Pill's name, it's a memorable name.
But that's the extent of it, I don't know anything
other than maybe a trial was going to take place.

THE COURT: Okay. For purposes of this trial, can you set aside anything that you may have learned about this case, serve with an open mind, and reach a verdict based only on the law and the evidence presented in this trial, in this courtroom?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Juror Number 78, good afternoon, or good evening now, as we get to this time. I'm just going to talk to you a little bit about the death penalty. You indicated that it's an extreme but sometimes necessary punishment. Can you expand kind of on your viewpoint or your thoughts about the death penalty for me?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Well, certainly, it's an action that can't be reversed, it's absolute. If you

determine later, well, maybe we made a wrong decision, it can't be reversed. I think the death penalty -- just in a practical sense, or a pragmatic sense, from everything I read, it's a lighter burden on society to give somebody a life sentence rather than give them the death penalty.

(Unintelligible) give a death sentence. When it might be warranted, I think, is when there's a possibility of the guilty person, the person who's found guilty, when the possibility is that, should they get loose, escape, incarceration, that they might cause terrible damage to society at large, like the leader of a (unintelligible), or something like that. So the death penalty is an extreme thing, but sometimes it's warranted. H

MR. BROWN: In your mind, that type of a situation, do you see the death penalty limited to only that type of a situation?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No. I think the scenarios we can talk about are probably unlimited. Every case needs to be considered on its own; but, in general, as a generality, that's (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: Okay. And about your opinion as far as whether it's a lighter burden on society, you said it would be a lighter burden on society with a life

3

4

5

7

6

8

10

9

11 12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

sentence rather than the death penalty. Do you think that's something -- would that enter into your consideration when you're determining a life or death recommendation to the Court?

JUROR NUMBER 78: It might be a factor. It could be a factor. There's probably other things that would carry more weight.

MR. BROWN: Okay. What other things?

JUROR NUMBER 78: I don't know.

Okay. Let me kind of go through the MR. BROWN: process with you a little bit on if you're selected as a juror, how a jury gets to the point of making that recommendation. I know the judge covered it this morning with you, but she covered a lot of things, and it was several hours ago. The first step, obviously, is that the jury that's selected needs to return a verdict for first degree murder. If they return a verdict of not quilty, then there's no sentencing at all; if they return a verdict for a lesser charge, such as second degree murder, or something else, the death penalty's off the table, sentencing is to the Court, and you, as a jury, are done at that point. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Okay. Yes.

If the jury returns a verdict of MR. BROWN:

guilty of first degree murder, then we reconvene, and you'd hear additional evidence that goes towards the sentencing aspect. You may have already some of it from the guilt phase, but then more will come in in the second phase. And the Court's going to, after you hear that evidence, give a set of final instructions; and the first thing she's going to lay out for you is to give you a list of what are called aggravating circumstances that may apply in this case, and you need to determine whether or not any of those aggravating circumstances, one or more, are proved.

1.0

What aggravating circumstances are, are some fact or situation, a circumstance, that would increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim. And it's to those circumstances that you look, and it's that basis, and that basis alone, that you can justify and vote for the death penalty. So those are the circumstances that take first degree murder, I'll use the term aggravate, aggravating circumstances, aggravate it up to the higher sentence of the death penalty. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. BROWN: So you look to see whether the State's proven at least one, we may have proven more, but in order to get to the next step, we have to prove

at least one, of those aggravating circumstances. If
the State hasn't proven any, then your recommendation
has to be life. If we've proven at least one, then
you look at those circumstances that have been proven
and ask yourself, do these justify the death penalty?
If your answer is no, then you return life, a
recommendation of life. If your answer is yes, these
aggravating circumstances justify the death penalty,
you go to the next step.

That's where the Court's going to tell you that you then evaluate the mitigating circumstances. as the Court mentioned, that's evidence that relates to the defendant, his background, character, his life. And you take that evidence, and there's also a burden of proof for that. As I said, the State has to prove aggravating circumstances beyond a reasonable doubt. Well, there's a burden of proof for the mitigating circumstances, it's lower, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. So mitigating evidence is presented, if something's not proven to your satisfaction, you disregard it. You take that mitigating evidence that's been proven, and you -- the judge is going to tell you that you compare it and weigh it against the aggravating circumstances.

Now, in your lifetime, have you had to make

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 critical, key decisions? JUROR NUMBER 78: Sure. Yes. 2 MR. BROWN: And when you've made those decisions, 3 do you look at all the factors that you have, all the 4 circumstances, everything that's involved? 5 JUROR NUMBER 78: Yeah. Well, ideally. 6 MR. BROWN: At least you hope to, that's what you 7 8 try to do. JUROR NUMBER 78: Correct. MR. BROWN: And when you look at those, 10 11 obviously, some factors, or some circumstances, you 12 find to be far more important than others. Right? 13 JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes. MR. BROWN: And those important circumstances, 14 you give great weight to in making your decision. 15 16 Right? 17 JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes. Those ones that you find have little MR. BROWN: 18 importance, you give little weight to. Right? 19 JUROR NUMBER 78: Right. 20 I mean, you kind of weigh all those 21 MR. BROWN: 22 circumstances, and that's how you come to your 23 decision. Right. 24 JUROR NUMBER 78:

MR. BROWN: What the Court's going to instruct

25

you is you go through that same type of process here. It's a weighing process. You consider everything that's been proven, you determine how much weight to give it. You can give something great weight, or you can find something not important at all, and give it very little weight. What you have to do is agree to consider the evidence, but the weight is up to you. You determine how much weight to give to all the evidence that's been presented to you.

