Page 1401 1 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT IN THE EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT 2 IN AND FOR BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA 3 CASE NUMBER: 05-2012-CF-035337-AXXX-XX 4 5 STATE OF FLORIDA, Plaintiff, 6 ORIGINAL 7 versus 8 BRANDON LEE BRADLEY 9 Defendant, 10 11 12 VOLUME VIII OF XI TRANSCRIPT OF DIGITAL RECORDED JURY TRIAL 13 VOIR DIRE 14 15 The transcript of the Digital Recorded Proceedings taken in the above-styled cause, at the Moore 16 17 Justice Center, 2825 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera, Florida, on the 24th, 27th, 28th day of February, and 6th, 18 7th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th and 17th day of March, 19 20 2014, before the Honorable Morgan Reinman. 21 22 RYAN REPORTING REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS 23 Case # 05-2012-CF-035337-AXXX-XX 1670 S. FISKE BOULEVARD 24

25

ROCKLEDGE, FLORIDA

		Page	1402
1	APPEARANCES		
2			
3	THOMAS BROWN, ESQ., and		
4	JAMES MCMASTER, ESQ., Assistant State Attorneys		
5	State Attorney's Office 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way		
	Building D.	_	
6	Viera, Florida 32940 Appearing Plaintiff	ior	
7			
8	J. RANDALL MOORE, ESQ., MICHAEL PIROLO, ESQ,		
9	and MARK LANNING, ESQ.,		
10	Assistant Public Defender		
11	Public Defender's Office 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way		
12	Building E Viera, Florida 32940 Appearing Defendant	for	
13			
14	Brandon Lee Bradley, Defendant, present		
15			
16	* * * *		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

MR. BROWN: When you've made those decisions, did you try to look at all the factors involved?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Try to consider everything, right?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Right. I (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: You try to consider everything, right? That's the way most of us make decisions. When you looked at those factors, some factors were pretty darn important and you gave them great weight if your consideration, right? Other factors you looked and said in this decision these I don't think are that important, I'm going to give them very little weight, right?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Right.

MR. BROWN: And you weighed everything and you came to your decision.

JUROR NUMBER 164: Um-hmm.

MR. BROWN: Same thing that the Court's going to tell you to do here. Whatever has been presented and proved, you have to consider. You determine how much weight. Court's not going to give you any magic scale, she's not going to say aggravator one gets X amount of weight, mitigator one gets Y amount of weight, you have to determine personally how much weight to give.

Now, I'm not going to you, and I don't believe the Defense will either, how much weight you would give to a particular aggravator or a particular mitigator. At this point it wouldn't be a fair question because you don't know, you haven't heard, you have to hear everything to determine the weight, right? However, the key is can you consider it.

Now, you may say, may be thinking well, I would consider that but in my mind it's not going to carry very much weight, that's fine, as long as you're open to consider it. Okay. No one is asking you how much weight to give. So, can you agree to consider all the aggravators that the Court lists?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Um-hmm.

MR. BROWN: Yes?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. BROWN: You have to give a yes out loud because we're record and there's a record. And nods of the head --

THE COURT: And there's a microphone right by you just so you know.

MR. BROWN: So, you would agree to consider all the aggravators that the Court would provide and whether we've proven them?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And again, all the mitigation evidence that's been provided, if it's been proven, you would consider it?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And you determine the weight. You know, the juror sitting right next to you may give a different amount of weight to an aggravator and mitigator than you will, but the key is everybody has to consider it all and determine the weight.

JUROR NUMBER 164: I understand.

MR. BROWN: Now, you go through that weighing process. The Court's -- the question will be from the Court you weigh the aggravators versus the mitigator. If the mitigation outweigh the aggravation, then your recommendation has to be for life. If you find the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, the aggravating circumstances, then you're in a position where you are legally justified to recommend to the Court a recommendation of death.

Now, the Court's not going to tell you if the State proves A, B, C and D that you must return a recommendation of death. You're not going to hear that. In fact, what she's going to tell you is that you are never required to recommend death. What you are required to do is to consider and go through that

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

weighing process and if you go through that weighing process and you find that the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation and after going through that weighing process that the aggravators still justify the death penalty in your mind, then you can recommend the death penalty. Any question about that?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Not at all.

MR. BROWN: Understand the process step by step what you have you have to do? Any problem with it?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Not at all.

MR. BROWN: You can consider all the aggravators and all the mitigators and make your own mind up as to how much weight?

JUROR NUMBER 164: I will.

MR. BROWN: And do you have anything in your own moral beliefs, religious beliefs, philosophical beliefs, family, work history, whatever it make, that causes you any undue concern, anxiety, difficulty being put in that position of possibly recommending a sentence of death?

JUROR NUMBER 164: I do not.

MR. BROWN: Can you do it?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. No further

22

23

24

questions, Your Honor.

2

THE COURT:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Questions by the Defense. MR. MOORE: You remember, it's only been a few

minutes, the Court telling you that while it may seem like we want you to take a position and say that you can do and maybe you can't things, follow the instructions, follow the law, it may seem like we're asking for that, if you're not sure that's an appropriate answer as well, and it seems to me for somebody in your position that would be an awkward admission as grown ups we like to feel like we're sure and not have doubts and certainly if we have doubts we don't want to have to admit it in public but, you know, this is a not a situation where we need to keep, I'm not suggesting that you are, but as we go through this, if you have any doubts you need to tell us because it would be, it would be unfair to have anybody involved in this that has doubts and not admit it. I'm not implying anything, I'm just saying. And when we talk about this, it's in the hypothetical. You know, hypothetically, what if Mr. Bradley is found guilty of first degree murder, hypothetically if you reach this point, then what could you do, that is hypothetical. The part that is not hypothetical is that if you're on this jury you

can be part of a process which results in Mr.

Bradley, twenty-four years old, being sentenced to

death and being executed. That's not hypothetical, that's a fact, you would be part of that process in that context.

JUROR NUMBER 164: I understand that.

MR. MOORE: In recalling what you heard about this case which you indicated was on TV I believe.

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And what you read on the Internet, Florida Today perhaps?

JUROR NUMBER 164: I only saw a little thing on the news itself, I didn't read anything about it.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Then do you recall what channel that was?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Probably 13.

MR. MOORE: Now, when you watch the news you don't accept it all at face value --

JUROR NUMBER 164: Of course not.

MR. MOORE: -- as being gospel. As any grown up would be, you're skeptical, but there's certain things that you accept that come through to you and you say yeah, you don't question it, it probably happened, a police officer being shot and being dead, and so you don't question that I would presume.

JUROR NUMBER 164: I would have to see all the evidence.

MR. MOORE: Well, I'm just --

JUROR NUMBER 164: I know (unintelligible) there's conflicts but I don't know anything else about it.

MR. MOORE: All right. I mean, that part of what you recall you accept as probably being true, right? And then you indicated in recalling the news coverage that you said the guy got out of the car and shot the deputy and there were two people involved, a guy and a gal, right? You know Mr. Bradley is the guy, a guy who's here charged with first degree murder and in your mind in reviewing that, what degree of credibility do you give to that that the guy, Mr. Bradley, is the accused shooter?

JUROR NUMBER 164: I have no idea. Like I said, I have to depend on the evidence brought forward but again I wouldn't know who it was it, could have been snipers (unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: Do you believe that?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Anything could be believable, (unintelligible) a story out there.

MR. MOORE: What I'm getting at is how believable is it that the -- to codefendants, a guy

and a gal, the guy is the, according to the news report, the shooter, how believable is that in your mind? We're not talking about snipers from a roof.

JUROR NUMBER 164: I was (unintelligible) and you're shooting, they shoot to kill.

MR. MOORE: Okay. I mean, in reflecting on what you heard, is it your -- do you have an opinion with respect to Mr. Bradley's guilt now based upon what you heard to any degree, give any credibility to the story that you heard that alleges that he was the shooter?

JUROR NUMBER 164: I have no idea who's (unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: Do you have an opinion with respect to his guilt in this homicide?

JUROR NUMBER 164: No, I don't.

MR. MOORE: Now, I'm talking about the death penalty, have you given it thought to the extent that you had an opinion about the death penalty before you came into this courtroom and became a part of this process?

JUROR NUMBER 164: No.

MR. MOORE: Never thought about it?

JUROR NUMBER 164: No.

MR. MOORE: Or discussed it?

JUROR NUMBER 164: No.

2

MR. MOORE: In casual conversation?

3

JUROR NUMBER 164: Not really.

4

5

open this up to discussion, for discussion purposes,

MR. MOORE: Now, since we're just trying to

6

for discussion purposes, you're in the I'm for it

7

category with qualifications.

8

JUROR NUMBER 164: Um-hmm.

9

MR. MOORE: Can you think of reasons why you

10

would be in favor of the death penalty, in general?

11

Not talking about how you're going to come down in

12

this case, but in general what are reasons why you

13

would in the for death penalty column as opposed to

14

the against death penalty column? If you can think

15

of any.

16

JUROR NUMBER 164: Somebody that

17

(unintelligible).

18

types of homicides where you would say that is a

19

death penalty case, that person should get the death

21

20

penalty and I won't consider -- what do you consider

MR. MOORE: You mentioned -- well, are there

22

maybe circumstances, are there such killings for you,

23

a mass killing like what we just described being one

24

of those where you would not be able to consider

25

mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 164: I would consider mitigating 1 circumstances. 2 MR. MOORE: How about the homicide involving a 3 police officer, is that one where you will not 4 consider mitigating circumstances? 5 JUROR NUMBER 164: I would consider it. 6 MR. MOORE: You mentioned the expense, it's 7 expensive to keep somebody in prison for life, is 8 that a reason for the imposition of the death penalty 9 for you? 10 JUROR NUMBER 164: No, that was just a comment. 11 MR. MOORE: Would that be a factor in any way 12 13 in your decision --JUROR NUMBER 164: Absolutely not. 14 MR. MOORE: -- as to how you would go in this 15 16 case? JUROR NUMBER 164: I don't have to 17 (unintelligible). I mean, my taxes are my taxes, 18 that's just the way it is. 19 MR. MOORE: You sure that would not be a factor 20 in this case? 21 JUROR NUMBER 164: No, it wouldn't be. 22 MR. MOORE: If -- so that we can talk more to 23 get an idea of your understanding of you heard, it's 24

confusing, you never heard this before, you're trying

to, just like everybody else, trying to understand this which is why we spend the time on it, you have to understand it to be a part of this.

JUROR NUMBER 164: True.

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

MR. MOORE: If Mr. Bradley were found guilty of first degree murder, hypothetically, and then -which is a necessary -- it's a prerequisite to your -- to going to the penalty phase, unless that happens you don't go to the penalty phase, right? Let's presume that and then evidence is presented, you hear both sides and you go back deliberate and in your mind, because you have your own individual vote in the penalty phase, in your mind the State has established a whole lot of what are called aggravating circumstances. Now, you don't know what they are so. Let's just say that every, you know, six, five or six or more and so that's -- in your Also in your mind you find that there are no mitigating circumstances or if there are, they're outweighed by the aggravating circumstances, what do you believe at that point your choices are? Do you believe if you stop at that point your vote, you cast your vote as to what the sentence should be, what do you think your choices would be? What do you think your options are? You know that --

JUROR NUMBER 164: I don't know at this time, it would have to be with the supporting evidence.

MR. MOORE: No, I'm not asking you to predict what you will do. You know what this is all about is what you can do, not what are you going to do. We're not asking what can you do. In other words, at that point do you believe that you can vote for death or do you think more has to be done? Let's say you found aggravating circumstances.

JUROR NUMBER 164: More has is to be proven for it to be a death sentence, you know.

MR. MOORE: At that --

JUROR NUMBER 164: He's a young man, (unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: At that point you feel like you could or could not vote for life without parole? Let me --

JUROR NUMBER 164: He have to hear -- go ahead.

MR. MOORE: You are never required at any point to vote for death penalty. Life without parole is never off the table ever. Even if you find all of the aggravating circumstances that are presented and you feel like the State has proven those beyond a reasonable doubt, you find no mitigating circumstances, life without parole is always an

option. You understand?

4 |

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. MOORE: But death as a possible recommendation is off the table, if you feel the State has not proven aggravating circumstances, death is off the table. Or if you find aggravating circumstances and you feel the mitigating circumstances outweigh aggravating circumstances, death is off the table and you have to vote for life.

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. MOORE: You're going to get written instructions so you don't have to --

JUROR NUMBER 164: I understand.

MR. MOORE: You're not going to a test at this point but we have to make sure you understand this. And so the point is life is never off the table whereas death may be, okay, as I been describing to you. You can always vote for life without parole.

What is, in your concept, what is your concept of about what life without parole means? What do you think that means?

JUROR NUMBER 164: They'll be in prison.

MR. MOORE: If I tell you that the law provides that anybody sentenced to life without parole will die in prison and there's no possibility of their

release, do you accept that? Or do you question that?

4

3

JUROR NUMBER 164: I question it a little bit, yes.

5

6

7

8

MR. MOORE: What if -- what would it take for you to be assured that that in fact is the law, a person sentenced to life without parole will die in prison with no possibility of release? If I tell you that is the law, will you accept that?

9

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

11

MR. MOORE: You sure?

12

13

JUROR NUMBER 164: If it is the law. I've never heard of anybody being convicted to life in prison and was on parole.

14

15

16

1.7

18

MR. MOORE: Never heard of anybody getting out, is that what you're saying? I'm telling you, the Court has told you and will instruct you again, life without parole means there's no possibility of release, the person will die in prison. I just need to know if you accept that.

19 20

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

2122

MR. MOORE: You say you do?

23

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

24

MR. MOORE: When the Court instructs you that she will give great weight to the jury's

recommendation, in your thinking at this point, how important do you think the jury's sentencing recommendation is to the sentencing?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Can you repeat that?

MR. MOORE: Sure. She's a judge and she has an ultimate say about what a sentence is, but how important to her the sentence imposed by the Court do you believe the jury's sentencing recommendation is? You think it's not important? Do you think it's something that she can just kind of shrug off? Do you think -- what do you think?

JUROR NUMBER 164: No, I think it's very important, that's why we're here.

MR. MOORE: If I tell you that it's essential, that she can not arrive at a sentence without your recommendation, would you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. MOORE: She can't do it without you.

JUROR NUMBER 164: Right.

MR. MOORE: Let me ask about types of mitigating circumstances. Mental health, do you believe mental health, good mental health is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 164: To a certain sense, yes.

MR. MOORE: Do you believe that people who are

mentally ill can choose not to be?

2

3

JUROR NUMBER 164: No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

qualified experts, mental health experts, that Mr. Bradley suffered from mental illness, is that something you could or would be open to consider, potentially, as a mitigating circumstance? JUROR NUMBER 164: I could yes.

MR. MOORE: If you were to hear testimony from

MR. MOORE: If you were to hear evidence from qualified experts that Mr. Bradley suffered from brain injury or brain damage, is that something that you could be open to considering as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Drug abuse, have you ever known anybody who struggled with drug addiction, let me put it that way, drug addiction?

> JUROR NUMBER 164: I have.

MR. MOORE: Do you think that's a choice? Drug addiction, not drug use, drug addiction.

JUROR NUMBER 164: Well, with that choice, it was their choice (unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: Well, certainly a choice to start using drugs or not, but once one is addicted, do you believe that whether a person can choose or not is

clear cut, a person choose not to be an addict? 1 JUROR NUMBER 164: It's a difficult thing. 2 MR. MOORE: You recognize that people who are 3 addicted struggle for addiction? 4 5 JUROR NUMBER 164: Oh, sure. Some more than others? MR. MOORE: 6 JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes. 7 If you were to hear testimony of MR. MOORE: 8 drug abuse or drug addiction in this case related to 9 Mr. Bradley, is that something that you would be open 10 11 to consider as mitigating? JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes. 12 MR. MOORE: If you heard evidence of physical 13 14 and emotional abuse, childhood physical and emotional abuse, it is that something that you would be open to 15 16 consider? JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes. 17 MR. MOORE: At the penalty phase if you arrive 18 there, the jury's vote does not have to be unanimous. 19 Each juror has the right to his or her own vote. You 20 don't have to come together as a group -- certainly 21 22 to discuss but you don't have to all agree, that's the point. Do you accept that? 23

JUROR NUMBER 164:

2.4

25

MR. MOORE: And you have the right to your own

Yes.

3

5

4

7

6

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 2.4

25

vote, whatever it is, at the penalty phase and you have at right to have your vote respected and you have no obligation to justify your position, do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 164: I do, yes.

MR. MOORE: And similarly, you owe the courtesy to the other jury members of the jury to accept and respect their votes, their opinions, and not try to browbeat them or intimidate them into agreeing with you just because they don't, do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 164: Yes.

MR. MOORE: If I can have a moment.

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

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

MR. MOORE: All right. Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 164, I need you to report back here at 8:30 on Friday morning unless you get a call otherwise.

JUROR NUMBER 164: Okay.

Okay. We do have phone numbers for THE COURT: you, the jury clerks downstairs do. So, our plan is to go into the second phase of jury instructions starting 8:30 Friday morning. So, unless you hear something otherwise, we'll see you then.

```
1
                JUROR NUMBER 164: Friday at 8:30.
                THE COURT: Friday at 8:30. So, at 8:30 report
2
         to the jury assembly room downstairs. Okay?
3
4
                JUROR NUMBER 164: Very good.
5
                THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. Any
          questions or concerns?
6
7
                JUROR NUMBER 164: Not at all.
                THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.
8
9
                (Thereupon, Juror Number 164 exited the
10
    courtroom.)
11
                THE COURT: Okay. Let's take about a ten
         minute break. Court will be in recess until 10:40.
12
                (Thereupon, a recess was taken in the
13
14
    proceedings.)
                THE COURT: Okay. We can bring out
15
16
         Mr. Bradley.
17
                (Thereupon, the defendant was escorted into the
     courtroom by the court deputy.)
18
                THE COURT: Okay. We can bring in Juror Number
19
20
          165.
                (Thereupon, Juror Number 165 was escorted into
21
22
     the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were
23
     had as follows:)
                THE COURT: Okay. Good morning Juror Number
24
25
          165.
```

JUROR NUMBER 165: Good morning.

2 3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

19

21 22

23

24

25

THE COURT: First thing I want to do is thank you for being here. Thank you for your patience with us with regard to this process. When I talked to yesterday afternoon I talked about some rules that kind of came into effect at that time. They came into effect at the time you came and spoke with me. So, since that time, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 165:

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

> JUROR NUMBER 165: No.

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

> JUROR NUMBER 165: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 165: No.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you some I'm going to ask you some questions about the knowledge of the case and then we're going to

talk about the death penalty. The State will have an opportunity to ask you questions and the Defense will have an opportunity to ask you questions. First question -- in questioning you, there are no right or wrong answers. What we ask you to do is be honest, complete, frank. Some people say Judge, can I say this? You can say whatever you want. That's what we need you to -- if you think it's important, we want to hear it. The -- some of the questions will solicit a yes or no answer. You know, with all due respect, we want you to answer yes or no but we understand sometimes the answer is I don't know. You may have to think about some things this morning that you haven't ever really thought about before. is -- there may be some difficult questions about some difficult concepts. So, my first question is kind of easy though. Do you know anything about the case either from your own knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, or from the media, including television, radio, Internet, electronic device, or newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 165: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me specifically, if you can, what information you think you know about the case.

2425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 JUROR NUMBER 165: Just what was on the news back then. 2 THE COURT: Okay. What was on the news when 3 the event occurred? 4 5 JUROR NUMBER 165: Correct. THE COURT: Okay. Would that be by television? 6 JUROR NUMBER 165: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Any information you would have 8 gained from this case, would it be from television? 9 JUROR NUMBER 165: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Okay. You say just from the news 11 back then, what about -- I mean, I'm going to be more 12 13 specific. You know that there was a shooting of a law enforcement. 14 JUROR NUMBER 165: Right. 15 THE COURT: Tell me what else you know. 16 17 JUROR NUMBER 165: That a robbery at a hotel and then the officer pulled the defendant over and 18 19 she was shot. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Do you know anything about the -- when the defendant -- you say pulled -- when 21 the officer pulled the defendant over, anything about 22 23 that? JUROR NUMBER 165: No. 24

THE COURT: Was there anyone else in the car

1 with him? 2 JUROR NUMBER 165: Yeah, there was a girl in 3 the car. THE COURT: Okay. Do you know anything about 4 5 the girl's case? JUROR NUMBER 165: No. 6 7 THE COURT: Did you see pictures of Mr. Bradley in the newspaper? I mean on the television? 8 JUROR NUMBER 165: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Okay. So, you heard about it the 10 day the event happened. What have you heard since? 11 12 JUROR NUMBER 165: Nothing really since. THE COURT: Okay. Did hear anything -- you 13 said you didn't hear anything about the girl's case? 14 JUROR NUMBER 165: No, I don't know anything 15 16 specific about her case. THE COURT: You say I don't know anything 17 specific, do you know anything about it? 18 JUROR NUMBER 165: That she was there. 19 20 THE COURT: Okay. JUROR NUMBER 165: I'm not really sure. 21 THE COURT: So, you haven't heard any follow up 22 23 news with regard to her case? JUROR NUMBER 165: Not really. 24

THE COURT: Not really, is that a yes or no?

JUROR NUMBER 165: I haven't paid attention that much to it.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. And what about did you hear anything about jury selection?

JUROR NUMBER 165: No.

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do in this case, in order to be a juror in the case is to 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 and the evidence presented in this trial in this courtroom, can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 165: Um, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. You said um, yes. So, what -- tell me your thought process.

JUROR NUMBER 165: Well, I work in hospital trauma ICU so I get to see a lot of victims of gunshot wounds and things like that. So, I'm sympathetic to that as far as, you know, like the family is concerned.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you formed any -- and those are the type of things we need you to tell us because we're going to talk about those. Have you formed any fixed or definite opinions about Mr. Bradley?

JUROR NUMBER 165: Not yet, no.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. I mean, some people come in here, this can be an emotional case for some, it's not an emotional case for others, would you consider it an emotional case for you?

JUROR NUMBER 165: I would.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me why.

JUROR NUMBER 165: Because getting to see victims of gunshot wounds and, you know, families whose loved one's in the hospital, I deal with it every day at work.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me tell you what I anticipate is going to happen in this case. I do anticipate -- today there's not very much people here This isn't a very exciting process at the watching. moment. I do anticipate that there will be family members here of the decedent, of Deputy Barbara Pill. I do anticipate there will be family members here. Also, we do anticipate as part of the trial that you will see photographs of Deputy Pill after she was They will be what can be described as graphic. shot. The other thing is there's -- you may see a video of the shooting. That can be described as well as graphic. How do you think that will affect you in your ability to serve in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 165: I don't think that's going

to affect me.

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. You're just saying that you --

JUROR NUMBER 165: It's the emotional aspect of what the family had to deal with and, you know, seeing.

THE COURT: Do you think that for purposes of being a juror in this case you could set that aside and -- I mean, I would think as a result of what you're saying you might be, and I use the word biased, but don't take that offensively, biased in favor of the State?

JUROR NUMBER 165: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you think you can set that aside? What your job is as a juror is to -- the State has the burden of proof. They have to prove each element of each count, and there's four counts, beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. That's their job. They know that's their That's their job in every criminal case. Defense does not have to prove anything. defendant as he sits here today is presumed to be not guilty. In fact, he's presumed to be innocent. reason for that is because there's no evidence and nothing has been presented before the Court. So, he

has the presumption of innocence. That's the basics of pretty much -- I mean, that's the basics of every criminal trial. So, what you would have to do as a juror is to set aside what you know, set aside that, you know, sympathy that you may have for the victim's family and give the defendant the presumption of innocence that the law requires and make the State prove their burden, would you be able to do that?

JUROR NUMBER 165: My feeling is that that would be -- I would still be biased.

THE COURT: Your feeling is that you would still be biased in favor of the victim?

JUROR NUMBER 165: Yes.

THE COURT: And the other thing is you're probably going to hear what's called victim impact statements where the victim's -- if in the event there's a guilty verdict on Count I, the victims have a right to make a statement and you may hear those statements and the instructions are with regard to that is in considering whether to make a recommendation to the Court of death or life in prison without the possibility of parole, you cannot consider those statements as aggravation making the death penalty more likely or as mitigation making life in prison without the possibility of parole,

giving it more weight, you cannot consider that for purposes of aggravating or mitigating, do you think you would be able to do that?

JUROR NUMBER 165: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. You could do that. Your concern is that you would be biased in favor of the State because of what you've experienced in the past?

JUROR NUMBER 165: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you think that this would not be a case that you could be fair and impartial?

JUROR NUMBER 165: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do we.

MR. LANNING: Stipulate.

MR. BROWN: Agreed.

THE COURT: All right. Juror Number 164, or 165, I didn't circle your number, I appreciate your honesty. I appreciate you being -- telling us that information, being direct with us, and I am going to release you from being considered in this case. What I'm going to ask you to do is go downstairs, report to the jury assembly room, they'll give you some brief information and send you on your way. Okay. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 165 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. For purposes of the record, Juror Number 165 has been released for cause. Okay. We'll bring in 171.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 171 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning Juror 171.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Good morning.

THE COURT: First I want to thank you for being here. Thank you for being patient with us with regard to this process. Yesterday when I spoke with you we talked about some rules that came into effect at that time. I'm going to ask you about those rules. Those came into effect when I announced them. Since that time, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

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

No.

JUROR NUMBER 171:

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you some questions this morning. The State may have an opportunity to question you and the Defense may have an opportunity to question you. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Some of the questions may be difficult. Some people haven't thought about these issues previously. We're going to talk to you about prior knowledge of the case and then we're going to talk to you about the death penalty. Some of the questions solicit a response of yes or no. Weed like a yes or no if that's the appropriate response, but if the appropriate response is I don't know, that's a response as well. Okay. The first question I'm going to ask you is do you know anything about this case either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, or from the media, including radio, television, Internet, electron device, or newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what information you believe you know about the case and be specific if

1 you can. JUROR NUMBER 171: Just vaguely seeing it, it 2 was on the news when it first happened, but that's 3 it. 4 THE COURT: Okay. The news when it first 5 happened, would that be on the television? 6 7 JUROR NUMBER 171: Right. THE COURT: Have you seen anything from any 8 other source other than the television? 9 10 JUROR NUMBER 171: No. 11 THE COURT: Read anything in the newspaper, 12 seen anything on the Internet? 13 JUROR NUMBER 171: No. THE COURT: And you said the television when it 14 15 happened? 16 JUROR NUMBER 171: Right. THE COURT: Okay. So, nothing since then? 17 JUROR NUMBER 171: Not really. 18 19 20

THE COURT: Did you know -- you say not really, but did you know anything about jury selection taking place or anything of that?

JUROR NUMBER 171:

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what you believe you know about the case, what you think -- or what was your recollection of what was reported that happened.

1 JUROR NUMBER 171: That some stuff was stolen from a hotel and there was a chase and then a cop was 3 shot. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Did you see pictures of the 5 defendant on the TV, of Mr. Bradley on TV? JUROR NUMBER 171: I don't recall it, I don't 6 7 think so. THE COURT: Okay. Did you hear anything about 8 9 whether he was with anyone? JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes. 10 THE COURT: And who was he with? 11 12 JUROR NUMBER 171: I don't know, some woman. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Anything about the woman? 14 JUROR NUMBER 171: No. 15 THE COURT: Anything about -- anything that you 16 can recall at all about the woman? 17 JUROR NUMBER 171: No. THE COURT: Okay. And you -- anything else, 18 any specifics about the case that you recall? 19 20 JUROR NUMBER 171: That was it what I told you. 21 Okay. What we ask you to do for THE COURT: 22 purposes of this trial is to set aside anything that 23 you may have learned about this case, serve with an open mind and reach a verdict based only on the law 24 25 and the evidence presented in this trial in this

courtroom, can you do that?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

25

24

JUROR NUMBER 171: Not at this time because I don't really know the extent of everything that

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

THE COURT: What happens if you're back at the end of the trial in deliberations and you listen to all the evidence that's been presented in the trial and you say oh, I just remembered, I remembered hearing this but nobody gave me any evidence about that, I never heard anything about that in the courtroom, can you set that aside and not consider it?

JUROR NUMBER 171: I don't really know anything.

Okay. I'm just saying, every once THE COURT: a while you'll go oh, yeah, I remember that, I never heard anything about that.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

THE COURT: Okay. Here's my other question. Did you -- some people have an emotional attachment to information that they've heard, maybe to this particular case because of the information that they've heard, do you feel have any strong feelings about the quilt or the innocence of Mr. Bradley at this time?

happened.

2

that he's guilty?

3 4

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. So, is it fair to say that the case didn't really have an emotional impact on you?

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have an impression

JUROR NUMBER 171: No. I mean, it's a --

THE COURT: I say that and it sounds kind of callous.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right, that's why I say yes, it was a cop but I guess I don't know too much about the story.

THE COURT: So, it doesn't solicit any emotional responses in you at this time?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No. I mean, it's sad that someone died but, you know, but no other emotional.

THE COURT: So, at this time -- I'm going to give you more information about this later but the State has the burden of proof. They have to prove each element of each count beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. That's how it is in every criminal case. They know they have that burden of proof. The Defense and the defendant, they do not have to prove anything. At this time because

there's no evidence before you, no evidence that's come before the Court, the defendant is presumed to be not guilty. In fact, the defendant is presumed to be innocent. Can you presume the defendant to be innocent at this time and make the State meet their burden of proof and prove this case?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Any questions or concerns about that?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Have I not asked you a question and you want to tell me something that I don't know?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to change gears on you, we're going to talk about the death penalty.

What -- and I ask this pretty general just to get your response. What are your reviews about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 171: I think like every case is different so I'm not really against it or for it, it's just depends on the situation of what happened really.

THE COURT: So, if I had to put you in a category of for or against it, you would be in the

category of for it but you have some reservations?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right, because I mean every case is different I guess you would say. So, I mean, you know, in certain cases I would say I was for it, you know, depending on the information and then otherwise, you know, and depending I guess on the crime.

THE COURT: Okay. In this case the first part of the trial is called the guilt phase. In the event the jury returns a verdict of guilty on Count I, and it only pertains to count I, Count I is first degree murder, if there's a guilty verdict on Count I, then we proceed to a second phase and we call that the penalty face. In the penalty phase you would be instructed that you, as a juror you would make a recommendation to the Court of a possible -- of a penalty and you would need to consider death or life in prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty to make a recommendation of one or the other, do you think you could do that?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

THE COURT: And are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. You would be open to consider life in prison without the possibility of parole?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Correct.

THE COURT: And you would -- would you be open to consider it in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. No one's ever going to ask you what you would, what your, what your recommendation would be. Okay. They're not, they're not allowed to ask you that. So, no one's going to ask you that, but they're going to talk to you about can you consider both possibilities and in considering that the Court's going to instruct you about aggravating circumstances and mitigating circumstances. I talked to you about that the other I'm going to talk to you more about that this morning and how you -- give you some assistance in weighing the aggravating circumstances and the mitigating circumstances and assist you in making your recommendation. What we ask you to do is be open minded to consider both possible penalties, can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Questions by the

State.

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. Juror Number 171, good morning.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Good morning.

MR. BROWN: The Court talked to you a little bit about the news that you heard and things that you may remember that you heard or that you read and things of that nature. Would you agree when you -- did you see it on the TV or did you read some articles?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes, I saw it on the TV.

MR. BROWN: Would you agree that when you saw it it's not something that you're focusing on, listening to intently or anything of that nature?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right, it was just on.

MR. BROWN: Right. Right. So, are you confident in the accuracy of what you remember that you heard or is it possible that --

JUROR NUMBER 171: I would say yeah, I mean, just because it was so big, you know.

MR. BROWN: Right. Right. So, you may -you're not entirely certain about the details you
recall, you're maybe not accurately remembering them,
right?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

MR. BROWN: And also when the news is breaking and coming out, would you agree that they may not always have all of the information, may not have it complete?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

MR. BROWN: Sometimes they, you know, occasionally they try not to but occasionally they may get something wrong.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

MR. BROWN: And so -- and that's why the Court asked the questions that certainly you can set aside everything that you heard coming in.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Just basically put it out of your mind because it may be any or a combination of all of those factors. So, the information there may not be correct.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

MR. BROWN: Or accurate or complete.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Correct.

MR. BROWN: And that's why you have to base are verdict on everything that you hear in the courtroom. You put aside what you heard, any preconceived notions that you have, base your verdict on facts and evidence and what you hear, any problem doing that?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

MR. BROWN: Now, concerning the death penalty,

I want to go through the process with you that we
have to go through if you're selected and we get to
that stage. We start with, as the Court mentioned,
the death penalty, to consider it, the jury has to
come back with a verdict of guilty of first degree
murder. If the jury comes back with a lesser charge
such as second degree murder, the death penalty is
off the table and the sentencing is entirely with Her
Honor. If you come back with not guilty, then there
is no sentencing. So, if the jury comes back guilty
of first degree murder.

Now, there are two ways the State can prove first degree murder. One is what's known as premeditated murder, the other is called felony murder. Now, those will be explained to you later on in the process if you advance, but the State can prove it through either of those two ways. They can prove it both ways. Either way it results -- if it's proven it would result in a conviction of a first degree murder which put the death penalty on the table. Now, do you accept and understand that death penalty --

JUROR NUMBER 171: Sorry.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

1718

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

MR. BROWN: That's okay. Death penalty is not automatic?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

MR. BROWN: So, regardless of the facts and circumstances of the case, nothing comes in with automatic death penalty, you have to go through the process.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

MR. BROWN: So, it could be a mass murderer of fifty people, it's not -- nothing is automatic, you have to go through the process. And if the jury comes back with that first degree murder verdict, we would reconvene, additional evidence would be presented and then the Court would give a final set of instructions and in those -- and the jury would deliberate. In those instructions the first step that she's going it tell you to do is to examine what are called aggravating circumstances. Now, if you recall from yesterday when the Court went over this with you, aggravate something circumstances, it's a statutory list and it's circumstances which may increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim and it's to those circumstances and those alone that you look to to determine whether or not the death penalty is justified.

Now, there's a burden of proof. We have to prove those just like in the guilt phase, we have to prove those aggravating circumstances beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. Court gives you that list and you feel the State hasn't proven any of those, then your recommendation has to be life because you would have found there is no aggravating circumstances, no aggravation. feel the State's proven at least one, we may have proven more than one, we may have proved them all, it's going to be a list, I expect it to be more than one, likely three, four, five or six, if you feel the State's proven at least one or more than one, you look at the ones we've proven and ask yourself do these aggravating circumstances justify the death penalty. If you find that they don't, then your recommendation is life. If you find that they do, you move on to the next step in the process and that's where you look at what are called mitigating circumstances. And as the Court told you yesterday, those come from the defendant, his life, his background, character, things concerning him, and just like the aggravating circumstances, if they suggest a recommendation of death, the mitigating circumstances come in and they suggest a sentence of

life. There's a burden of proof for those. It's a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. Obviously like the aggravating circumstances, if something is presented and you find it's not proven, you disregard it. The Court's going to tell you you're going to go through a weighing process, weighing those aggravators against the mitigators.