So what you do is, you go through that weighing process, and you have to ask yourself, does the mitigating evidence, mitigating circumstances, outweigh those aggravating circumstances you've already found to have been proven. You weigh those. Obviously, if you find the mitigating circumstances outweigh the aggravating circumstances, then your recommendation has to be life in prison. If you find, however, that it does not outweigh the aggravating circumstances, then you're in a position where, legally, you can make a recommendation to the Court for the death penalty.

Now, the Court's going to tell you -- or she's not going to tell you, if you find A, B, C, that you must return a recommendation of the death penalty. It doesn't work like that. You can say, well, I'll do

whatever the law requires me to do, but there's going to be no requirement. You've got to go through that weighing process, find that we've proven the aggravators, find that they're not outweighed by the mitigation; and if you get to that point, and you find the death penalty is justified, that's when you make that recommendation. She's going to tell you that you're never required to return a death penalty verdict, you have to go through that weighing process, and find that it's justified. Do you understand?

MR. BROWN: Any questions about that process?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

Yes.

MR. BROWN: Now, given that process, if you find the death penalty is justified, can you return a recommendation for the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 78:

MR. BROWN: Do you have concerns or have any hesitation, based on philosophical beliefs, religious beliefs, moral beliefs, family history, whatever it may be, is there anything about you that causes you concern or hesitation about having to return or being in a situation where you have to make that type of decision?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No. Except that I need to know

that I am making the right decision. I have to be absolutely certain that I'm right.

MR. BROWN: Okav. Now, you used the term

MR. BROWN: Okay. Now, you used the term
"absolutely certain." When the Court spoke earlier
and talked about the aggravating circumstances and
proof, she talked about proof beyond a reasonable
doubt. You remember hearing her talk about that?

MR. BROWN: And she used the term, a reasonable doubt is not a speculative, forced, not a possible doubt, or imaginary doubt.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Right. Yeah. Beyond a reasonable doubt, to me, would be an absolute.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Correct.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Do you see a difference between a reasonable doubt versus impossible doubt, or speculative doubt?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes. Sure. Yes.

MR. BROWN: Do you see a difference -- the distinction?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. And that's kind of where I'm going, you used the term "absolute," somebody may define absolute to be, well, if I have a possible doubt, or speculative, forcing myself to doubt, I'm not absolute.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Okay.

2

MR. BROWN: So do you see there can be a difference in that burden of proof?

3 4

JUROR NUMBER 78: Sure.

5

MR. BROWN: That's why I wanted to talk to you when you used that term, to make sure that we're on

6

the same page in what we're meaning. Obviously, I'm

7 8

-- you know, I use the term reasonable doubt on a

9

regular basis, you do not. It's not something that

10

you use in ordinary conversation outside of court.

11

JUROR NUMBER 78: Sure.

12

MR. BROWN: So when you use that term, you have

13

to be "absolutely certain," where are you leaning,

14

what are you meaning by that term?

15

my personal definition, of that agrees with the beyond

JUROR NUMBER 78: I think -- well, my definition,

16 17

a reasonable doubt.

18

MR. BROWN: Okay. So you're not going to hold

19

the State to a burden that's higher than what the Court described to you?

20

21

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

22

MR. BROWN: And that's where we're trying to go,

23

I want to make sure that you're going to do this the

24

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

right way.

25

MR. BROWN: Okay. Now, do you come in with -- I think we covered this earlier, but now that we went through the process, and you know the Court's going to give you that list of aggravating circumstances that may apply in this case, do you come in with any idea, or notion, of saying, you know, in order for me to recommend the death penalty, it's going to have to be one of these types of things or situations?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No. No preconceived notions.

MR. BROWN: Okay. So you'll listen to what the Court tells you.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And, obviously, it's going to be a statutory list of items that you can consider that would increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Say that again, please.

MR. BROWN: Well, the aggravating circumstances, as I mentioned earlier, those are -- it's a list of items that would increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim, circumstances concerning the case and what happened. So you could listen to that list the Court gives you and follow that?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. BROWN: One last area that I want to cover --

1

23

24

25

and I pretty much try to ask every person that's been here this, and it may or may not apply to you, but it also could apply to somebody else, and if you're back in the jury room, and you see it happening, then you know to put a stop to it. Knowing that if you, as a juror, come back with a verdict of less than first degree, say you come back second degree murder, you will not be in the situation where you have to make that recommendation to the Court of life or death. So if the State proves to you that this defendant committed first degree murder, would you let it enter into your thought process, your deliberation process, you know, they proved first degree, but if I just go down to second, I don't have to come back, and I don't have to worry, and I don't have to be faced with that situation of voting for or against the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

MR. BROWN: You would agree that the evidence presented to you, the verdict that that evidence dictates, will be the verdict that you return?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

Thank you. No further questions, MR. BROWN: Your Honor.

Okay. Questions by the defense? THE COURT:

MR. PIROLO: Thank you, Your Honor.

evening. How are you, sir? As you know, there are no wrong answers. We just ask that you speak your mind. Whatever you've got inside, whatever you're thinking, just let us know. And I want to touch on a couple things that you brought up earlier, and I've got some different questions to ask.

First of all, what I want to start with is, you've heard life without the possibility of parole, and what that means is, the person who is sentenced to life without parole never gets out of prison. They die in prison. Do you accept that? Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 78: I know that's what it is, yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. I bring that up because earlier you mentioned something about what if the person could get out later on, and maybe do some more harm to society. Do you understand that in a case like this, if we get to the second phase, if you were to return a life without parole recommendation, that's what the sentence would impose, is that Mr. Bradley, this individual that we're concerned about here, would never get out of prison.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: You made that comment earlier, I thought -- correct me if I'm wrong, but what I thought

you meant was, if the guy could get out one day, I don't want him to get out, that would be a good reason for the death penalty. I just want you to understand --

JUROR NUMBER 78: No, that wasn't my intent with that hypothetical.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. But you do understand what life without parole means?

JUROR NUMBER 78: It means that, yes, the defendant will be incarcerated for all of his life.

MR. PIROLO: Right. Do you agree that's a critical decision to come to?

JUROR NUMBER 78: It's -- I've had to make a lot of really difficult decisions (unintelligible) business owner (unintelligible). This, I would say, is probably the most difficult -- if I'm part of this jury, that would be about -- it may be the most difficult decision I've ever had to make.

MR. PIROLO: Do you think you could return a life without parole recommendation if it was appropriate?

If you MR. PIROLO: Any hesitation over that? found that --

Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 78:

JUROR NUMBER 78: Oh, no, I have no hesitation that when I decide, that I can do what I decide.

21

22 23

24

25

1.7

MR. PIROLO: You mentioned the death penalty should be extreme -- it's an extreme penalty, but sometimes it's necessary. On a scale of 1 to 10, or let's say 0 to 10, with 10 being absolutely support the death penalty, 0 being don't support it, maybe oppose it, where do you fall on that scale?

JUROR NUMBER 78: 10 is absolutely supporting it?
MR. PIROLO: Yeah.

JUROR NUMBER 78: When it's absolutely warranted, 10; when there's kind of significant doubt, I'm closer to 0. It depends on the circumstance, what's been revealed, what I've been made to understand, what the situation is.

MR. PIROLO: Can you give us an example of the kind of case, kind of first degree murder, that deserves the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No, I can't. I could make something up, if you'd like. An easy one for me --

MR. PIROLO: Well, go ahead --

JUROR NUMBER 78: An easy one for me would be Saddam Hussein.

MR. PIROLO: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 78: He was put in prison, and escaped. If there's a chance of tremendous killing as a result of their escape.

MR. PIROLO: Let's just drop it down just a notch from Saddam and say the death of a child, a person meant to do it, did it, and killed a child. Would that be a case that you would say deserved the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 78: That's too simple a question.

Maybe, and maybe not, is my answer on that one.

Maybe, but maybe not. It depends on the extenuating circumstances.

MR. PIROLO: You would have to then do the next process, which would be listening to the aggravating circumstances, and considering them; if you find them, then move on to the next step.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yeah. I couldn't just say yes. The simple situation you give me, I couldn't just say, okay, that warrants the death penalty, no.

MR. PIROLO: You're not told everything, there's a reason for that, but you're given a summary of how this process works, and you understand that you only get to the second part of the trial if there is a conviction for first degree murder?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Anything less than that, or not guilty, you're thanked for your time and you go home.

And that -- when we get to that second stage, if we

ever get there, you have to first see if there's any aggravating circumstances that have been proven. The State will -- their burden is beyond a reasonable doubt, so they would have to prove to you aggravating -- at least one aggravating circumstance beyond a reasonable doubt. If they show you nothing, no aggravating circumstances proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt, then it's a life recommendation. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: If they prove to you at least one, then we move on to mitigating circumstances. Now, the burden for the mitigating circumstances is less.

Aggravating, again, beyond a reasonable doubt, high burden; mitigating, you would have to be reasonably convinced that the mitigating circumstance exists.

And you kind of get why -- I think you understand why the burdens are different. Aggravating, high burden; lesser burden for mitigating since we are talking about someone's life.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Can you appreciate that?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes, I can.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. And, again, we keep saying "someone," but, specifically, in this case, we're talking about Mr. Bradley, that's the case that's before us. Now, can you -- hypothetically, let's say the State has proven to you six aggravating circumstances, at that point, can you still be open and wait for and listen to mitigating circumstances, and consider the mitigating circumstances, or if six are presented to you, would you just shut off and say, that's it for me, I can't move on to the mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No. I would wait to hear it all, the mitigating, yes.

MR. PIROLO: Can you -- I asked you earlier if you can you give us an example of a first degree murder case where you would say it warrants the death penalty, can you think of some circumstances that would warrant a life without parole sentence?