Now, in your lifetime have you had to make some key, critical important decisions?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Um-hmm.

THE COURT: And when you've made those decisions, did you try to look at all the factors involved?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

MR. BROWN: That's what most people try to do when you make key decisions. And when you looked at everything you found some of those factors very important and you gave them great weight in your decision making, right?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

MR. BROWN: Other factors you looked at and considered them but you said, you know, I looked at this and I thought about it, this really isn't that important and I'm going to give it little weight.

1 |

You agree?

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 171: Okay.

And that's how most of us make, MR. BROWN: typically would make key important decisions. Honor is going to tell you the same process here is that you look, you have to compare and weigh the aggravators and mitigators, you determine how much wait to give each aggravator and to each mitigating circumstance. She's not going to tell you aggravator number one gets X amount of weight and mitigator number one gets X amount of weight. You're not going to hear that. We may suggest in arguments to you but she's not going to tell you how many weight, it's a decision you have to make. There's no magic formula she's going to give you to determine how much weight, it's entirely up to you. And the juror next to you, he or she may decide completely the opposite of your decision as to how much weight. It's a personal decision you make.

Your recommendation that you make in this case for guilt has to be unanimous, the jury has to be unanimous with the decision. For the sentencing phase it's not unanimous. It doesn't have to be (unintelligible) but it doesn't have to be. I could be 12/0, 11/1, 10/2, 9/3 all the way down. Okay.

So, that's why you have to make that decision on your own. You discuss it and talk about it but it's your decision and your vote. So, you have to go through when you weigh. She's not going to tell you, as I said, how much weight. What she is going to tell you you have to go through that weighing process. So, consider everything and you weigh it.

Now, we can't ask you, it wouldn't be fair to ask you how much weight would you give to this aggravator or this mitigator because you haven't heard the evidence, you haven't heard the evidence in support of it and you have to hear everything to determine how much weight because you're weighing them against each other. Right?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

MR. BROWN: So, the question is can you consider it. You may hear we ask you aggravator one or mitigator one could you consider this and you may just think I'll consider it, I may give it that much weight, but can you consider, that's what we need to know, are you open to considering all the aggravators that the Court gives you?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Um-hmm.

MR. BROWN: And likewise if mitigation evidence is presented to you, are you open to consider what's

been proven?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. I'm not going to ask the weight, just the consideration.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

MR. BROWN: So, you go through the process and you weigh the aggravators versus the mitigators. You assign the weight, determine that and you go to the recommendation process. If you determine that the mitigation outweighs the aggravation, then your recommendation has to be life if you find that it outweighs the aggravation. On the other hand, if you find that the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, then you're in a position where you're legally justified to recommend a sentence of death.

Now, the Court's not going to tell you if the State proves A, B, C and D that you must return a recommendation of death. You understand that? In fact, what she's going to tell you is you are never required to recommend the death penalty. What you are required to do is go through that weighing — consider everything and go through that weighing process and then when you weigh it if you weigh it, the aggravators versus the mitigator, you find the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation and at

4

3

5 6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

definite.

that point you feel based on that process that the death penalty is justified, that's when you can recommend the death penalty. Okay. Any questions? JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

MR. BROWN: You feel comfortable in going through that process?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Is there anything in your background, be it political beliefs, philosophical beliefs, religious beliefs, moral beliefs, work history, family history, whatever it may be, that causes you any undue concern, angst, anxiety, troubles in being asked to be in a situation to make that decision or having to make a recommendation of life or death?

JUROR NUMBER 171: I don't think so.

MR. BROWN: If the State of Florida proves to you aggravating circumstances and they're not outweighed by the mitigation and you feel they justify the death penalty, can you, not asking will you, but can you return a recommendation of death?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Probably.

THE COURT: I didn't hear the answer.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Probably. It's not

MR. BROWN: Again, I try to phrase that I'm not 1 asking you what you will do but if we've met the legal burden, which is we've proven aggravating 3 circumstances, they're not outweighed by the 4 mitigation, you feel that those aggravators justify 5 the death penalty, you have to make those findings to 6 be able to recommend that. So, given that situation, 7 again, I'm not asking you what you would do, that 8 wouldn't be a fair question, but can you recommend a 9 sentence of death? 10 11 JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes. MR. BROWN: Thank you. Your Honor, no further 12 13 questions. Okay. Questions by the Defense. 14 THE COURT: Good morning. 15 MR. LANNING: 16 JUROR NUMBER 171: Good morning. MR. LANNING: Juror 171, you've heard the Judge 17 vesterday when she pretty much read the instructions 18 19 to you about this weighing process --20 JUROR NUMBER 171: Right. MR. LANNING: -- that you go through and now 21 22 you've heard Mr. Brown go through it a second time. 23 JUROR NUMBER 171: Um-hmm. 24 MR. LANNING: Sound complicated?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yeah.

25

MR. LANNING: Okay. Well, I would like to know at this point in time what your understanding is as to your options, what you're supposed to do if you get to a certain point. A little bit of a pop quiz.

JUROR NUMBER 171: You mean guilty versus not guilty?

MR. LANNING: No, no, based on this weighing process of aggravators and mitigators.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Right.

MR. LANNING: Because we're jumping way ahead of the gun. There's not been a guilt phase. We're not conceding the guilt but we have to do this up front to talk about the possible death penalty.

At this point in time, what is your understanding of what you're supposed to do assuming that the State has presented aggravation, it might be every aggravator that they've asked for and aggravation is high and any mitigation that you've heard has been low, what is your understanding at this point as to what you're to do?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Whatever outweighs it (unintelligible).

MR. LANNING: Okay. You failed.

JUROR NUMBER 171: Okay.

MR. LANNING: The instructions -- if the

aggravation outweighs the mitigation, that's the first time that you can keep and could give the death penalty. Okay? It's not saying that you should. There's nothing in the jury instructions that would tell you you should give the death penalty under those circumstances. There's nothing in the instructions that says you must. There's not even anything that says that you should. It's the first — it's like you're being — you're going through this process but the most you will get is a permission slip. Then it becomes on you and even at that point it's a can, not necessarily I should.

Do you have a conception in your mind of what life in prison without the possibility of parole means?

JUROR NUMBER 171: It means he'll never get out of jail.

MR. LANNING: No question in your mind that that is the law?

JUROR NUMBER 171: That I know.

MR. LANNING: The State has to prove the aggravation beyond a reasonable doubt and the mitigation is a lower, is a lower burden of proof, it's by the greater weight of the evidence. That means if you're reasonably convinced that that

mitigation has been proved, you can take it as 1 2 proven. What's your impression of what might constitute 3 mitigation? 4 JUROR NUMBER 171: I guess background. 5 MR. LANNING: Okay. Part of it. 6 7 JUROR NUMBER 171: Previous history, what happened prior to this incident. 8 MR. LANNING: Okay. I'd like to give you a few 9 examples and see if it's evidence that you could 1.0 consider as mitigation. If evidence were presented 11 by qualified witnesses, experts, that Mr. Bradley 12 suffers from brain damage, is that something that you 13 14 could consider as mitigation? JUROR NUMBER 171: Yeah. 15 16 MR. LANNING: Could you -- are you familiar at all with MRI? Do you know what that is, what an MRI 17 18 is? JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes. 19 MR. LANNING: Okay is that something you would 2.0 be open to consider in terms of considering whether 21 there's been brain damage? 22 23 JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

> MR. LANNING: What about mental illness, if evidence were presented through experts that

24

25

MR.

Mr. Bradley suffers from mental illness, is that evidence that you could consider as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

MR. LANNING: What about drug abuse and drug addiction? Some people feel that drug addiction is a choice, that it's not mitigating in any way. And again, there's no right or wrong answer in here. What's your opinion?

JUROR NUMBER 171: It can be, I don't know for sure.

MR. LANNING: All right. I don't know if it's been brought up to you at this point but some evidence that may come into this case involves photographs and video, photographs of the deputy after her death in autopsy and video of the death.

It's graphic. Does that cause you any concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

MR. LANNING: In your -- you indicated that you weren't really for the death penalty, that every case is different. Are there any situations in your mind that that is a slam dunk death case, that person needs to be put down?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Child molesters, people that abuse children or kill children.

MR. LANNING: In that situation, in the case of

2
 3
 4

a child molester, and you understand that it's only if there were also a murder that there could be a death sentence, but in a situation like that, would you still be able to consider mitigation or would that just be a case where you would feel like I don't care what they put on?

JUROR NUMBER 171: That specific case with children?

MR. LANNING: Sure.

JUROR NUMBER 171: I probably wouldn't be able to consider anything else (unintelligible).

MR. LANNING: How about any others that you can think of?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No, that's probably the only one that I was thinking of.

MR. LANNING: What about a person who's charged with killing, a mass murderer, would you still be open to considering mitigation evidence in that situation?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Let me ask you this. If you put your level of support for the death penalty on a scale between zero and ten, zero being no support, I don't think the death penalty should ever be involved, number ten I am strongly for the death

penalty, we probably need to see it more often, where 1 were you place yourself in that level? 2 JUROR NUMBER 171: Again, I'm kind of in the 3 middle. I mean (unintelligible). I mean, I'm right 4 in the middle. 5 6 MR. LANNING: May I have a moment? 7 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 8 (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the 9 proceedings.) 10 MR. LANNING: What are your thoughts of why you support the death penalty? 11 12 JUROR NUMBER 171: Why? MR. LANNING: Yeah. If you woke up tomorrow 13 morning and found out you're the governor of Florida 14 and you got to make the rules, would you have a death 15 16 penalty? 17 JUROR NUMBER 171: Probably. MR. LANNING: Okay. Any reason why? 18 JUROR NUMBER 171: Just because in some cases 19 it does deserve, I guess you would say, the death 20 penalty like we were discussing, like, you know, 21 children being killed and other reasons, you know. 22 So, I probably say yes, maybe someone does deserve 23

MR. LANNING: And part of this case could also

24

25

it.

involve what's called victim impact evidence and that's where witnesses and other evidence could be presented to show the effect of the death of the decedent on friends, family and community. That evidence, you would be instructed that you could not consider that as aggravating, it couldn't be considered as an aggravating circumstance. There's no instruction as to how you could use that but only the instruction that you couldn't use it to consider as aggravation. That evidence I think you could imagine could be emotional and upsetting, is the instruction that you could not consider that as aggravation, could you follow that instruction?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

MR. LANNING: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 171, I'm going to release you for today. You're still being considered as a potential juror in this case. I'm going to ask you, unless you get a phone call otherwise, to report back at 8:30 on Friday morning. Report to the jury assembly room at that time.

During this recess you must abide by those rules governing your service as a juror. Do not talk about this case with anyone. Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio, or Internet comments about the

Don't conduct any independent research. Now, 1 do you have any questions or concerns? 2 JUROR NUMBER 171: No. 3 THE COURT: Okay. So, we'll see you Friday at 4 5 8:30. 6 JUROR NUMBER 171: Okay. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. (Thereupon, Juror Number 171 exited the 8 9 courtroom.) THE COURT: Okay. We can bring in Juror 172. 10 (Thereupon, Juror Number 172 was escorted into 11 the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were 12 had as follows:) 13 THE COURT: Okay. Good morning Juror Number 14 172. Thank you for being here. Thank you for being 15 a part of this process, being patient with us 16 regarding the process. When I spoke to you yesterday 17 I talked about some rules that came into effect. 18 Those rules started at that time. So, I'm going to 19 ask you about those since they started. Have you 20 read or been exposed to reading newspaper articles 21 headlines or anything related to this trial or its 22 23 participants? JUROR NUMBER 172: No. 24

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television,

25

2

case?

radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 172: No.

4

3

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

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you some questions

5

JUROR NUMBER 172: No.

6 7

8

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

opportunity to ask you some questions, the Defense

will have an opportunity to ask you some questions.

There are no right or wrong answers to the questions,

this morning and then the State will have an

we just ask you to be honest, complete, frank,

provide full disclosure. Most -- some of the

questions may solicit a yes or no response.

that's an acceptable response as well.

the things you may have never thought about before

and if the answer to the question is I don't know,

question I'm going to ask you is pretty simple.

you know anything about this case either from your

9 10

JUROR NUMBER 172:

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

21

20

2.2

23 24

25

own knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, or from the media, including radio, television,

Internet, electronic device, or newspapers? 1 JUROR NUMBER 172: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what information you 3 know about the case. 4 JUROR NUMBER 172: I saw a couple of news 5 stories when it happened. Do you want specific 6 details? 7 THE COURT: If you know -- yes, specifics if 8 9 you can, please. 10 JUROR NUMBER 172: I mean, I have a vague recollection of what happened. There was some kind 11 of car chase and in the process the deputy was shot. 12 And I think there was one other person that was in --13 another person involved, I think it was a woman. 14 15 not sure what happened to her. THE COURT: Okay. So, you would have heard 16 that at the time of the event? 17 JUROR NUMBER 172: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Did you -- have you heard anything 19 since then? 20 21 JUROR NUMBER 172: Not really. THE COURT: Have you heard that there was jury 22 selection? 23 JUROR NUMBER 172: That I did hear. 24

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

25

JUROR NUMBER 172: I thought it was over by the 1 time I got here. THE COURT: So, have you heard anything else? 3 JUROR NUMBER 172: No. 4 THE COURT: Where would you have gotten that 5 information? 6 JUROR NUMBER 172: I got it from the TV and 7 then the neighbor that I lived next door to at the 8 time, she was a Melbourne police officer. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Do you still live next door 10 11 to that neighbor? JUROR NUMBER 172: No, I don't but I still talk 12 13 to her. THE COURT: Okay. So, you're friends with a 14 15 Melbourne police officer? 16 JUROR NUMBER 172: Yes, her husband or -- yeah, her husband and my boyfriend work together at Brevard 17 18 Fire Rescue. THE COURT: Okay. So, your -- is it your 19 20 current boyfriend as well? JUROR NUMBER 172: Yes. 21 22 THE COURT: Works at Brevard Fire Rescue? JUROR NUMBER 172: 23 THE COURT: Okay. Because of those 24

relationships, have you formed or -- generally, have

25

you formed any fixed opinions about the guilt or innocence of the defendant?

JUROR NUMBER 172: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Would you have trouble sitting on this case knowing that a witness may be someone from the Melbourne Police Department?

JUROR NUMBER 172: Trouble. It would probably be easier for me to -- because of my friend, my neighbor that I used to live next door to. So, it may influence me.

THE COURT: Okay. And some of the witnesses may be from, I don't know if it's Brevard Fire and Rescue, I think it is.

JUROR NUMBER 172: I didn't recognize any of the names that were read.

THE COURT: Would that cause you concern knowing that it may be some coworkers of your boyfriend?

JUROR NUMBER 172: No. I mean, he works up in Rockledge so he doesn't really -- well, he knows people, but we don't really (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. Does the fact that this is a -- the fact that this involves the death of a law enforcement officer, does that cause you some concern?

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 172: Yes, knowing my neighbor I have a deep respect for her and for police in general.

Okay. What we ask you to do in THE COURT: this case, the State has the burden of proof and -that's in every criminal case. They have to prove each count -- each element of each count beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. defendant does not have to prove anything. defendant is presumed at this time because there's no evidence before the Court to be not guilty. the defendant is presumed to be innocent. We need jurors who are -- can be not biased in favor of the State or biased in favor of the Defense, not be prejudiced against the State or prejudiced against the defense. I instruct you that, you know, as a juror you can't have those considerations. Do you think the fact -- I mean, in this case based on your affection I assume for the Melbourne police officer, do you think you could you would be biased in favor of the State?

JUROR NUMBER 172: You kind of touched on it yesterday about the testimony of police officers, I would probably be a little bit more inclined to give them more credibility.

2

3

5

6

4

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. So, let's talk -- because you have respect for police officers.

JUROR NUMBER 172: Yes, having been with my boyfriend and knowing his friends, I just attended the wedding of a fireman and BCSO deputy, I have a great respect for what they do on a day-to-day basis.

THE COURT: Okay. So, let's talk about that. What I told you before is that I'm going to give you instructions on how to -- how you weigh the testimony of any witness. I do that first just so you know what the general rules are. And then I tell you that -- I give you an instruction about law enforcement officers. Now, in this case we expect there will be law enforcement officers, not that list that you heard, but there will be law enforcement officers, not that entire list, but there will be some law enforcement officers. What I tell you is that when they come in you have to be able to weigh their testimony the same as you weigh other witnesses testimony. Now, after you hear the testimony the weight that you decide to give their testimony, that's up to you after you hear my instructions on how to do it and after you hear the testimony. know, obviously as a juror you're going to hear some testimony and you're going to go I give great weight

to that testimony, I don't know if I believe that other testimony. I mean, you get to decide you want to give great weight to it, little weight or no weight to it. You can hear a person's testimony and say I'm not considering it, I don't believe that, I'm not considering that. You have the right to do that as a juror. But what you can't do is give them extra credit because of their profession, any profession, and that includes law enforcement officers or fire -fire -- I call them -- I guess they're firefighters. 10 11 Can they still call them that?