JUROR NUMBER 78: I can think of a case, but I don't know enough about it, I don't know what my answer would be, because I don't know enough about the details. If I was on the jury here, I would hear it all. The case is -- (unintelligible) recently died in prison, he's -- a boyhood friend of mine, his daughter, Tiffany, disappeared several years ago, and

this fellow who was in prison for another murder, I believe, in his diary, it was found -- it seems likely that he's the one who killed -- that's what happened to Tiffany, he killed her. So it seems like their unknowing (unintelligible) they think they know what happened to Tiffany.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Even though I know how much hardship it's been for Pat and his wife all these years, and Mr. Rowles got to live his life until his death from whatever it was, in prison, I can't say that he should have gotten the death penalty, or not. I can't say that it was wrong to just, instead of the death penalty, incarcerate him for all his life, because I don't know all the circumstances or what the -- if there were any mitigating or anything else. So I know something about something that was a really important case involving the death of someone, but -- when you're talking about something as important as these two things, incarceration for life or a death penalty, I really can't make blanket statements too much, (unintelligible). It's too serious just to do -- have a generalization of, oh, if this happens, I'm going to do this, or, you know -- it's too complex.

MR. PIROLO: We're, in away, tied -- our hands are tied in terms of what kinds of specifics we give

1.6

you at this point.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Sure. But you are specific about what the -- how this is going to proceed, and what the outcome might be, what our options are going to be at the end -- toward the end of the trial if he's found guilty.

MR. PIROLO: If you were presented with graphic photographs that depict how Deputy Pill was killed, would that cause you to just shut off to any mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

MR. PIROLO: You'd still be able to keep an open mind to listen to all of them and consider them?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: If you saw a video depicting how Deputy Pill was shot, was killed, would that close you off to any mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

MR. PIROLO: The aggravating circumstances are limited. By law, there's just a specific list of them. On the other side of it, the mitigating circumstances are unlimited, and I'm going to get to a few of them with you, but can you accept that there's an unlimited amount of mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 78: It's an awful lot, but okay.

If you say so.

MR. PIROLO: We can present to you "X" number of mitigating circumstances for the trial, through that second part of the trial; and during your deliberations, if you start thinking of other things you've heard, and you say, you know what, that's mitigating too, the lawyer maybe didn't argue it, but that's mitigating to me, and you can consider that as well. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 78: I'm not sure I follow what you're saying.

MR. PIROLO: Because the mitigating circumstances open, they're unlimited, it could be -- I'm not saying it's going to happen, but it could be a situation where, while you're deliberating, while you're doing the weighing, that you say, you know, I heard X, Y, and Z, and I find that to be mitigating. Just because a lawyer didn't argue it as mitigating doesn't mean you can't take it as mitigating.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Okay. You're asking me if I'm going to take information that I know from outside this courtroom?

MR. PIROLO: No, no, no, not outside. You hear it here, but it just may not have been argued to you.

JUROR NUMBER 78: Okay. I don't know.

2

4

3

5

6

7 8

10

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. PIROLO: Let me get to a couple more -- a couple specific ones, and then we'll try to come back to that. Do you think that mental illness is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Maybe sometimes.

MR. PIROLO: How so? I mean, what circumstances do you think it would be a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Actually, the answer would actually be no. And the reason -- the reason is, I've seen some people who I have been around, somebody in my own family, who does suffer from mental illness; but I've suspected for years that he exaggerated it for their own benefit. That's probably rare. For most people, mental illness is (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: If you were to hear evidence, obviously from a qualified expert, of mental illness, would you be able to consider that as a mitigating circumstance in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: How about brain damage or brain injury, if you hear evidence of that, would you consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: How about physical and/or emotional abuse, would you be able to consider that as a

mitigating circumstance?

_

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to read to you a portion of a jury instruction, and I'm going to ask you if you were presented with this, would you be able to consider this kind of mitigation. The instruction is, "the capital felony was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance." Would you be able to consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Possibly. Yes.

MR. PIROLO: How about this one, "the capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law was substantially impaired." Would you be able to consider that as mitigation, a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: How about drug addiction, would you be able to consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Would you consider mitigation, some of which I just asked you about, would you consider that as an explanation for a person's behavior, or would you just look at it as an excuse?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Explanations.

MR. PIROLO: Do you believe a person is the product of past life experiences? Forget about DNA, forget about Mom and Dad, you can't pick on Mom and Dad, but do you think that things that happen, that go on in a person's life, shapes the person they become?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: We've talked about the second part being a recommendation that's given to the Court, but it's not to be taken lightly, because this judge, she cannot do her job -- if we get there, she could not render or impose a sentence without your recommendation, she's got to give it great weight. It's not something where you can say, oh, whatever, the judge will do whatever she wants anyway. As you said earlier, it's a critical decision. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Would you be able to -- whatever verdict you have, do you think you'd be able to stick to it, or do you think someone could twist your arm to voting a different way?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No. My opinion is my opinion.

MR. PIROLO: And you would also respect a fellow juror's vote as well, you wouldn't try to browbeat

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

10

12 13

14

1516

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

them into changing their vote or anything like that?

JUROR NUMBER 78: Correct.

MR. PIROLO: Can I have a minute, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. PIROLO: No more questions, Your Honor. Thank you, sir.

Okay. Juror Number 78, what I'm THE COURT: going to have you do is, you're going to be released for today, you are still being considered as a potential juror for this panel. I'm going to have you go downstairs, they're going to give you a phone I'm going to ask you to call between -- call number. next Wednesday, which is March the 5th, and they'll give you this information downstairs, between 1:00 and 5:00, and they're going to tell you when to return to the second part of jury selection. It's probably going to be -- just so you know, you're going to call next Wednesday, but it may be Thursday or Friday. will most likely be the next day, or the day after that that you're going to have to return. I'm just telling you that for planning purposes.

During this break, you must continue to abide by the rules governing your service as a juror.

Specifically, do not discuss this case with anyone.

Do not -- avoid reading newspaper headlines and

articles relating to this trial or its participants.

Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial. Do not conduct any research yourself regarding any matters concerning this case or its participants.

Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 78: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for being here.

We'll send you downstairs, and you can be on your way.

Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 78 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. I did release Juror Number 80. So Juror Number 80 is not here, I told her to come back in the morning. Now, Mr. Moore, you're exactly right, that one panel, the first row on the second, i put in one more.

MR. MOORE: I'm sorry, I couldn't --

THE COURT: Yes, you were right, the numbers that you picked were right. But we'll be in recess until 8:30 in the morning. Any questions or concerns? Yes, sir?

MR. BROWN: The only person I had -- do we have another panel coming in tomorrow?

THE COURT: I released that panel, so the only thing we're going to address tomorrow is the second half of this panel, individual questions. I did release the panel for tomorrow. I don't think we'll get to that.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, could I approach briefly, take 30 seconds of your time?

THE COURT: Yes. Are you going to give me information about Mr. Lanning?

MR. PIROLO: No.

THE COURT: Okay. We need information about Mr. Lanning. But you can approach.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had before the Court, out of the hearing of any other parties present in the courtroom as follows:)

MR. PIROLO: The Court may or may not know that most of the time I'm a single parent. My daughter's mom is -- but I take her to school in the morning, if I get here at 8:32 --

THE COURT: That will be fine.

MR. PIROLO: That's the only thing, I just wanted to the Court a heads up.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm okay with that.

MR. PIROLO: I just wanted the Court to know that. The next several days will be days I'll be

1 taking her to school in the morning. 2 THE COURT: Okay. As soon as we see you, we'll start then. 3 MR. MOORE: If I have a hard time waking up and I 4 don't get in until 9:00 --5 THE COURT: I won't buy that from you. I'm 6 giving Mr. Pirolo the "I don't know him as well" 7 8 break. What's the status on Mr. Lanning? Is there an issue with his daughter? 9 MR. PIROLO: He left to -- she's getting 10 discharged today, so he had to go pick her up. 11 THE COURT: So that's a good thing. 12 MR. MOORE: Well, he said early on that if he has 13 14 to stay home with her because she can't get around, 15 then he's out. 16 THE COURT: Okay. MR. MOORE: We haven't heard from him, I don't 17 know what the final word on that is. We're waiting to 18 19 hear. THE COURT: 20 Okay. MR. PIROLO: That's why he left early, it was to 21 22 pick her up.

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was

Okay. Thank you.

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: I knew there must have been an issue.

concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Court will be in recess until 8:30 tomorrow morning. Thank you.

(Thereupon, court was in recess for the day, 2/26/14; thereafter, court was reconvened on 2/27/14 and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. We can bring in Juror Number 102.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 102 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 102, first of all, I want to thank you for being here, thank you for your patience with regard to this process. We spoke to you yesterday, and you talked about that you were — I think you did scheduling for a medical office, and that you were concerned about, perhaps, this being a financial hardship if you were here for the five weeks, and you were going to see if your employer was going to pay you for this time when you were here. Can you tell me if you've been able to follow up on that issue?

JUROR NUMBER 102: Yes. Yes, I went there after I left here yesterday, I went there. And I actually got the protocol for the company, as it stands, and we

do get paid, in full, our base rate. There is no limitation as to how many weeks or days we need, at least not in the protocol, it's not listed there.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 102: The only thing I have to show is, at the end of it all, I have to show a letter from the Court like I had last night, I picked one up for yesterday.

THE COURT: Okay. We can take care of all that.

JUROR NUMBER 102: They say we have to show hours, but my immediate supervisor said no, but just, if we can, show the hours. What they're saying is that if I'm getting a day, I'm getting eight hours, they don't only give us -- you know, they do it in blocks of eight. So if I'm actually here for a day for jury duty, under my work protocol, it's considered eight hours.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 102: What I think they were looking at was, let's say I worked at a hospital and I went on the 3:00 to 11:00 shift, if I get called in for jury duty, obviously, the only hours they're going to pay me for would be from 3:00 to 5:00, because those would be the two hours I would miss work for.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. So having found out

that information, are you good to go? Can --

JUROR NUMBER 102: Yeah, I'm okay with that now,
I double-checked. And the other thing I
double-checked was that if we were out for that length
of time, that they cannot terminate our employment
because you're not there.

THE COURT: Right.

JUROR NUMBER 102: You know, I double-checked that, and they were like, oh, my God, no, we can't do that.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I appreciate that.

Okay. What I'm going to have you do is -- we're going to question everyone in numerical order, because that's the most fair way to do it, I just wanted to bring you in and follow up with that. So I'm going to have you go back outside.

JUROR NUMBER 102: Okay. I felt a lot better when I knew that.