JUROR NUMBER 172:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I don't know if that's politically correct, I think they're fire and rescue, but for purposes of this discussion I'll call them firefighters, can't give them extra credit just because of their profession. That's easy for me to tell you that's the instruction but you may say no, based on my experience and based on what I know I can't do that. Is that your concern?

JUROR NUMBER 172: Why yes.

THE COURT: So, you would give greater weight to the testimony of a law enforcement officer?

JUROR NUMBER 172: I just would give greater credibility. When I -- I've sat on a trial before

2

and the testimony you have to look at it as if it would apply to the case.

3

THE COURT: Right. Right.

4

JUROR NUMBER 172: So, weight maybe, maybe not,

5

but credibility, yes.

6

THE COURT: So, when you say credibility,

7

you're talking about believability?

8

JUROR NUMBER 172: Yes.

9

THE COURT: So, if there was a dispute between

10

the police officer said one thing and someone else

11

said another thing, you would give more credibility

12

to the police officer's testimony?

13

JUROR NUMBER 172: Yes.

14

THE COURT: Okay. Do we?

15

MR. BROWN: Stipulate.

16

MR. MOORE: Stipulate.

17

THE COURT: Then Juror One 172, you don't have

18

to worry about that surgery on March the 25th, you'll

19

20

JUROR NUMBER 172: Okay.

be good to go.

21

THE COURT: I'm going to go ahead and release

22

you from being considered as a juror in this case.

23

do want to thank you for being patient with us about

24

the process. I'm going to ask you to go downstairs.

25

You are released. Just tell them that you've been

2

released, they're going to give you some general information and send you on your way.

3

JUROR NUMBER 172: Okay.

4

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

5 6

courtroom.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 174: No.

JUROR NUMBER 174: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Just for the record, Juror Number 172 is released for cause. We can bring in Juror Number 174.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 172 exited the

(Thereupon, Juror Number 176 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Good -- go ahead, be seated. Good morning Juror Number 174. First of all, I want to thank you for being part of this process. you for being patient with us. Yesterday I talked to about some rules that came into effect. Those rules started at that time. So, I'm going to ask you since I talked to you about those rules, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

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

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11 12 13

1415

16 17

18 19

21

20

22

24

23

25

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

JUROR NUMBER 174: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 174: No.

THE COURT: Now, I'm going to ask you some There's no right or wrong answers to the questions I'm going to ask and then the State may have an opportunity to question and you and the Defense may have an opportunity to question you. What I -- with regard to your answers, we just ask you to be honest, frank, provide full disclosure. And like I said, there are no right or wrong answers. Some of the answers are going to solicit a response These -- there may be some hard of yes or no. questions that's asked of you. If the answer is I don't know, that's a valid response as well. I'm going to need you to speak up because everything is being recorded. So, we need to get an audio answer from you. My first question I'm going to ask you is do you know anything about this case either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by

discussions with anyone else, or from the media, 1 including radio, television, an Internet device, or 3 newspapers? JUROR NUMBER 174: I do from the very first 4 5 time that it happened, when it happened. 6 THE COURT: Okay. JUROR NUMBER 174: It read it in the papers. 7 THE COURT: Okay. At the time that it 8 9 occurred? 10 JUROR NUMBER 174: Right. THE COURT: You read something in the paper? 11 JUROR NUMBER 174: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Would the newspaper be your 13 14 primary source of information? JUROR NUMBER 174: And also television. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Did you see something on 16 television as well? 17 JUROR NUMBER 174: That was when it happened, 18 the first time it appeared in the paper. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what specific 20 information you believe you know about this case. 21 22 JUROR NUMBER 174: I know about the robbery of the hotel and then the killing of the woman deputy 23 24 sheriff.

THE COURT: Okay.

25

1 JUROR NUMBER 174: That's it. THE COURT: Okay. Anymore specifics? You said 2 robbery in a hotel, that was a specific. 3 JUROR NUMBER 174: I just know the names. 4 5 THE COURT: And you know of the names of the individuals involved? 6 JUROR NUMBER 174: Yeah. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Do you know anything about a 8 codefendant, about someone else that may or may not 9 have been with Mr. Bradley? No? 10 JUROR NUMBER 174: No. 11 12 THE COURT: Did you ever see a picture of 13 Mr. Bradley? JUROR NUMBER 174: Yes, in the paper. 14 THE COURT: In the paper. Okay. So, you 15 gained that information at the time of the event, 16 17 correct? JUROR NUMBER 174: Yes. 18 THE COURT: What have you heard since then? 19 JUROR NUMBER 174: I think I read like one, 20 two, three days and after that I didn't pay 21 22 attention. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Did you hear anything about jury selection taking place? 24 JUROR NUMBER 174: No. 25

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do as part of this process is 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 in this courtroom, can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 174: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have -- when I say serve with an open mind, do you have any fixed opinions about the guilt or the innocence of the defendant at this time?

JUROR NUMBER 174: What does that mean?

THE COURT: Okay. At this time in a criminal case, all criminal cases, the State of Florida has the burden of proof. They have to prove each element of each crime beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. That's their job in every criminal case. They know that's their job. The defendant and the Defense do not have to prove anything. They are -- so, at this time because there's no evidence that's been presented before the Court, the defendant is not guilty and so you have to come into this courtroom and say from the beginning of trial because you haven't heard anything that yes, the defendant is not guilty. In fact, you have to give -- presume

that the defendant is innocent. Can you presume that the defendant is innocent at this time for this case?

JUROR NUMBER 174: Not hundred percent.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOORE: What was the answer?

THE COURT: Not a hundred percent. Okay. Tell me what you're thinking. Tell me why you say not a hundred percent.

JUROR NUMBER 174: Well the first time when I read that, because it was a female police officer, I was just really mad.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 174: For that to be done to her.

MR. MOORE: I'm having trouble hearing.

JUROR NUMBER 174: Because being a mother --

THE COURT: Okay. If you could try to speak up just a little bit. Okay. Say that again if you can. I heard that you said because -- when you first heard the case you were really mad because it was a female police officer and you're a mother.

JUROR NUMBER 174: Yes.

THE COURT: So --

JUROR NUMBER 174: And then the one who did it was a young man, you know, it's just like -- I don't know, I guess it's from my culture and how we respect

our elderly, mothers, grandmothers. So, that (unintelligible) I was like really mad.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 174: Why did he do it, you know, he shouldn't have done it.

THE COURT: So, it solicited an emotional response from you in hearing what the charges were and what may have been done?

JUROR NUMBER 174: Right.

THE COURT: Okay. For purposes of this trial, knowing that is this case and it's that case and you'll have to determine the guilt or innocence of Mr. Bradley, would you be able to do that? And you have assume for this time at this moment that he's not guilty.

JUROR NUMBER 174: I don't think he's innocent.

THE COURT: You don't think he's innocent.

Okay. And so would it be fair to say that you would be -- do you know what the word biased means, that you would be biased in favor of the State?

JUROR NUMBER 174: I don't know if that's being biased but it's just.

THE COURT: You would favor the State in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 174: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOORE:

THE COURT:

Stipulate.

Okay. Then Juror Number 174, I am

courtroom.)

in this case. Okay. I do appreciate you coming to be here. I wish I could have gotten to you sooner but I have to go by the numbers and the process does take a little bit of time, but I do want to thank you for being part of the process and thank you for being here. I'm going to have you go downstairs, speak to the jury assembly person downstairs in the jury assembly room and they're going to release you and just take your badge and just give you some brief.

Okay? Okay. So, thank you for being here.

going to release you from being considered as a juror

THE COURT: Okay. So, for the record, Juror Number 174 has been struck for cause. So, we'll bring in Juror Number 175, and I know I need to ask him about his work. Mr. Moore, he can't do the thumbs up.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 174 exited the

MR. MOORE: Only in private.

THE COURT: If they both do it, you can.

MR. MOORE: As long as nobody can see.

THE COURT: Can't do it with the jury.

MR. PIROLO: Can he do thumbs down?

2

THE COURT: You can probably do it now. You

3

can do it now, you just can't do it.

4

5

the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were

6

had as follows:)

176.

7

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning Juror Number

(Thereupon, Juror Number 175 was escorted into

8

9

JUROR NUMBER 175: 75.

10

THE COURT: I mean 175, sorry about that, I'm

11

looking ahead, Juror Number 175. First of all, I

12

want to thank you for being here. Thank you for

13

being patient with us. Thank you for participating

14

in this process. When we spoke to you yesterday you

15

were going to go and try to get some information and

16

you didn't have much time but hopefully you had

17

enough time to get that information. Tell me where

18

we're at with regard to that.

19

in the day by the time I got out of here so it was

JUROR NUMBER 175: Well, I did -- it was late

20

difficult to round up everybody that I needed to, but

2122

I did get the most important people and they pretty

23

well echoed the same thing that I said yesterday. My

24

boss's exact words were you've got to be kidding me,

25

you know, when I told him about four or five weeks

1 | 2 |

and there's a lot of stuff cued up, you know, for me to do and even (unintelligible) I was not aware of yesterday they're also cued up for me to do.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 175: So it's going to cause complications on the company side for sure.

THE COURT: Okay. If you --

MR. MOORE: Stipulate.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

apparently they have a stipulation about with regard to that. Okay. Juror Number 175, then I'm going to release you from being considered as a juror in this case. I wish I could have gotten to you sooner. I feel kind of responsible to have to go by the numbers. I have to go in order. I have to make this as fair a process as I can.

JUROR NUMBER 175: That's fine.

THE COURT: Fair and impartial process as I can, that's my job, but I do appreciate you going back and getting that information. You know, hopefully it would have worked out but I understand and they've stipulated that you can be released. So, I will release you from being considered as a juror in this case. If you would go downstairs, report to

the jury assembly room, they'll just give you some 1 brief information and send you on your way. 2 JUROR NUMBER 175: Okay. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. 4 5 JUROR NUMBER 175: Thank you, Your Honor. (Thereupon, Juror Number 175 exited the 6 7 courtroom.) THE COURT: Okay. For the record, Juror Number 8 175 has been released for cause. Okay. We're 9 scheduled to start with Jurors Number 177 through 189 10 and that's at 1:15. Anything we need to discuss 11 12 before that time? Okay. MR. MOORE: No. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Court will be in recess 14 15 until 1:15. Thank you. (Thereupon, a recess was taken in the 16 proceedings.) 17 THE COURT: Please be seated. Okay. 18 bring in Mr. Bradley. 19 (Thereupon, the defendant was escorted into the 20 courtroom by the court deputy.) 21 THE COURT: What's the status of our jury? 22 THE COURT DEPUTY: Your Honor, they're on their 23 24 way up now. THE COURT: Okay. Any matters that we need to 25

discuss prior to bringing in jurors? 1 No, Your Honor. 2 MR. BROWN: MR. MOORE: No, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. We'll wait for them and then 4 5 we'll start the process. 6 (Thereupon, a pause was taken in the 7 proceedings.) THE COURT: Okay. Can I have a bench 8 conference, please? 9 (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had as 10 11 follows:) 12 THE COURT: If you recall yesterday, we had the juror that asked questions about my recess 13 instruction, Juror Number 188, he's part of this 14 group. He wants to talk to the Court. He wants to 15 16 come in. He is pretty emotional. He told one of the deputies that his son was incarcerated last year and 17 when his son was released he committed suicide. 18 he's emotional about being here, emotional about this 19 20 process. 21 It would probably be best to take him so he doesn't --2.2 23 THE COURT: I was going to take him out of 24 order because I just didn't want him talking to the

25

other jurors.

MR. MOORE: Okay.

2

THE COURT: So, I'll take him first.

3

(Thereupon, the benchside conference was

4

concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:)

5

THE COURT: Okay. You can tell them that we'll

6

do 188 first.

7

THE COURT DEPUTY: It will be just a moment,

8

Your Honor. I don't think they're up yet. They're

9

not up yet.

10

(Thereupon, a pause was taken in the

11

proceedings. Thereafter, Juror Number 188 was escorted

12

into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings

13

were had as follows:)

14

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon Juror 188.

15

You have some things -- that I would discuss with you

16

but you asked the court deputies if you could be

17

taken out of order and you said that there was some

18

matters that you wanted to discuss with us. So, I'm

19

going to let you go first and tell me what it is you

20

think that the Court should know.

21

22

twenty-seven years old, I'm from Illinois suburb of

JUROR NUMBER 188: I had a son that was

23

Chicago, and he was charged with domestic violence

24

and then, which I know is his fault and everything,

25

and we lived in (unintelligible) County. So, his

3 4

5

6

7 8

10

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

girlfriend dropped the charges but the county still

THE COURT: Okay.

had to pursue the matter.

JUROR NUMBER 188: So, he was sentenced to five months in jail even though his girlfriend dropped the charges. So, then after he got out of jail he lost his job and so he didn't have a job and on his record it was felony conviction. So, he tried to get different jobs and once they saw that they didn't hire him and then he committed suicide. So -- which I know, that, you know, it's different issues because he caused it himself, but in Cook County which, there was an officer which, it doesn't matter if he's an officer or not, they had it right on TV on a film that he stood there and beat the heck out of a bartender, I mean, it was right on TV for weeks at a time, and he never -- all I got was probation and it just upset me so bad that here my son had to serve five months in jail, his first conviction of anything, and then he ended up not able to get a job he ended up committing suicide and that was the only son I had. So, it just -- yesterday being here just -- I had a hard night last night because it's still, you know. We moved out of Chicago to get away from the memories and that. So, that's -- I just

don't feel I would be a good person to be here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

20

19

21

22 23

24

25

THE COURT: So, even though that's a different state and a different county, just being in the courthouse in and of itself is upsetting to you?

JUROR NUMBER 188: Yes, I'd thoughts in my mind last night.

THE COURT: Okay. One of the things we talk about is ability to concentrate and pay attention. Obviously, just for the record, you appear to be upset, your hands are shaking a little bit, I can understand that. Do you think it would be difficult for you to give this case the attention that it would need in order to go through the process?

JUROR NUMBER 188: Yes.

THE COURT: I just didn't hear you. How long ago did that occur?

JUROR NUMBER 188: Well, seven years ago.

THE COURT: Okay. And it's still bothering you to this extent at this time?

JUROR NUMBER 188: Yeah. I mean, if he had died in a car accident or something like that, you know, it would be accepted but when it was suicide it just to me is the worst way to go.

THE COURT: I noticed that yesterday when I talked about the instructions with regard to recess

you were concerned about that. So, I have a little bit of concern in the ability to follow those instructions. How --

MR. MOORE: We can stipulate.

THE COURT: Okay. Then Number 188, we'll go ahead and release you so that you won't have to be here any longer. You are released from being considered as a juror in this case. Thank you for being here. Thank you for being involved in the process. I do need you to report downstairs to the jury assembly room and they'll give you further instructions but it will only be brief and then you'll be sent on your way.

JUROR NUMBER 188: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

JUROR NUMBER 188: Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 188 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. For the record, Juror Number 188 will be released for cause. Now, they told me that there was some people that weren't here.

THE COURT DEPUTY: I think they're all here now.

THE COURT: Okay. They're all here. Okay.

I'll have Juror 177.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 177 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon Juror Number 177.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Thank you for being here. Thank
you for being patient with us with regard to this
process. I'm going to ask you some questions first
about yesterday when we recessed I talked about some
rules. Those rules came into place, came into play
as of that time. So, as of the announcement of those
rules, have you read or been exposed to reading
newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this
trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 177: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 177: 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?

2

JUROR NUMBER 177: No, ma'am.

3

4

5

J

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay.

through coworkers.

JUROR NUMBER 177: No

Not through news.

JUROR NUMBER 177: I know about the case just

THE COURT: Now I'm going you to ask you some questions about your knowledge of the case and then I'm going to ask you questions about the death penalty. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions. We just ask you to be open, frank, honest, give us the information that you think is necessary for us to know in order to make a fair -- a decision who can be fair and impartial in this case and with whom both sides are comfortable. going to ask you questions and the answers to the questions sometimes may ask for a yes or no but sometimes you may say I can't answer that that way. So, you answer it however you're comfortable with answering it. The first question I'm going to ask you is what do you know -- do you know anything about this case whether from your other personal knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, or from the media, including radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspaper?

THE COURT: So, you haven't read anything about 1 the case or seen anything about the case? JUROR NUMBER 177: No. 3 THE COURT: Do you normally listen to or hear 4 5 local news? JUROR NUMBER 177: No, I don't. 6 THE COURT: Okay. So, like say on a weekly 7 basis you wouldn't have known anything? 8 JUROR NUMBER 177: No. 9 THE COURT: So, you heard some discussions from 10 coworkers. Where do you work? 11 12 JUROR NUMBER 177: (Unintelligible). THE COURT: Okay. Do you -- so, you know 13 14 something from that? 15 JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes. 16 THE COURT: And -- so, apparently there was a discussion among coworkers? 17 JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Was that the day of the event or 19 somewhere near the date? 20 JUROR NUMBER 177: The day of the event. 21 22 THE COURT: What did you hear? JUROR NUMBER 177: Just that it had happened, 23 an officer had been killed. 24 THE COURT: Tell me what specific information 25

1 that was talked about. JUROR NUMBER 177: Just the whereabouts, where 2 it was, near Eau Gallie, that an officer had been 3 shot and that's basically it. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Did you here anything about 5 anything that happened before an officer was shot? 6 JUROR NUMBER 177: No. 7 THE COURT: Did you hear -- did you talk about 8 who may have shot the officer? 9 JUROR NUMBER 177: No. 10 THE COURT: Okay. How long a conversation was 11 12 it? 13 JUROR NUMBER 177: Maybe two minutes. THE COURT: Okay. 14 JUROR NUMBER 177: At the most. 15 THE COURT: So, there was -- that an officer 16 had been shot and talking about the location of it? 17 JUROR NUMBER 177: Right, it was in the break 18 19 room, you know. THE COURT: Okay. Did you -- any other 20 specifics? 21 22 JUROR NUMBER 177: No, ma'am. 23 THE COURT: Any specifics about -- know specifics about what may have lead up to the 2.4

25

shooting?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No. 1 THE COURT: Did you talk about the event 2 3 afterwards? JUROR NUMBER 177: No. 4 THE COURT: Talk about it since? 5 6 JUROR NUMBER 177: THE COURT: Did you know that -- did you hear 7 anything about jury selection going on with regard to 8 this case? 9 JUROR NUMBER 177: The only thing I heard was 10 approximately a week to ten days ago when there was 11 the person that was shot here. 12 THE COURT: Oh, yes. 13 JUROR NUMBER 177: I heard that it was during 14 the jury selection. 15 16 THE COURT: Okay. That jury selection in this case was going on at the same time. 17 JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes. 18 THE COURT: And who did you hear that from? 19 JUROR NUMBER 177: Coworkers. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Did --21 JUROR NUMBER 177: I'm in HR so I don't really 22 associate with a lot of the workers, it's just 23 usually during, you know, the breaks. 24

THE COURT: So. You work in like an office at

25

the Belk?

JUROR NUMBER 177: I do.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you formed any fixed opinions with regard to the guilt or innocence of Mr. Bradley in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any emotional attachments to this case?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No.

THE COURT: Some people say it's a law enforcement officer, I feel this way because.

JUROR NUMBER 177: No.

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do is 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, can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to switch gears on you. What are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 177: I'm not against it but I've

never been put in that situation to make a decision.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 177: So, honestly I'm not sure.

THE COURT: Is it a discussion that you've had

previously?

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

JUROR NUMBER 177: With my, with my husband who's now deceased because he was very much for it. So, we did discuss it. Like I said, I'm not totally against it but when put to the test, you know, could I do it, I'm not sure.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 177: I'm not sure.

THE COURT: So, if I had to say you were for it or against it and put you in one category or the other, I would probably have to say you're for it?

JUROR NUMBER 177: I would say I'm not against it.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 177: But if I personally have to be put in that position to make that decision, I'm not sure.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 177: You know, I would have to know all of the facts.

THE COURT: It's a hard position to be.

JUROR NUMBER 177: It is.

THE COURT: It's definitely -- most of the people that come here we ask them questions, they never thought about these questions before.

2

3

4

6

5

7

9

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yeah, exactly.

THE COURT: So, it's okay. If you need -- if a question is asked of you and you need to think about it for a moment, you're welcome to do that too because you may hear some questions here this afternoon that you've never thought about before.

I'm going to talk to you a little bit about the I talked to you about it a little bit yesterday. This is kind of a general overview and then I'm sure the attorneys will go more into detail. The first part of the trial is what we call the guilt In the guilt phase if the jury returns a phase. verdict of guilty on Count I, only pertains to Count I, and that's guilty on Count I which is first degree murder, then and only then do we proceed into a second phase which is called the penalty phase. In the penalty phase you will hear additional evidence about aggravating and mitigating circumstances. Aggravating circumstances tend to -- aggravating circumstances are circumstances that aggravate the Okay. Mitigating circumstances are circumstances that lessen the crime for whatever reasons. And there are specific instructions associated with both and you're going to hear those this morning. You're going to get instructions on

how to lead you into making a recommendation to the Court and what I will instruct you to do is to -your duty as a juror and I will instruct you to do
that is to make a recommendation to the Court of a
penalty and you are to consider death or life in
prison without the possibility of parole as a
recommendation. So, my question to you becomes would
you be able to consider both penalties?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. The ultimate decision is yours. Nobody today is going to ask you a question that says if that happens what would you do, what they're going to ask you though is can you -- if this happens, can you consider both possible penalties. What we want you to do is serve with an open mind, listen to everything and then make your decision, but be open to listening to everything. Some people say, and I'm going to ask you this. Some people say that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree, do you agree with that?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I mean, it's based on what you -- what we need to find out this afternoon is what you think what you would be open to consider. No right or wrong answers. What we -- we just ask

2

3

5

6

7

9

11 12

10

14

13

1516

1718

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

you to follow the Court's instructions and consider both possible penalties. Could you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then I'll open it to questions by the State.

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Juror Number 177, good afternoon.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Good afternoon.

MR. BROWN: I'm going to talk to you a little bit about the death penalty itself and ultimately where I'm going to come back to is when the Court asked you if you could consider both penalties and beyond considering I'm going to ask you obviously not will you, but if you can vote for the death penalty. I know you've expressed some hesitation and you're unsure if you can. So, I want to go through an explain to you the process ultimately coming back to can you. And, you know, people are on the entire spectrum. Some people come in and say that under every circumstance they're going to vote for death and they're in a position that the can't consider both, others have come in and said under no circumstances would I ever vote for death, it doesn't matter, I'm voting for life. Then we have people all the way in the middle. And so the question is going

to be if you're simply not sure that you could ever vote for a death penalty or that you could and that you can and the only way for us to know is to ask you and I want to explain the process to you so you kind of understand that and have a context for that decision. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay.

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

Some of what -- a lot of what I'm MR. BROWN: going to cover the Judge may have already covered it yesterday, but I know she gave you a lot of information in a condensed period of time. first step would be the verdict of the jury would come back with in what we call the guilt phase. In order for the death penalty to be under consideration, the verdict would have to be guilty of first degree murder. If they come back with a lesser such as second degree murder, the death penalty is off the table and it's entirely to the Court. Obviously, if they come back not guilty, then there is no sentencing, period. So, the State has to prove or can prove first degree murder one of two ways, premeditated murder or what's known as felony murder, and those two would be explained to you later in the process if you're selected but either one is a theory on how the State can prove first degree murder.

prove one, the other or both to get you to first degree murder which gets the death penalty on the table.

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

Then the jury would reconvene, additional evidence is presented and the Court will give you her final set of instructions. In those instructions she's going to first tell you to look at what are called aggravating circumstances. And as she said yesterday, it's a statutory list of circumstances which may increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim, and it will be a list, I expect it's going to be more than one, maybe three, four, five, six, those are the circumstances and only those that a juror can look to to justify the vote and support the vote for a death recommendation. As you can tell from the term and the description that they increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim, it's what aggravates a particular murder from other murders. So, it's the circumstances. will be that list of circumstances you will look to.

Those have to be proven beyond any reasonable doubt by the State. Same burden of proof as in the guilt phase. So, we have to prove aggravating circumstances. If don't prove any, your recommendation would be to have life. If we've

proven at least one, and we have proven more than one or proved them all, you look at those that have been proven and ask yourself do these justify the death penalty. If the answer is no, then you return a life If the answer is yes, you go to the recommendation. next step in the process which is look at the mitigating circumstances. And if you recall the Court spoke of those yesterday, they come from the defendant, his history, background, character, things of that nature. Those have to be proven as well, it's a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. The Court's going to tell you you go through a weighing process weighing those aggravators and mitigators and if the mitigation in your mind outweighs the aggravation, then your recommendation is life. If the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, you're in a position where you can legally be justified in recommending the death penalty to the Court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Now, the Court's not going to tell if the State proves A, B, C and D that you must return a death recommendation. In fact, what she's going to say is that you are never required to make a death recommendation. What you are required to do is consider everything and you go through the weighing

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

process and you weigh those aggravators and the mitigators and if you find that the mitigators do not outweigh the aggravators and after weighing that process you feel that the aggravators still justify the death penalty, that's when you make the death recommendation. Okay. So, any questions about that process?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No, I understand that point, that's good.

MR. BROWN: Now, I can't tell you what the aggravators are and obviously it wouldn't be fair to ask you if these are the aggravators would you do then because you have to hear everything and you So, with that process, and as I said, keep in mind, the Court's not going to tell you how much weight an aggravator gets or how much weight a mitigator gets, that's entirely your choice. have to decide how much weight. You have to consider everything but you decide how much weight. The juror right next to you, he or she may give an aggravator different weight, may give a mitigator different weight, but it's you have to decision how much weight that you give and then your recommendation in the quilt phase whether the defendant's guilty or not has In the sentencing recommendation it to be unanimous.

does not have to be a unanimous vote. If six or more recommend life and half recommend or greater, then it's a life recommendation from the jury. If it's a majority recommending the death penalty, then it's reported as what the vote is and it's considered a death recommendation. So, it could be if it's 12/0 for death it gets reported as 12/0. 11/1, 10/2, 9/3, 8/4, we don't know how you voted, we just know what the total vote count is. So, even though you're back, you're deliberating, you'll discuss, talk about things, when it gets to that point it's your individual vote. It doesn't have to be a majority. That's why everybody can give things different weight and you can disagree about it. So, knowing that that is -- and some people say I can follow the law, if it tells me that we need to return a death recommendation, that's what I would do but there is no law that tells you you have to return death. never have to. If you find the mitigators outweigh -- the aggravators outweigh the mitigators, then you're in the area where now you have to decide does it justify the death penalty. With that process, how do you feel about that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 177: It makes more sense to me and I can do that. Like I said, I'm not saying yes,

I would be for the death penalty but I'd have to hear

everything and like I say weigh it out and so that

would make more sense to me. I'm not one to come in

here and say vote for death penalty.

THE COURT: So, if the State of Florida proves to you at least one aggravator and you go through the weighing process and you find that the mitigator does not outweigh the aggravation and after going through that weighing process you feel that the aggravator or aggravators, depending on the number, justify the death penalty, can you do that? I'm not asking will you, can you at that point make a death recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, do you come in with any concept of well, this type of case or these two types of cases I could recommend death but not in any other case? Let me give you an example. Some people talk about say a mass murderer or somebody who murder or murders children, that type of case I would give death but everything else I couldn't.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Again, I couldn't say yes, I would.

MR. BROWN: Right.

JUROR NUMBER 177: If I was chosen on the jury

I could but I'm not going to say --

MR. BROWN: Right. And what I'm asking -- I'm not -- I guess let me rephrase the guestion.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Do you think you are limited to only considering death in some set of circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No.

MR. BROWN: And like I said, some people say well, if it's a mass murderer I could give death but shy of that I couldn't. Some people may add in place of that a murder of a child I could consider death but every other circumstance no. You see, I'm just trying to find where in the spectrum you are. Part of the -- your obligation as a juror is to consider and fairly consider both penalties. The Court's going to give you that list of the aggravating circumstances and what I need to be able it to know is that you can fairly consider those aggravators and make your decision on the death penalty based on those?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And that you're not closed off to I'd only consider this one type of aggravator and nothing else that the Court's going to give me. So, fair enough, you would be able to agree to consider

the aggravators?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And likewise, the Defense would present mitigation evidence to you and again there part of the obligation if it's proven you have to consider it.

I'm certain in your life you've had to make key and critical decisions, right?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Um-hmm.

MR. BROWN: When you've made those decisions you try to look at all the factors.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And some of the factors you look at and find they're pretty darn important and you give them a lot of weight in your decision, and other factors you look at and say this really isn't that important to me and you give it very little weight, right? And that's kind of what you have to do the Court will tell you in the weighing process is you have to decide the weight. You can consider something and give it very little weight, you can consider something and give it great weight, or give it weight somewhere in between, the key is can you agree to consider, you determine the weight.

As the Judge talked about earlier, there's no

magic standard here. She's not going to tell you aggravators get this much weight or this one does, a mitigator gets X amount of weight, it's entirely up to you and you make that decision and we can't -- we may say in arguments to you when we get to that point how much weight we think you should give. At this point we can't ask you how much weight because you have not idea because again you have to -- I think you've already mentioned this, but it's a fact, you have to see everything, hear all the evidence and that's how you determine the weight, that you can't assess it in a vacuum. So, I want to make sure my questions don't come to you across as if I'm trying to ask you that, I'm certain the Defense is the same way, it's just can you consider.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And then one other topic I do want to cover. We talked about if the jury comes back with a verdict of less than first degree murder, say second degree murder death, penalty is off the table and your job at that point ends, the sentence is entirely up to the Court which means you wouldn't have to come back for that second step and be faced with a decision of making a sentencing recommendation and what I want to cover just to assure that knowing

in the back of your mind that I can avoid that next step by just doing a verdict of second that that thought process wouldn't affect your verdict at all.

Would you agree that justice is that you return a verdict that the evidence proves?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Say that again.

MR. BROWN: Justice would be that you return the verdict that the evidence proves.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And that if the evidence proves first degree murder, that you would return -- could return that verdict as opposed to saying well, first is proven but it's easier for me to go to second, therefore I'll just do second.

JUROR NUMBER 177: No.

MR. BROWN: You understand the State's concern --

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. BROWN: -- that that could happen?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. BROWN: That's why I just bring it up just to ensure that you think about that, you're not going to do that, you agree?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Agree.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. No further questions,

2.2

Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the Defense.

MR. LANNING: Good afternoon. When did you hear about the shooting?

JUROR NUMBER 177: I work right over here in the and a customer had come in and mentioned it to an associate and they came back to the office and told us. I'm not sure what day it was, I think like a week, ten days ago.

MR. LANNING: A week before last?

JUROR NUMBER 177: And so the assumption was at the time they are selecting the jury for this trial.

MR. LANNING: At that point had you got your jury notice?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No. Well, I think I did, yes, I think I did.

MR. LANNING: Did that catch your attention like, oh, I have to go there the week after next?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Well I thought it was already over with so I had no idea until yesterday that.

MR. LANNING: How about the fact of the shooting though, did that bother you at all like hey, I got to go up there?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No. No.

MR. LANNING: All right. You indicated that your husband was very much for the death penalty. 2 JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes. 3 4 MR. LANNING: How long ago did he pass? 5 JUROR NUMBER 177: A little over a year ago. 6 MR. LANNING: Did he ever express any talk 7 about this case? JUROR NUMBER 177: No, he was very ill, he 8 9 didn't even know about this case. MR. LANNING: Do you know, if you know, where 10 his strong support for the death penalty came from, 11 did he ever express it? 12 JUROR NUMBER 177: He served in the military, 13 he was an officer in the military for twenty-seven 14 15 years. 16 MR. LANNING: Okay. I want you to think about a scale with zero being zero support for the death 17 penalty and ten being very strong support for the 18 death penalty, could you place yourself somewhere on 19 20 the scale? JUROR NUMBER 177: Depending on the 21 circumstance. 22 MR. LANNING: 23 Sure. JUROR NUMBER 177: I would say an eight, an 24

eight for the death penalty.

25

L

MR. LANNING: It sounds like you might have a circumstance in mind.

JUROR NUMBER 177: No, it's just, you know, before you come in being a juror you have a concept well, I would do it this way, I would do it this way, you know, but when you become a juror and it's, you know, up to you, it's, you know. Like I said, I have to weigh everything out just like I've been told to do before I could say death penalty. I don't have somebody in mind saying death penalty.

MR. LANNING: All right.

JUROR NUMBER 177: So, I'm not against it but in some cases, you know, I would say no, it doesn't support it.

MR. LANNING: What's your impression of what life without the possibility of parole is?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Just what it is, life without parole, never coming out.

MR. LANNING: Do you think that would be a harsh penalty or not?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. LANNING: I mean, do you do you have a picture in your mind of, you know, you hear about sometimes about federal prisons being a country club and that sort of thing, do you have anything like

that in your mind?

.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Like the Michael Milkins maybe but no, very few I would say.

MR. LANNING: You heard the Judge go through — she basically read a large portion of the instructions and ultimately if you ever get to that point you'd also receive them in written form. You also heard Mr. Brown go through the various processes and this weighing. If you got to the point, I'm not asking you what you would do, okay, but if you got to the point where the State has presented substantial aggravation and the Defense has presented little to no mitigation, do you have an understanding at this point what you should do at that point?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. LANNING: What would that be?

JUROR NUMBER 177: We would consider the death penalty.

MR. LANNING: Okay. We don't want you to go back into the jury room with any kind of misconception, okay, and it sounds like you might have a misconception because at that stage, that's the first stage that you could ever even consider giving the death penalty. It sounds like you felt that at that stage you should.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Well, not that I should but it leans more towards that way.

MR. LANNING: All right.

JUROR NUMBER 177: The weight of it, I mean. You said (unintelligible) mitigation.

MR. LANNING: The instructions that you're given, you'll never see anywhere within the instructions that you should lean one way or the other. Okay. There's nothing in the instructions that you should recommend death anymore than there is that you must. The instructions only provide the bare minimum where you could. Not that you should, not that you must. In fact, life always remains an option under any circumstances. You can have the highest aggravation, you could have zero mitigation and you can still choose life without parole as a penalty, right?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay.

MR. LANNING: Some evidence that you might hear in the course of the case could be a little difficult to know how to consider it. An example of that is called victim impact evidence. There may be friends and relatives of the decedent testify about the affect of the loss of her on friends, family and the community. The court will give you an instruction

with that that says you cannot consider that as any aggravating circumstances. You almost certainly never likely to consider it as any way mitigating, but there's no explanation of how you're going to use it. It could be emotional upsetting. Do you think you would be able to follow the Court's instruction that you could not consider that in any way as aggravation?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

2.2

MR. LANNING: Okay. The State has to prove aggravating circumstances beyond a reasonable doubt. Just like during the guilt phase, they have to prove the elements of the crime beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. They also have to do that in relation to the aggravators. Mitigation evidence does not have that same kind of burden, it has to be proven by the greater weight of the evidence, more likely than not. If it's fifty-one percent versus forty-nine percent, Defense proves it. All right?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Um-hmm.