THE COURT: Definitely. I can understand that. So thank you.

MR. LANNING: Judge?

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. LANNING: Can we discuss before you have her --

THE COURT: Okay. Number 102, if you'll -- I

quess they -- if you'll just wait right there for just 1 2 a moment. (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had before 3 the Court, out of the hearing of any other parties 4 5 present in the courtroom as follows:) 6 THE COURT: Mr. Lanning, your reflex is, like, 7 five seconds too slow. MR. LANNING: Are we going to release the last 8 four or five? 9 I don't know. I was going to talk to 10 THE COURT: you, and then the deputy can do that. 11 12 MR. LANNING: Okay. 13 THE COURT: Okay. (Thereupon, the benchside conference was 14 concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:) 15 16 THE COURT: Okay, she can step outside. (Thereupon, Juror Number 102 was escorted out of 17 18 the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, voir dire selection was had which was not requested to be 19 transcribed.) 20 Okay. We'll bring in Number 87. 21 THE COURT: (Thereupon, Juror Number 87 was escorted into the 22 courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were 23

had as follows:)

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 87, first, I want

to thank you for being here, thank you for your service, and thank you for being patient with us with regard to this process. It is a long process, it's long for you, it's long for us, but it is a necessary process; and I assure you we are doing everything we can to move this process along as quickly as we can.

Now, having said that, the other day when you were released, I gave you some rules, and those rules kind of came into effect when I gave them to you, so I'm speaking of that time period. Have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No.

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 87: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 87: No.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you some questions,

and talk to you about some things, and then the State will have an opportunity to ask you some questions, and the defense will have an opportunity to ask you some questions. My first question is pretty general, just to put this out there, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 87: I mean, I don't -- I don't know. I mean, if someone were to end someone else's life, and proven guilty, maybe. I don't know, I've never been in the situation to tell someone whether or not they get death or another option.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me tell you how the process works, and I'll ask you some other questions.

JUROR NUMBER 87: All right.

THE COURT: We have the first part of the trial, which we call the guilt phase. And in the guilt phase, it is the jury -- if the jury returned a verdict of guilty on count one, which is first degree murder, then, and only then, we move into the second phase. In the second phase -- and for purposes of the second phase, you have to assume there's a guilty verdict on count one, which is first degree murder, then we move into the second phase, and the second phase is what we call the penalty phase. In the penalty phase, as a juror, the jury would be

instructed to make a recommendation to me, to the Court, of possible penalties; and the possible penalties for a guilty verdict on first degree murder is either death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree --

JUROR NUMBER 87: No, I don't.

THE COURT: Okay. So would you be able to consider life in prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty under certain circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So if I instructed you that -as one of my instructions to be a juror on this case,
if I instructed that you were to consider life in
prison without the possibility of parole as a possible
penalty, would you be able to do that?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you what you know about this case, most people know something about the case. Be as honest and frank as you can. Like I said, there's no right or wrong answers in here, we're just trying to get the information.

JUROR NUMBER 87: Right.

THE COURT: So that everyone can make an informed

decision. Do you know anything about this case, either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussion with anyone else, from the media, radio, television, Internet, newspaper? Do you know anything about this case?

JUROR NUMBER 87: I know it happened last year. When I told people that I had jury duty, they brought up that this was being done. As far as details go, I was with my grandmother last week, she had said she might have worked with his brother. I don't know, but she just started talking about it a little bit. But I'm not sure if that's the same story, if that's 100 percent true.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's talk about different things. You said that you heard about the case when the event happened.

JUROR NUMBER 87: Right.

THE COURT: How did you hear about the case?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Just through talk and --

THE COURT: You didn't see a newspaper, or see it on the news or anything?

JUROR NUMBER 87: I might have seen it on the news, but nothing --

THE COURT: So what information, specifics, do you think you know as of that time?

JUROR NUMBER 87: All I know is a police officer 1 2 had been killed. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Any other details? 4 JUROR NUMBER 87: No. 5 THE COURT: And then you said your grandmother 6 talked to you, what was that conversation about? JUROR NUMBER 87: Just, you know, that -- she 8 said that the brothers look alike. 9 THE COURT: You talking about the brother of the defendant, or the brother of --10 11 JUROR NUMBER 87: I believe so. 12 THE COURT: -- the deceased? 13 JUROR NUMBER 87: I'm not 100 percent sure on 14 that part. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Was your grandma talking to 16 you and you weren't really listening? JUROR NUMBER 87: Kind of, yeah. She didn't say 17 if it was the defendant or --18 19 THE COURT: Okay. So there was some discussion, 20 but -- and did that come up as a result of you having 21 jury duty? JUROR NUMBER 87: Yeah. Because I was talking to 2.2 her about me going to jury duty. 23 24 THE COURT: And do you remember any other 25 specifics as a result of that conversation?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No. Then she just started talking about how the brother was doing at work, and I just --

THE COURT: The brother was doing at work. And you're not sure if it's the brother of the decedent or the brother of the defendant?

JUROR NUMBER 87: I think it might be him (indicating).

THE COURT: Okay. And so what did the grandmother say, in general, about the brother at work?

JUROR NUMBER 87: That he's doing good and trying to get promoted. Nothing about the case or nothing, just about the brother. That she heard that he was the brother.

THE COURT: Okay. And where does your grandmother work?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Publix on Babcock.

THE COURT: Okay. Any other information or any other knowledge?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No.

THE COURT: When you come to court, what we ask you to do, and it's not unusual that someone has heard something about this case, but what we ask you to do is to set aside anything you've learned about this

case, serve with an open mind, kind of have an open slate, and reach a verdict based on the law and the evidence presented in this trial in this courtroom.

4 Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, if you heard something out there, and when the evidence came before the Court, that wasn't part of it, you never heard something, and you say, hey, out there I heard this, I didn't hear this in the courtroom, are you going to be able to put that aside, because that hasn't been proved and that wasn't something that happened in the courtroom, and not consider that?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And at this time, the defendant is considered to be innocent, at this moment, and I'm going to talk to you more about that later on. Because the State has the burden of proof, they have to prove each element of each crime beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt; and if there's been no evidence presented at this time, as we sit here, can you look at the defendant and give him the presumption of innocence?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. Juror Number 87, good morning. You talked a little bit about what your grandmother told you. Can you put that completely aside, and would that affect you at all as a juror in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No.

MR. BROWN: Okay. How about the fact, ultimately, if you're selected, and the jury comes back with a guilty verdict of first degree murder, you'd have to go back and make a recommendation to the Court of either life in prison without parole, or the death penalty. How are you going to feel about that with the possibility that your grandmother may know the defendant' brother?

JUROR NUMBER 87: I don't know how close they are. She -- they work in different parts of the store. I mean, as far as I know, their relationship is (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: Well, and that's where -- the only time I'm going to get an opportunity to talk to you about this is during jury selection.

JUROR NUMBER 87: Right.

MR. BROWN: So, you know, at this point you're not allowed to go back and talk to your grandmother anymore about her relationship, so you're going to be

-- what you know now is all that you're going to know until after the fact.

JUROR NUMBER 87: Right.

MR. BROWN: So my concern is that, obviously, there's some type of a connection. Obviously, your grandmother's had some conversations, I assume, with his brother.

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

MR. BROWN: So she obviously doesn't completely dislike him, if she talks to him and knows that he's doing well. So you're going to be in the situation of having to think, now, this recommendation -- first, sit on the jury to determine guilt, to start with. Then, if it gets to that point, making a recommendation of life or the death penalty, knowing that your grandmother knows his brother.

JUROR NUMBER 87: Right.

MR. BROWN: So --

JUROR NUMBER 87: It could affect that, when choosing either/or.

MR. BROWN: Do you think that would put you in a situation that may potentially bias or affect your verdict?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Not -- I don't know. I mean,
I'd be more worried about her and the friend and that

kind of thing.

MR. BROWN: Right. Okay. Well, here's my concern: Jurors have to come in, as the Court mentioned, with an open mind. And you've got to be completely impartial. You cannot be biased for or against.

JUROR NUMBER 87: Right.

MR. BROWN: You come in with a clean slate.

That's why we go through this, and we want you to be able to set aside anything that you've heard, because you've got to base your verdict on the facts and the evidence in the courtroom. And having a potential connection — and would be just as troublesome, obviously, if you had that connection to the family of the victim, because you may have that built—in or inherent bias, it just may exist, and that's what I'm trying to explore with you. So would you be concerned about that?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No. I'd come in with an open mind, listen to both sides.

MR. BROWN: Okay. How about -- would you be concerned about the effect it's going to have on your grandmother and what she might think?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No. I mean, nobody would know I'd be in here. I mean, maybe when it was all said

1 and done, whatever happened, it could --2 MR. BROWN: Right. A week later, two weeks 3 later, three weeks later, a month later, you know, she's --4 5 JUROR NUMBER 87: Something's going to come out. MR. BROWN: Right. You're telling her you're 6 serving on a jury, you're going to be on a jury for 7 the next month, five weeks, she's probably going to 8 9 figure it out. 10 JUROR NUMBER 87: Right. 11 MR. BROWN: So how do you feel about that? 12 JUROR NUMBER 87: I mean, I'd still do, if I was 13 chosen, my job to listen to both sides; but it would be in the back of my mind, for the future. 14 MR. BROWN: And we always ask this question, will 15 16 you be able to set it aside, which is a difficult thing --17 JUROR NUMBER 87: I could, yes. 18 MR. BROWN: Are you confident in your ability to 19 do that? 20 JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir. 21 MR. BROWN: Do you think it would weigh in your 22 23 consideration at all? JUROR NUMBER 87: No. 24

MR. BROWN: Now, the next question is, you're a

young man of 22 -- or how old are you?

2

JUROR NUMBER 87: 22.

3

4

MR. BROWN: 22. You're a young man, you work, how do you feel about being put into this situation where for the next several weeks --

6

5

JUROR NUMBER 87: I mean, I wouldn't say it's

7

exciting, but it's an opportunity to see what goes on

8

in something like this.

9

MR. BROWN: How about being put -- obviously, at

10

22 -- we don't know who the other jurors will be, but

11

odds are that you will be, if not the youngest, one of

12

the youngest ones, you won't have the life experiences

13

of everybody else, but yet you're going to be going

14

back there and potentially voting for either life, or

15

for the death penalty.