MR. LANNING: Some potential areas that you may hear, and I'm not asking whether you -- what, if any, weight you would give to them but I want to see if you're open to giving them consideration. One would be mental health. If, in your opinion, qualified

experts testified that Brandon Bradley suffers from 1 brain -- from mental illness, is that something that 2 you could give consideration to as potentially 3 mitigating? 4 JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes. 5 MR. LANNING: What about brain damage? 6 7 JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes. MR. LANNING: You could. Now, what about drug 8 addiction? 9 JUROR NUMBER 177: No. 10 MR. LANNING: Do you believe drug addiction 11 would be a choice? 12 JUROR NUMBER 177: (Unintelligible). 13 MR. LANNING: Do you believe even addicts 14 cannot be addicted? 15 16 JUROR NUMBER 177: No. MR. LANNING: Ma'am? 17 JUROR NUMBER 177: I believe that addicts 18 cannot be addicted. 19 20 MR. LANNING: Right, that they -- even addicts can stop their addiction. 21 JUROR NUMBER 177: With medication possibly. 22 MR. LANNING: Okay. If -- now some people take 23 the position that drug addiction, I couldn't consider 24

that as mitigating, I'll tell you what, I'd consider

it aggravating. Now, how about you, what would your position be on that. 2 JUROR NUMBER 177: I believe it would be 3 aggravating. 4 5 MR. LANNING: If the Court were to instruct you that you couldn't consider it to be aggravating, 6 could you follow that instruction? 7 JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes. 8 MR. LANNING: Now, you understand the Court's 9 instructions are it's an order that if it's not 10 preserved then that means somebody didn't get a fair 11 12 trial, right? JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes. 13 14 MR. LANNING: And your opinion that drug addiction would be aggravating, I want you to assume 15 for a minute that evidence of drug addiction will 16 come into this trial. 17 JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay. 18 19

MR. LANNING: Okay?

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay.

MR. LANNING: Evidence of a lot of drugs on Brandon Bradley's part will be put in front of you, your opinion that that would be aggravating, is that something you can set aside?

JUROR NUMBER 177: If that's the Court's

instruction, yeah.

MR. LANNING: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 177: I'd have to hear everything.

I mean, I know there's different kinds of drug

addictions so I can't put it all in one basket, I

would have to hear it as part of the evidence.

MR. LANNING: There's some other evidence that could come up during this trial and will come up is autopsy photos of a disturbing nature and a videotape of Deputy Pill's death, would viewing such evidence cause you any concerns about being able to remain fair and impartial?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. LANNING: Have you ever been put into a position of having to see that kind of thing?

MR. LANNING: You mind telling me the circumstances.

JUROR NUMBER 177: I was in a car accident in 1997 or '96.

MR. LANNING: And were their any fatalities?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. LANNING: May I have a moment?

(Thereupon, a pause was taken in the

proceedings.)

MR. LANNING: Are you a member of the church?

JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes.

MR. LANNING: Do you know, does your church take a position on the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No.

MR. LANNING: Your recommendation the Judge has indicated would be given great weight, what does that -- what do you picture as that meaning?

JUROR NUMBER 177: The recommendation the Judge gives.

MR. LANNING: The recommendation that the jury provides the Judge, she's read the -- that that will be given great weight, what do you think that means?

JUROR NUMBER 177: It means -- we're talking the death penalty again?

MR. LANNING: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay. Then that would be a consideration. Like you said, you're not going to say yes or no, you know, as to each individual but great weight is leaning towards that, that you could, it's not completely off the table.

MR. LANNING: Actually, the jury's ultimate recommendation would very likely not be followed by the Court.

THE COURT: Very likely not be followed?

1 MR. MOORE: Would. THE COURT: Very likely be followed by the 2 3 Court. MR. LANNING: Right. I apologize, I misspoke. 4 THE COURT: That's okay. I think we all looked 5 at each other. 6 7 MR. LANNING: So, if the jury made a recommendation of death in this case and it would 8 have to be a death, correct, it would have to be 9 greater than 6/6. Okay. Anything 6/6 or less in 10 favor it would mean a life sentence. Anything 11 greater, 7/5 or above would be given great weight by 12 the trial court. So, do you understand that? 13 JUROR NUMBER 177: Yes. 14 MR. LANNING: Okay. 15 16 JUROR NUMBER 177: I do. MR. LANNING: Thank you, ma'am. 17 JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 177, I'm going 19 to release you for today. 20 JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay. 21 THE COURT: I need you to report back Friday at 22 8:30 a.m. to the jury assembly room. 23 JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay. 24

THE COURT: Unless you get a phone call

1 |

otherwise.

JUROR NUMBER 177: Okay.

8:30. Now, during this recess you must continue to abide by your rules governing your service as a juror. Do not talk about this case with anyone. You can tell people that you're here, you're serving jury duty, what time you have to be it here, where you're at, just not what case it is, the specifics of the case, what happens here in the courtroom. Later on you can talk to whoever you want about that if you choose to do so. Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 177: No.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll see you back here on Friday. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 177 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. We can bring in 178. And I do know 178 we need to talk to him about his work schedule.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 178 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

JUROR NUMBER 178: Good afternoon everyone.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. 178. One, thank

you for being here. That you for being patient with us regarding the process. 2 JUROR NUMBER 178: Yes, ma'am. 3 THE COURT: When I spoke to you last you talked 4 about being -- doing refrigeration something. 5 JUROR NUMBER 178: Maintenance. 6 7 THE COURT: Maintenance at the Port. JUROR NUMBER 178: Yes, ma'am. 8 THE COURT: That there was limited people who 9 10 did that and that you were concerned that you 11 wouldn't get paid. 12 JUROR NUMBER 178: Oh, I know I'm not going to 13 get paid. THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what your 14 15 concerns -- I mean, did you have a chance to follow 16 up on that? JUROR NUMBER 178: Yes, ma'am, I went to work 17 this morning and I talked to my manager and the 18 19 owners of the company. 2.0 THE COURT: Okay. 21 JUROR NUMBER 178: And they asked me to give 22 this to you. THE COURT: Okay. If you want to hand that to 23 one of the deputies. I will read this and I'll let 24

the attorneys read it.

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

THE COURT: Okay. If you want to give this to the attorneys so they can -- have them both review it.

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

MR. MOORE: We're stipulating.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Juror Number 178, we've reviewed the letter from your employer. The attorneys have agreed that you can be released from your services as a juror here and released from being considered for this case. Okay. So, what I'm going to ask you to do, I want to thank you for being here. Thank you for being involved in the process. I'm going to have you go downstairs, speak to the jury assembly room, the clerk in the jury assembly room, they'll give you some information and they'll -- just briefly and they'll send you on your way.

JUROR NUMBER 178: Yes, ma'am. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Give you that letter back. Thank you. Have a good day.

JUROR NUMBER 175: Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 178 exited the

1 | courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. Just for the record, 178 will be released for cause. I think we're on 183?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll bring in 183.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 183 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon Juror Number183.

JUROR NUMBER 183: Afternoon.

THE COURT: Thank you for being with us. Thank you for being patient with us with regard to this process. When I spoke to you the other day I talked about some rules that came into effect at that time. So, I'm going to follow up on those rules. Since that time, have you been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 183: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 183: No.

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

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

case?

JUROR NUMBER 183: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 183: I've heard other jury members discussing it but, potential jury members, but I was not involved in the conversation.

THE COURT: You heard other jury members discussing it? What were they discussing?

JUROR NUMBER 183: Just talking about what they had read in the news. I literally tried to block it out because you had said not to participate in that.

THE COURT: Did you hear that today or the other day?

JUROR NUMBER 183: No, yesterday.

THE COURT: Okay. Was that before they came in and before I met with them or was that after I --

JUROR NUMBER 183: It was here in the courtroom.

THE COURT: Here in the courtroom. While we were all here?

JUROR NUMBER 183: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: While we were perhaps at the bench?

JUROR NUMBER 183: Yes, ma'am.

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Was that before I announced the rules or was that -- I think I announced the rules during the first break. Do you know -- I know we took some recesses. I think there was -- I mean, we had some bench conferences here. I know there was probably a long bench conference in the very beginning when we talked about hardship.

JUROR NUMBER 183: I'm pretty sure that it was during the second one but I cannot say for sure.

THE COURT: I'm not sure if the second one would have been before I announced the rules or not. What did you hear?

JUROR NUMBER 183: I knew it was wrong so you must have announced the rules because.

THE COURT: What did you hear them discussing?

JUROR NUMBER 183: Just -- like I said, I was really trying to block it out, just general information, you know, that they had read about the case.

THE COURT: General information, that's -- if you could be more specific, I would appreciate it.

JUROR NUMBER 183: Let me really think about it.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 183: I think it was more how they

were feeling about everything that was happening and a couple things that they had read in the paper or on the news. It was nothing that really stuck with me because, like I said, I was really --

THE COURT: I just wanted -- with all due respect, at this point I want to make sure that nobody else was violating the rules and if I need to ask them some questions about it or be more specific about questions to ask jurors. I mean, do you remember any specifics, I mean, about how they were feeling or about the case? I know you're saying you were trying to block it out so you were trying not to listen and now I'm asking you to tell me what they said.

JUROR NUMBER 183: Right, exactly. They were talking about the manner of the case, you know, capital punishment and a couple of other things like that, they were discussing how they felt about that.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. You don't remember any other specifics?

JUROR NUMBER 183: I really don't, I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. We're going to talk to you this morning. I'm going to have an opportunity to talk to you, State's going to have an

opportunity to talk to you, and the Defense. 1 I can tell you that there's no right or wrong answers to 2 these questions. Some of the questions that may be 3 asked of you you may not have thought about before. 4 What we ask you to do is be honest, frank and 5 complete with your answers. If there's something 6 that you think we need to know, don't be shy, tell us 7 what it is. Like I said, there's no right or wrong 8 answers in here. Sometimes we'll solicit a response 9 that is normally a yes or no. If you don't -- if you 1.0 can't answer it yes or no, that's acceptable as well, 11 but do think about your answers. I mean, they're 12 important with regard to this process. The first 13 question I'm going to ask you is do you know anything 14 15 about this case, that would be prior to you coming to court, either from your own personal knowledge, 16 rumor, by discussions with anyone else, or from the 17 media, including radio, television, Internet, 18 electronic device, or newspapers? 19

JUROR NUMBER 183: My future son-in-law is a police officer.

THE COURT: Okay.

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 183: And my daughter was listening when this happened. So, I aware that it happened.

THE COURT: Okay. Your daughter was 1 visiting from -- and where was she visiting from? 2 JUROR NUMBER 183: From North Carolina. 3 THE COURT: And her future -- her fiance? 4 JUROR NUMBER 183: 5 Yes. THE COURT: Well, they're not quite engaged, 6 they've been cohabitating for five years. Okay. 7 her significant other is a police officer? 8 JUROR NUMBER 183: Yes. 9 THE COURT: And --10 JUROR NUMBER 183: So, she was very upset 11 because everywhere we were going people are saying 12 did you hear what happened, did you hear what 13 happened, and for her it was very emotional because 14 of his job. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 JUROR NUMBER 183: I mean. Sorry, I lost my 17 voice. I'm really trying to speak up. 18 THE COURT: You said you lost your voice? 19 JUROR NUMBER 183: Yeah. 20 THE COURT: Is that -- I mean --21 JUROR NUMBER 183: It's better than it was 22 23 yesterday. Okay. It seems like that subject 24 THE COURT:

solicited kind of an emotional response from you and

you had a hard time speaking, is that in regards to -- I can't tell you if you said you're losing your voice is or if that's because of your having an emotional response to that.

JUROR NUMBER 183: Well, it's all very (unintelligible) both I have emotional, it's like a squeak.

THE COURT: Okay. You know what, take a deep breath, anything that happens in here, we're fine.

MR. MOORE: May I?

THE COURT: Oh, okay. So, her significant other is in law enforcement and is that in I think you said North Carolina?

JUROR NUMBER 183: Yes, Huntersville, North Carolina.

THE COURT: Okay. This case does involve the death of a police officer.

JUROR NUMBER 183: I understand.

THE COURT: Sometimes that does solicit an emotional response in people. I mean, it solicited a response in you. Is that because it's your daughter or because it's a police officer?

JUROR NUMBER 183: Well, it's both.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 183: And I really had a really

hard time yesterday, you know, hearing all the 1 charges and then hearing all the names of the 2 3 officers and all their families that were affected. It was, it was difficult thing. 4 THE COURT: Okay. So, would it be difficult 5 for you to sit as a juror in this case? 6 7 JUROR NUMBER 183: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. 8 Judge, may we approach? 9 MR. BROWN: 10 THE COURT: Yes, you may. (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out 11 12 of the hearing of Juror Number 183 as follows:) 13 MR. BROWN: Obviously, I'm good with a 14 stipulation on her. We would stipulate as well. 15 MR. MOORE: 16 MR. BROWN: My only issue is maybe the Court would want to inquire about what juror or jurors she 17 18 had talked to. 19 MR. MOORE: Before we let her go. Yeah. She was -- she was seated in 20 MR. BROWN: the courtroom. Jim thought it may have been when 21 they were on break but if she was seated in the 22 23 courtroom I know that 188 who was the gentleman that, 24 you know, we --

THE COURT: Oh, okay. Yeah.

2.2

MR. BROWN: Sitting right behind her and that may very well --

MR. MOORE: Were they --

MR. PIROLO: Maybe she can narrow it down to perception or --

MR. MOORE: Interact from the two?

MR. BROWN: She was right in front of him. So, she clearly would have -- if he was talking she would have heard him.

MR. MOORE: Maybe we can all that won't reveal her identity to anybody.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll talk to her.

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

THE COURT: Okay. Number 183, I'm going to release you from being considered as a juror in this case. Before you leave though, I just want to follow up on what may have happened yesterday. I know where you were sitting. You were sitting kind of the middle in the right — the left hand side to me, left hand side right there. I assure you we're not going to share that Juror Number 183 told us, but who — can you tell us who appeared to be talking?

JUROR NUMBER 183: Yeah, because I do feel it's so important that everything is fair. It was the

lady next to me and the two gentlemen behind me.

THE COURT: So, the lady next to you.

JUROR NUMBER 183: Against the wall.

THE COURT: And the one behind you is 188, he's the one that spoke out at the end that said he may have trouble following the rules.

JUROR NUMBER 183: Yes, that was (unintelligible).

THE COURT: So, it was the one behind you and --

JUROR NUMBER 183: Two behind me.

THE COURT: Now, when you say behind you, he was directly behind you. Was it the one on --

JUROR NUMBER 183: It was the two next to the wall and the one next -- behind me directly behind me. So, the lady who was next to me against the wall, the gentleman behind her and the gentleman next to him.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you're sitting three from the wall, that's what the chart shows.

JUROR NUMBER 183: It was after there was one person gone.

THE COURT: So, that would have been the one -- okay. So, it would -- I see who it would have been

because she would have been gone, 182 would have been 1 2 gone. JUROR NUMBER 183: Yes, ma'am. 3 THE COURT: And then I think the one directly 4 against the wall, 186, was also excused. So, it 5 would have been --6 JUROR NUMBER 183: She was excused after this 7 8 happened. MR. LANNING: I think she's referring to 181, 9 10 Your Honor. THE COURT: No, I think so too. 181, 187 and 11 12 188 who I'm thinking. MR. MCMASTER: 181 was excused at a later time, 13 not the first time around. 14 THE COURT: Right. So, I'm thinking 181, 187 15 and 188. And that's who you heard talking about it? 16 JUROR NUMBER 183: Yes, ma'am. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Now, 188 had talked about 18 his son -- having some issues involving his son, did 19 20 you hear any of that? JUROR NUMBER 183: No, ma'am. 21 THE COURT: It was just specifically about the 22 case and the death penalty? 23 They were saying a few 24 JUROR NUMBER 183: things but those were the major discussions they were

having, and a couple of things that I don't what they were saying or what they saw in the media or those kind of things. Really as soon as I heard it just everything occurred to me to block it out. I knew it wasn't right. I mean, he started talking and (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Talking about the --

JUROR NUMBER 183: The trial options.

THE COURT: Okay. And so it would have been involved with everyone on this side of you, know one on the other side?

JUROR NUMBER 183: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. All right. Then I'm going to ahead and release you.

MR. LANNING: Judge, can I ask a question?

THE COURT: You can if you wish, yes.

MR. LANNING: Did you have hear any expressions of belief of his guilt?

JUROR NUMBER 183: No, I did not. No, that I would have brought to the attention of the deputies if I heard something like that.

MR. LANNING: Did you ever hear any expressions like he should get the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 183: I don't -- I really can't say. I'm so sorry I can't give you clear answers,

I'm straining.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

23

25

MR. LANNING: Right.

JUROR NUMBER 183: Your client deserves a fair trial and I want to make sure that happens.

> MR. LANNING: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. 183, I am going to release I'm going to allow you to go downstairs, tell them that you've been released from Judge Reinman's courtroom. They'll give you brief information and they'll send you on your way. Thank you for being involved in this process. Thank you for being honest and frank with us, we appreciate it.