16

JUROR NUMBER 87: Correct.

17

MR. BROWN: Do you think that's a little too much

18

to ask, a little too soon in your life to do that?

20

19

JUROR NUMBER 87: I mean, I feel I've moved quite

20

well throughout my life. I own a home already,

21

full-time -- I work at Publix as well, trying to get

22

promoted through there. So, I mean, I've -- I'm more

23

ahead than a normal 22 year old is.

24

MR. BROWN: Okay. Do you feel comfortable making

25

5 that decision?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir.

2

MR. BROWN: Can you do it?

3

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir.

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir.

4

MR. BROWN:

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm going to go through a little bit of the process of how to make that decision, how you get there. Obviously, as the Court has said, if you return a verdict of first degree murder, that's when you proceed to the next step. If it's a verdict of something lesser, such as second degree murder, then you never advance to that next step, the death penalty's off the table. Do you understand?

MR. BROWN: If you return a verdict -- if the jury returns that verdict of first degree murder, then we would come back in, reconvene, and the jury would hear additional evidence, and the Court would give you a new set of instructions. The first step she would tell you in those instructions would be to look at what are known as aggravating circumstances. would be -- it would be a list, it will be at least one, but it can be more than one, circumstance or factor she's going to give you. Those are circumstances which can increase the gravity of the crime or the harm that was done to the victim. from those that you look at, and those, and only

those, are what you can look at to justify and give a recommendation of the death penalty, which is how they get the name of aggravating circumstances, increasing the gravity of the crime.

So she would give that list to you, you would look at that list and decide if the State has proven any of those. They have to prove at least one, may prove more than one, but you have to determine if we've proven any. If we've proven at least one, then you look at that one, or look at that group if we've proven more than one, and you say, do these — in your mind, do these justify the death penalty? If your answer is no, you would come back life. If your answer is yes, these aggravating circumstances justify the death penalty, you go on to the next phase of the process.

The next step would be to look at and consider the mitigating circumstances that have been provided. The mitigating circumstances are, as what she told you yesterday, circumstances concerning the defendant, his background, his life, things of that nature; and that evidence would be presented to you. Now, that has to be proven as well. The State -- we have to prove the aggravating circumstances beyond every reasonable doubt, the mitigation has to be proven, it's to a

lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. So things come in, if mitigation is not proven to you, you disregard it. But you take all the mitigation that's been proven, with the aggravating circumstances that have been proven, and you consider everything. She's going to tell you that you go through a weighing process. You have that so far?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: And like you've made -- you've indicated you bought a house, you made some other major decisions in your life, right?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Right.

MR. BROWN: When you sat down to that decision, you're going to buy a house, and what house to buy, did you sit and look at all the factors that you had?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

MR. BROWN: You considered everything. Some of those factors you looked at were pretty darn important, you gave them great weight, right?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Other things you looked at and considered weren't really that important to you, and you gave those little weight, right?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Right.

MR. BROWN: That's how we all make decisions, we

consider everything, and you weigh all the factors that you have. That's the same thing that she's going to tell you to do in this process. You take all the aggravators, you take all the mitigation, you consider everything, and you decide how much weight to give everything. You decide how much weight to give to the aggravators, you decide how much weight to give all the mitigation evidence that you received. can tell you how much weight to give. We only ask that you consider everything, but you decide the You may find some things, or a lot of things, to carry very little weight; others, you may give great weight to. So she's going to tell you to weigh the aggravators and the mitigators. If the mitigation outweighs the aggravators, then your recommendation would be life. If the mitigators do not outweigh the aggravators, then you're in a position where you can legally make to the judge the recommendation of the death penalty. Got it so far?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Now, she's never going to tell you, if the State does A, B, and C, and proves A, B, and C, you must come back with a death recommendation. She's going to tell you, in fact, that you are never required to return a recommendation of death. What

you have to do is find the aggravators, weigh those with mitigators; and if you find the mitigation does not outweigh the mitigation, and that you feel it justifies the death penalty, that's when you return a verdict of death. Any questions about that process?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No, sir.

MR. BROWN: Do you feel comfortable with doing that?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Knowing that's the process, do you think you can return, if you feel the death penalty is justified, a recommendation of the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Any hesitation?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No, sir.

MR. BROWN: Did you come in today with any preconceived ideas or notions of, well, you know, unless the State can show me either A or B, I'm not going to consider the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 87: No, sir.

MR. BROWN: You agree to look at -- as I told you, the judge, she's going to give you that list of aggravating factors, do you agree to look at those, and those are the ones you look at to justify the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes.

MR. BROWN: One other topic I'll cover, and I cover this with everyone is, obviously, if the jury comes back with a verdict of second degree murder, you do not proceed to that next step, you're not having to make that recommendation of life or death. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: My concern is, if the State of
Florida proves to you this defendant's guilty of first
degree murder, once you go back to that jury room and
start saying, you know, I really don't want to have
make that next decision, so I'm just going to come
back second to avoid having to make that decision.

JUROR NUMBER 87: No, sir.

MR. BROWN: You agree that justice is, the verdict should be what the evidence proves?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: You agree with that?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: And it's important everybody wants justice in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 87: Yes, sir.

(CONTINUED TO VOLUME V)