Thank you, Your Honor. JUROR NUMBER 183: (Thereupon, Juror Number 183 exited the

courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. 183, just for the record, will be released for cause. Now, the only person that's left that would have been part of that is 187. You want to go ahead an address 187?

> MR. BROWN: Sure.

Just while it's fresh in our mind THE COURT: go ahead and address that?

MR. PIROLO: Judge, also the concern is she said the two gentlemen behind her, 188 who's gone, 187 is the male but 189 is a male as well.

MR. BROWN: She said it was closer to the wall.

THE COURT: Yeah, she said it was that side of the wall. I asked her if it was on this side, anything occurred on this side of her and she said no. I did that for that reason.

MR. PIROLO: And they kind of shifted a little bit.

THE COURT: I mean, with all due respect, 188, I saw him even before he -- he was pretty -- I don't know what he said, he was pretty verbal. I don't know if the deputy heard anything.

THE COURT DEPUTY: He said something about not being able to follow the rules of watching the news and that.

THE COURT: No, that's -- he was the one that said that. I know even before that I could hear his voice but I didn't hear what he said before that.

MR. BROWN: Judge, the only slight concern I have would be by bringing 187 in here out of order and then start questioning him on that because that kind of tells him it was the juror before him.

THE COURT: Okay. I mean, I'll stay in order then. I just want to make sure we follow up with it. And we can even talk to 189, he'll be here today too, about if he heard anything. And I can even say 188

was pretty vocal back there, did it cause any concern for you, you know, did anything get said. Okay.

Because I heard 188 even before he -- but I couldn't hear what he was saying and it didn't appear to be an issue. I mean, it was a pretty lively bunch during the break. I'll try to control that more. I mean, it was a long bench conference too, so.

MR. LANNING: Judge, because it, because it was obvious to her, it may be obvious to 184 too.

THE COURT: Okay. We can talk to 184 too.

I'll talk to them all if you want me to.

MR. MCMASTER: We can ask them those preliminary question when they first come in and see if they heard something.

THE COURT: Yeah, and I can inquire a little bit more about that too. Okay. We can go ahead and bring in 184.

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon Juror Number 184.

JUROR NUMBER 184: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: First of all, I want to tell you thank you for being here. Thank you for being patient with us regarding this process. When we were -- when you were in court yesterday I talked about some rules that came into place. Those rules

talked about -- those rules kind of started at that time and the rules had to do with different things. So, I'm going to ask you about that and it's as of that time. Has anyone read or been exposed to reading newspaper -- I mean, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, ma'am.

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

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about this trial? JUROR NUMBER 184: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: And have you discussed this case with the other jury members or with anyone else or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Yesterday when the Judge, when I was up here and the attorneys were up here and we had a bench conference there was some -- a lot of talk among the jurors, was anyone talking about the case in your little section of -- in the right section among the jurors? Was anyone discussing the case?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: I know Number 188, the guy kind of to the side, he kind had a little bit of an objection about the rules. He asked did he have to follow those rules during the recess. Did you hear any discussions about that?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Did anything that happened around you at that time, did that cause you any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I know the other day you talked about being -- you do computer repairs for

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm pretty impressed with that being that I have a lot of problems with computers. So, that's -- normally people of our generation aren't as good on computers. So, I'm really impressed that you can do all that. Normally it's the really young kids that know all the stuff about the computers. So, that's pretty impressive. I'm going to talk to you today about some questions. I'm going to ask you some questions. What we ask you to do is to respond and be -- there's no right or

24

25

1

wrong answers, be as frank, as open and as comfortable with your answers as you can be. Don't -- if there's something you want to say, sometimes people say Judge, can I say this? You can say whatever you wish to say. Okay. This is your time to talk to us. This is your time to tell us things that you think may be important to us. be asked some questions that may solicit a yes or no If the answer is not yes or no, you can response. answer it appropriately as well. Sometimes we want to say hey, can you answer yes or no, if the question doesn't -- if you can't answer it yes or no, let us know that as well. I'm going to have an opportunity to speak with you, the State will have an opportunity to speak with you and then the Defense will have an opportunity to speak with you. I'm going to talk to you first about your knowledge of the case and then I'm going to talk to you about the death penalty. The first question I'm going to ask you is prior to coming to the court, did you know anything about this case either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, or from the media, including radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I saw it on the news.

THE COURT: You saw it on the news? 1 JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Would that be at the time the event 3 4 occurred? 5 JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. What happens is that we received an e-mail saying that there was traffic 6 so we need to, you know, we need to go in a different 7 way home. So, I was kind of curious so I saw it on 8 9 the news. 10 THE COURT: Okay. You were -- after you 11 received that you were curious so you saw it, then you maybe turned on the news? 12 13 JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. 14 THE COURT: So, that would have been at the time of the event and that would have been through 15 the television, is that correct? 16 JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Since that time have you heard 18 19 anything? JUROR NUMBER 184: 20 No. THE COURT: Did you hear anything about jury 21 22 selection? JUROR NUMBER 184: 23 THE COURT: Tell me what your -- do you have 24 25 any regular local news watching habits?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. Well, I use to watch like CNN, you know, maybe Fox, something like that. I don't really -- most times I may, you know have it on the TV in the morning time while I'm getting ready to go to work but I don't really pay much attention.

MR. MOORE: I can't hear, speak louder.

THE COURT: Okay. Can you speak up just a little bit?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I say I have on the TV, you know, I run my TV all night just to have, you know, something, you know, just going all night, but in the morning time I may have on the TV but while I'm getting ready I'm not really, you know, paying attention to the TV.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what specifics that you think -- what specific information you think you may know about the case.

JUROR NUMBER 184: The only thing I know is that someone was killed, that's all I know.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you know it was a woman sheriff?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What else? Anything that led up to that?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, that's all, that's all

I, that's all I heard, you know, that's all I heard 1 on the news. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Anything that happened after 3 that? 4 JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, you know, I heard 5 that, you know, because I work in that area about the 6 7 service. THE COURT: Okay. The service for Deputy Pill? 8 JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Okay. When you say you work in 10 that area, I think you work around that location, is 11 12 that --JUROR NUMBER 184: Right, yes, um-hmm. 13 THE COURT: And so did you hear something about 14 maybe traffic with regard to that or something about 15 16 that? JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes, I heard that the 17 traffic, you know, we may need to go another way 18 because I travel that way. 19 THE COURT: Okay. So, was that through -- how 20 did you hear that, through e-mails at work? 21 JUROR NUMBER 184: It's been a while so I think 22 it was an e-mail come through saying that, you know, 23 avoid, avoid that area and, you know, go another way. 24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Did you ever see a picture

of Mr. Bradley on the news? 1 JUROR NUMBER 184: 2 Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Did you hear anything about 3 anyone else being involved? 4 JUROR NUMBER 184: It was a female. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Do you know anything about 6 7 that? 8 JUROR NUMBER 184: I just saw a female and a 9 male. THE COURT: Okay. Did you hear anything 10 about -- anything else other than that at the time of 11 the event? 12 JUROR NUMBER 184: That's all I heard, yeah. 13 THE COURT: Anything since then? 14 JUROR NUMBER 184: 15 No. THE COURT: What about jury selection, did you 16 hear anything about jury selection in this case? 17 JUROR NUMBER 184: 18 No. No. THE COURT: Okay. Do you -- when you heard 19 about this case, did it, you know, did it stir up any 20 emotions in you? 21 JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, you know, when 22 anything like that happen, you know, you always, you 23 know, you kind of look at yourself, you know, and 24

kind of, you know, say -- I mean, it just, you know,

you know, you kind of just think about yourself.

THE COURT: Okay. Some people, some people --

2

3

I mean, obviously it's a tragic event.

4

JUROR NUMBER 184: Right.

5

THE COURT: But did you have any lasting emotions? Some people say they were angry, some

6 7

people said they're still angry, some people say they

8

thought about it for a while. I mean, did it make

9

you think about anything let's say later on, months

10

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, huh-uh.

11 12

THE COURT: Okay. So, you thought about it at

13

the time of the event?

later?

14

JUROR NUMBER 184: At the time of the event,

15

you know, I thought about it, yeah.

16

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do if you

17

could serve on the jury is to set aside anything that you may have learned about this case, serve with an

18 19

open mind and reach a verdict based only on the law

20

and the evidence presented in this trial in this

21

courtroom, can you do that?

22

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

23

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any hesitation

24

about that?

25

JUROR NUMBER 184: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to switch gears on you. What are your general views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 184: You know, I really -- to be honest, I really don't really have any opinion about that. I haven't really, you know. I've heard of that but it hadn't really, you know, made me, you know, emotional or anything like that so.

THE COURT: So, it's not -- is it something that you've talked about prior to coming here today?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, I haven't discussed

that.

THE COURT: So, it's not something that you thought about prior to today?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, I haven't thought about it, no.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going tell you a little bit about the process and then we're going to talk about what your duty would be as a juror. In the first part of the trial, which is called the guilt phase, if the jury returns a verdict of guilty on Count I, and Count I is the murder first degree, if there's a guilty verdict on Count I, then and only then you would proceed to a second phase and that's called the penalty phase. In the penalty phase, as a

22

23

24

25

1

juror you would be instructed to make a recommendation to the Court of a penalty of either death or life in prison without the possibility of What we ask you to do is to consider both possible penalties in making a recommendation to the You're going to hear evidence in the penalty Court. phase about aggravating circumstances, that kind of makes the crime more aggravating. You're going to hear mitigating circumstances which kind of makes the crime less of an offense, it's mitigating. you'll hear evidence of those. You'll be given some instructions on how to weigh those and come to a, come to a decision about what penalty to recommend to the Court. No one here is ever going to tell you in this circumstances what would you recommend, death or life, no one is ever going to ask you that, but what we ask you is can you consider both penalties?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

THE COURT: So, if I instruct you that as part of the process you have to consider the aggravating circumstances, consider the mitigating circumstances and then make a recommendation to the Court, would you be able to consider the death penalty or life in prison without the possibility of parole, both penalties?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

2

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. All right. Questions

3

by the State.

4

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. Juror

5

Number 184, good afternoon.

6

JUROR NUMBER 184: Afternoon.

7

MR. BROWN: I'm going to speak to you a little

8

bit about the death penalty itself but I want to go a

9

step beyond just when you consider and my question

10

and my focus this morning to be pending, and I'm

11

not -- obviously not going to ask will, but ask you

12

depending on the circumstances vote for either a life

13

or death recommendation?

14

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

15

MR. BROWN: Okay. I want to go through the

16

process of how you get there to make sure that you

17 18 understand it and you're comfortable with that process and your ability to do that. Okay. As the

19

Judge talked, the first step is the jury would have

20

to return a verdict of guilty of first degree murder.

21

Now, there's two ways for the State to prove that,

22

23

premeditated murder, theory number two is what's

either through -- theory number one would be

24

called felony murder. Those terms will be explained

25

to you later on in the process, but either theory the

State can prove it to get to first degree murder. We may end up proving both, but either one leads to first degree murder and if the jury returns that verdict of guilty, that's how we get there for consideration of a life or death penalty. If the jury returns a lesser verdict such as second degree murder, then the jury is done, the sentencing is entirely up to the Court and the jury doesn't go to the next step, they don't have to make a sentencing recommendation. You understand?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And obviously, if they come back guilty there is no sentencing at all. So, the jury comes back guilty with first degree murder, then the next step is we would reconvene. The jury would here additional evidence, the Court would give you her final set of instructions and those instructions — then you go back to deliberate. On those instructions the first thing she's going to focus you on would be what are called aggravating circumstances. And as the Court told you all yesterday, I realize some of this or a lot of it she's already covered with you, but she did give you a lot of information in a compressed period of time, so. Aggravating circumstances, that's a statutory

list of circumstances that may increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim and it's to those circumstances that you look to to decide whether or not the -- whether the death penalty is justified in the case. You're limited to those.

Obviously, you can tell from the brief description the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim that they're meant to aggravate what would be a first degree murder case, aggravated beyond, to justify the death penalty. You understand that no first degree murder automatically gets the death penalty, we have to go through this process with each one?

Understand?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Um-hmm.

MR. BROWN: Now, those aggravating circumstances, they have to be proven beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. Same standard of proof that's in the guilt phase. The Court will give you that list, I expect it to be more than one, may be three, four, five, and the question will be has the State of Florida proven any of those. If your answer is no, that we have not proven any of them, then your recommendation would have to be life because you would have found no aggravation. If you have found that the State has proven at least one,

and we may prove more than one, we may prove all of 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

them, but we have to prove at least one to get to the next step, you take those that you feel are proven and ask yourself based on these aggravating circumstances is the death penalty justified. Ιf your answer is no, then you would return a life recommendation. If your answer is yes, you go to the next step in the process. You understand so far? JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

The next step would be you consider MR. BROWN: what's called the mitigating circumstances. the Court told you all yesterday, that's evidence that comes from the defendant, his life, background, things of that nature, character, it concerns him, and similar to what aggravating circumstances, these circumstances that may suggest that life is more There's a burden of proof for those, appropriate. it's a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. It's still a burden but less than the burden for the aggravators. And the Court's going to tell when you take both of those, all the aggravators that have been proven, all the mitigation that's been proven, you have to go through a weighing process between those two.

In your life I assume you've made some key,

24 25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

critical important decisions? Yes?

JUROR NUMBER 184

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Always have to get a yes answer because everything is on the record being recorded so. And when you made those decisions, did you try to look at all the factors involved?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And when you looked at all those factors, some factors you look at and said these are pretty darn important and you gave them a lot of weight, great weight in your consideration, right?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Other factors you looked at and you said you know, I don't find these to be all that important and you gave them very little weight in coming to the ultimate decision, right?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 184:

MR. BROWN: Okay. I mean, that's the way most of us make decisions, you try to consider everything and just analyze it and you weigh it all and put it all together and come to your decision, right?

MR. BROWN: That's the way most of us typically make decisions. The Court's going to tell you the process she's going to give you is that same type of

Yes.

process. You have to consider everything and you determine how much weight and you go through a weighing process.

Now, she's not going to tell you, the Judge will not tell you aggravator one gets X amount of weight or mitigator one gets X amount of weight.

She's not going to give you a magic formula to determine what gets what weight, that's for you to decide and determine. We may suggest in our arguments when we get to that point in the trial how much weight you should give, but you determine how much weight. And obviously, I'm not going to sit up here and ask you, I don't believe the Defense will either, how much weight would you give to this type of an aggravator or how much weight to this type of mitigator because you don't know, you have to hear it all and you have to weigh it, right?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Right.

MR. BROWN: But the key is we want to make sure that you're open to consider what's given to you. You may hear and say well, that type of aggravator or mitigator I can consider it, you may be thinking you may not give it a whole lot of weight, as long as you're willing to consider it and then you determine the weight. The juror right next to you if you're

selected may say an aggravator or mitigator and may come up with different thoughts on how much weight he's going to give. The key here is in the guilt phase your verdict has to be unanimous, either guilty of first degree murder, second degree, something else, or not guilty. The penalty phase does not have to be unanimous. What gets reported back to the Court if it's a 6/6 split or a majority for life, then it's a life recommendation. If it's a majority that are recommending the death penalty, the number gets reported, not who voted what. If it's 12/0 the obviously we all know. If it's 11/1, 10/2 down to 7/5, the number gets reported but you do not have to agree unanimously. That's why I say. So, you have to make the individual decision you make. discuss it with the other members, you have to determine how much weight you will give every aggravator and every mitigator. You go through then and you weigh aggravation versus the mitigation and if the mitigation outweighs the aggravation, then your recommendation has to be for life. On the other hand, if the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation and you feel that the aggravating circumstances justify the death penalty after going through that weighing process, then you're in a

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

position where you're justified in recommending the death penalty to the Judge. You understand? JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Now, the Court's not going to tell you if the State proves A, B, C and D that you must return a recommendation of death. In fact, what she's going to tell you is that you are never required to recommend the death penalty. Some people say well, law says I have to it, I can do it but the law's never going to say what you have to do. What you do is you get in a position where if you go through the weighing process and the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation and after weighing you feel the aggravators justify the death penalty, that's when you can recommend the death penalty. Okay. Any questions about that process? JUROR NUMBER 184: No.

MR. BROWN: How do you feel about your ability to do that, to be in that situation, go through that process and make the recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I feel comfortable.

Is there anything in your MR. BROWN: background, be it moral beliefs, political beliefs, philosophical beliefs, religious beliefs, family history, work history, anything there that causes you

any undue angst, anxiety, trouble about being put in a situation having to make that recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, I don't think so.

MR. BROWN: Okay. You understand why I ask. I mean, some people, their religious — their religion may be against it, their church, and that causes them a great deal of trouble if they have to do something that may violate what their church beliefs or their own personal, moral, philosophical beliefs and that's why I ask. If I don't ask, I don't know.

Do you come in with any notion or concept of, well, I can vote for death in this circumstance or maybe these couple of circumstances and not any other type of circumstances? And let me give you an example. Some people say well, in a case of a mass murder or in a case of a murder of a child, I could vote for death in those circumstances but not in any other circumstance. Are you limited to that degree?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No.

MR. BROWN: Okay. So, you would agree the Court's going to give you that list of aggravators and you're open to considering the list she gives you?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: You're not coming in with a

preconceived notion of well, unless it's this or that, then I'm not going to look at any other aggravation, right?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, I have to hear the facts.

MR. BROWN: Good. Again, like I say, unless I ask the question, I don't what the answer is.

And this question when I put it to you I want to make sure you understand it's can you. I'm not asking will you but can you. You sit on the jury, return a verdict of first degree murder, you can consider the death penalty, you find the State's proven aggravators. You went through the weighing process and you found that the mitigation did not outweigh the aggravation, that the aggravators came out on top and after weighing them you looked at those aggravators and you felt they justified the death penalty, in that situation can you return a recommendation of death?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Again, not will because we don't, but if you go through that situation, you weighed them, aggravators came out on top, mitigator did not outweigh the aggravators and you felt that they justified the death penalty, can you vote for a death

recommendation?

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 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Again, like I said, I'm not asking what you will do, I just want to make sure that you can. Some people support the death penalty and say but, you know, personally, I just couldn't do I support it but I just couldn't vote that way. Others come in and say I don't care what the circumstances are, first degree murder means I'm automatically voting for the death penalty, I don't care about anything else. Others say that they could never do that. So, just trying to find out where exactly you are. Okay?

And the last topic I wanted to cover is as I talked about when I first got up here, if the jury comes back with a verdict of less than first degree murder, the death penalty is off the table, you would not come back for that second go around. Okay. the sentence is entirely up to the Court. understand that, right?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Now, a concern and why I pose this question to you, I try to pose it to everybody, is that in some way knowing in the back of your mind that, well, if I just come back with second, State's

24

25

proven first, but if I just come back with second I don't put myself in that situation of having to decide, having to vote life or death. So, I'm just going to come back with second because it's easier for me. Would that enter into your deliberation or your verdict thought process at all?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No.

MR. BROWN: Would you agree that justice would be to return the verdict that the evidence proves? JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And if we prove to you first degree murder, can you return that verdict?

Yes.

Okay. Even though that means you have to come back for the next step?

JUROR NUMBER 184:

MR. BROWN: You understand the concern that I have just to make sure that jurors don't say well, it's just easier if I do it this way, that you ought to return the verdict that he evidence proves, right?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. No further questions,

Questions by the Defense. THE COURT:

When you -- okay. What news MR. LANNING:

stations do you normally watch?

JUROR NUMBER 184: What stations do I normally watch? Well, when I get home the news pretty much is off (unintelligible) but in the morning time I have my station on Channel 6. Most of the time I watch CNN or Fox, that's where I usually go most of the time.

MR. LANNING: How about overnight while it's on, do you keep it on any particular channel?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I keep it -- well, most of the time in the afternoon I watch one of those (unintelligible). Most of the time when the news come on I'm already asleep.

MR. LANNING: Now, I may have misheard you, but you keep it on overnight?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes I do.

MR. LANNING: Is that just for the noise?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Just for the noise, yeah,

just to have something, yeah, just for the noise.

MR. LANNING: Is it on any kind of news channel?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Most of the time I keep my TV mostly on Fox.

MR. LANNING: All right. At your job -- I want to ask you this. Do you take the paper?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, I don't get the paper 1 but I do go on the Internet. 2 MR. LANNING: Did you follow this at all on the 3 Internet? 4 JUROR NUMBER 184: No, I just, you know, I 5 heard about it on the news and that's probably just 6 7 about it. MR. LANNING: There was a news special about 8 9 the funeral, did you happen to see it? JUROR NUMBER 184: Pardon me? 10 MR. LANNING: A news section on the news about 11 the funeral itself, I believe you said you heard 12 about it, did you see any footage of the actual 13 funeral? 14 15 JUROR NUMBER 184: Oh, no. MR. LANNING: And you know that there was a 16 woman that had been involved. 17 JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. 18 MR. LANNING: Okay. Do you know who -- which 19 of the two were supposed to have pulled the trigger? 2.0 JUROR NUMBER 184: I do not know that, no, I do 21 22 not know that. MR. LANNING: Okay. And you said that you saw 23 Mr. Bradley's picture. 24

JUROR NUMBER 184: I saw, you know, I saw, I

25

saw him, I don't know, it's been a while back,
like -- it's been like I think over a year or so
since I saw that.

MR. LANNING: Right.

JUROR NUMBER 184: I'm not sure -- I know I saw two, I don't think they cast names or something like that.

MR. LANNING: The people had already been arrested?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. LANNING: Did you form an opinion one way or the other about the guilt?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, most time I'm just, you know, I pretty much on the road all the time so, you know, I heard about it, you know, I just, you know, say that's another, someone else had got shot, you know, that was it, you know.

MR. LANNING: Right. In your, in your community, did -- you know, Mr. Bradley is a young black male, did you ever here any talk in your community about him?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No.

MR. LANNING: Now, you haven't again given a whole lot of thought about the death penalty before.

JUROR NUMBER 184: You know, you hear it all

the time that somebody was killed, you hear it all the time, you know, that somebody was electrocuted or whatever, you know, got the death penalty, you know.

MR. LANNING: Right. And when you hear -- when you heard that in the past, what's come to mind? Was it like well, that needed to happen or that's sad that that happened or?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I mean, you hear it often. So, you know, it's kind of like come to meet death.

MR. LANNING: I'm sorry?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I said if you hear that often, so it comes to be like it just doesn't.

MR. LANNING: Doesn't mean anything anymore?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I guess, you know, because,
you know, I may hear, you know, like so and so or
whatever and I look at them and, you know, just keep
going.

MR. LANNING: Okay. If -- think about a scale zero to ten and zero being little support for the death penalty and then ten being really strongly in support of the death penalty, and number five I'm right in the middle, could you put yourself on that scale?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yeah, I guess so, I guess I could say, you know, eight, nineteen. You know, I'm

just, I'm a person that believes in right and wrong.

JUROR NUMBER 184: That's the way I am.

Okay. And that's --

MR. LANNING: Okay. Would you, would you

consider yourself a person that believes in an eye for an eye? Would you consider yourself a person

that believes in an eye for an eye?

MR. LANNING:

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, you know, I consider, you know, I'm the type of person that try to do right things.

MR. LANNING: Right.

JUROR NUMBER 184: And, you know, I just feel that, I feel though that, you know, when things -- that people should pay for the things that they done when a person is killed.

MR. LANNING: Okay. Is the punishment of life without parole, is that an acceptable punishment for murder in your view?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, I have to first look at all the facts, you know, you have to look at all, you know, I just can't really say something I don't really know all the details.

MR. LANNING: Well, could you think of a first degree murder, can you picture any first agree murder in your mind that the acceptable punishment would be

1 |

life?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I never been a situation (unintelligible) so it would be kind of hard for me to say.

MR. LANNING: Are there any -- let me think.

Can you think of an example of a first degree murder where you think the only appropriate sentence would be death?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, you have to weigh, you know, you got to weigh, you got to weigh the evidence.

MR. LANNING: Right. You've heard the Judge explain this weighing process.

JUROR NUMBER 184: Right.

MR. LANNING: You heard Mr. Brown explain it as well.

JUROR NUMBER 184: Right.

MR. LANNING: Suppose you'd get into a situation that aggravating circumstances are present and mitigation is also present, mitigation does not outweigh the aggravating, at that point in time, I'm trying to make sure whether you understood their discussion, at that point in time, what is it -- what is your understanding of what you're supposed to do?

JUROR NUMBER 184: We supposed to -- you can

come back with two verdicts, two types of verdicts, you can come back with, you know, life without parole or you can still accept the death penalty or come back with a life without parole sentence, it could be -- you can come back with either one of those, you know.

MR. LANNING: Okay. And it sounds like you understood it well.

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. LANNING: Some people don't. The instructions lead some people to believe that they don't have a choice if the aggravation outweighs the mitigation and that they — at that point their only option's death, but you understand that it's not, you still have the option of recommending life even if the aggravation outweighs the mitigation.

Now, aggravation has to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. LANNING: Mitigation does not have to be -it doesn't have that high of burden, it's by the
greater weight of the evidence, more likely than not
could, if you're reasonably convinced it's proven,
it's been proven. You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes

MR. LANNING: Let me ask you whether you could consider -- I'm not asking you how you would weigh but if you would consider some potential mitigation. If evidence were presented that showed Mr. Bradley suffers from a mental illness, is that something that you could consider as mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I don't understand what you're -- well, I (unintelligible).

MR. LANNING: Could you tell me why?

JUROR NUMBER 184: You know, I know that sometime some cases and things that they use that sometimes as one of their reasons. So, I think it's just based upon the circumstances and the evidence that, you know.

MR. MOORE: How about -- I don't want to read too much into what you just said but it sounded like you kept up with some death penalty cases over the years, is that right?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, no, I wouldn't say
that. I do look at, you know, I do look at things
like that. I look at, you know, like some cold cases
and things like that, you know, KTV (unintelligible).

MR. LANNING: Right. But have you formed an opinion that mental illness is being used as an excuse maybe or that it's not true?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I've seen it used a lot. I seen it used, you know, like I've heard, you know, like I say, I do look at (unintelligible) and things like that.

MR. LANNING: How about brain damage, have you seen situations where people try to present brain damage and just being somehow mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 184: No.

MR. LANNING: How about having prior child abuse, is that something that you could consider as potentially mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, you know, I consider the facts and all that, you have to take all the aggravating and everything (unintelligible).

MR. LANNING: Well, how about drug abuse, is that something you consider as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 184: You know, those kind of things I've heard about, you know, but I don't know (unintelligible) in my opinion or not, that's kind of hard to say.

MR. LANNING: Well, would you put -- in reference to prior abuse as a child, do you know if you can consider that or not as mitigation? Again, I don't know is an acceptable answer. This is, you know, this is -- Mr. Bradley faces the most severe

2.0

sanction he can have and everybody, including him, is entitled to a jury that is impartial and unbiased, wouldn't you agree?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. LANNING: And you can have biases, it doesn't make you wrong. It could make you not the right person for this jury, it doesn't make you wrong. So, could you consider child abuse as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I have to look at the facts and things like that. I guess I could consider, you know, all the facts and things like that. I could look into too, that would be one of the things that I would look at and weigh.

MR. LANNING: Are you a member of a church?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes, I am.

MR. LANNING: And may I ask the religion?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Baptist.

MR. LANNING: Baptist?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. LANNING: And does the Baptist church have a position on the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I have never heard, you know, I have never heard them speak of that, no. He usually don't get into that. I have never heard him

say anything. He could have but I haven't heard it. 1 MR. LANNING: Yes, ma'am. Now, this case 2 involves the killing of a law enforcement officer and 3 it's charged as a premeditated. 4 Right? 5 JUROR NUMBER 184: Right. 6 MR. LANNING: And the if the State proves to 7 you that it's premeditated murder of a law enforcement officer, at that point could you consider 8 9 mitigation? 10 JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes, I consider all the 11 facts. MR. LANNING: If the State proves premeditated 12 murder of a law enforcement officer, is there any 13 14 mitigation evidence in your mind, anything that could possibly outweigh the aggravation? 15 16 MR. BROWN: Judge, I'm to object to that. THE COURT: Okay. Bench conference. 17 (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out 18 of the hearing of Juror Number 184 as follows:) 19 20 Judge, the objection is it's asking MR. BROWN: for a commitment in the process which is ultimately 21 what she has to do as a juror. 22 MR. LANNING: I'm trying to find out whether 23 she -- whether there is anything possible. I'm not 24

asking her whether she would do it.

25

THE COURT: Make sure you say you say can you consider mitigation.

MR. MOORE: I thought he said that. I thought he put it in the terms of can you, is there anything that you can considering mitigating which would outweigh the aggravating, just can you do it. Just when the State asked, you know, can you consider — if you found aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating, can you consider death. I mean, that's just the same way, it's just reverse.

MR. BROWN: His first question which she answer was premeditated of a law enforcement, can you consider. She said yes. And then the next question which I objected to was can you think of mitigation that could outweigh and that's the question that I'm objecting to.

MR. MOORE: Here's another thought. He asked in the abstract, you know, if she could accept a list of aggravating circumstances, which we object going all the way back to when we first tried to get aggravating circumstances in front of these jurors, the question they can answer, give an intelligent answer to and so she's being asked in the abstract like all the jurors can you accept this list of aggravating circumstances. They have no idea what

1.3

that means.

THE COURT: We're way beyond that, so.

MR. MOORE: So, you know, he's just asking in an abstract way is there mitigation that you could consider that potentially could --

THE COURT: He didn't that though. That was the question before and she answered that. We're on to a next question, so. I mean, the question as phrased I'm going to sustain the objection.

MR. MOORE: What are you going to ask, Mark?
You could ask her what she considers mitigating, what
she would consider mitigation.

THE COURT: Okay.

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

MR. LANNING: What type of things could you consider to be mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, you know, as I -- I mean, I'm not sure. I'm not trying to be like harsh or tough, but I know that as you speak like child abuse and things like that, I know that when I was growing up if, you know, the way that my mother would whoop me, we probably yield to that, you know. So, I mean, the child abuse, you know, so. I don't know. I'm just -- it just, it just make me think that in

that situation that, you know, that was the way of saying when my mother would do that (unintelligible) you done wrong so I'm going to punish you for that. So, I mean, it's like (unintelligible), you know.

MR. LANNING: Right.

JUROR NUMBER 184: So, you know. Today they calling it child abuse but in my time it was a good whooping and so, you know. I guess that's what I'm kind of saying that...

MR. LANNING: Is the idea of mitigation evidence, mental health.

JUROR NUMBER 184: Right.

MR. LANNING: Child abuse.

JUROR NUMBER 184: Right.

MR. LANNING: In your mind, and there's no right or wrong answer, would it just be an excuse to you?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, you know, I don't know. See, sometimes, you know, like we hear things like that, first thing, you know, you hear is that the person say well, you know, they have a mental problem or they, you know, or things of that nature. I seen that, you know, as an excuse as to why, you know, they did that or whatever. You know, my mother whooped me but, you know, I turned out to be a pretty

good person from that, you know, (unintelligible) or 1 whatever you calling it, you know, whooping or 2 3 whatever. MR. LANNING: I'm not --4 JUROR NUMBER 184: I know what you're saying 5 but, you know, I, you know, I just have to... 6 7 MR. LANNING: Could you tell me in your mind what might mitigate a first degree premeditated 8 murder? 9 MR. BROWN: Judge, again, I'm going to object 10 to that. 11 THE COURT: Overruled. 12 You can answer the question. Is MR. LANNING: 13 there anything possible in your mind that can 14 mitigate a first degree premeditated murder? 15 16 JUROR NUMBER 184: (Unintelligible). MR. LANNING: Ma'am? And if the answer is no, 17 there's nothing wrong with that. 18 JUROR NUMBER 184: 19 I Say no. MR. LANNING: I'm sorry? 2.0 I say no. JUROR NUMBER 184: 21 MR. LANNING: Nothing that could mitigate a 22 first degree premeditated murder, is that right? 23 JUROR NUMBER 184: I said no. 24

MR. MOORE: No, there's not?

25

JUROR NUMBER 184: Well.

MR. LANNING: If that's your, if that's your view, if that's true, we need to hear you say it if that's your view. Is that your view?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes.

MR. LANNING: And is there anything that we could do that would change that view?

JUROR NUMBER 184: I would have to -- well, I would have to see the evidence. I really (unintelligible).

MR. LANNING: Ma'am, it sounds like you've got strong views.

JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, you know, I'm not a, you know, I'm the kind of a person that, I'm just the kind of the person that believes in right and wrong. I mean, if you would (unintelligible) just say that I was really, you know, hard on him (unintelligible). So, you know, that kind of, you know, and then I ask them I say you going to take them back and they say no.

MR. LANNING: Take them back?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Take the (unintelligible) back, you know, if I could take it back, yeah.

MR. LANNING: Oh, okay. Ma'am, I'm not -- now, I don't want to you think that I'm --

JUROR NUMBER 184: But you know what, honestly, do people honestly care. I know a lot of people, this could be a possibility that I could, you know, I could know the person, I really don't know. I know a lot, you know, people get angry but (unintelligible). It doesn't have anything to do about (unintelligible). I mean, I'm not hard, I'm not a nice person.

MR. LANNING: I don't doubt that, ma'am. I don't doubt it. Ma'am, if I understood you correctly, there's nothing in your mind that would mitigate a first degree murder and --

MR. BROWN: Judge, I object to this and ask to approach on it.

THE COURT: Yes, you can.

MR. LANNING: I haven't finished the question.

THE COURT: If we can have a bench conference.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of Juror Number 184 as follows:)

MR. BROWN: Judge, I'm objecting to this because I think he's -- I see two different meanings of his question that he's asked here and that's I think the trouble and based on her last response I think the juror's interpreting his meaning different than I think the intent of the question because she

said --

degree.

THE COURT:

MR. BROWN: The two interpretations would be are you mitigating a penalty versus mitigating first degree murder. His question is is there anything that would mitigate a first degree murder and she's talking about taking a degree back because that's the term she used, if I could take a degree back because we've already talked about first degree and second

What is your two interpretations?

THE COURT: I hear what she said but she still says she can consider death and life at the -- as a possible penalty even if there's no mitigators and she still said she would consider both as a possible penalty in this case so.

I don't think she's viewing this question --

MR. MOORE: She's rejected every mitigation that we put in front of her.

THE COURT: She said --

MR. MOORE: Mental health, drug addiction, brain damage.

THE COURT: She's been hesitant about it and she said I don't know if I can consider that.

MR. MOORE: I heard her say no and what we can do -- and I also heard her say that there's no mitigation that she would be open to considering and

so if that's the case, then the question has to be in considering a penalty if she could follow the Court's instruction and engage in this process. I mean, that's a fair question.

THE COURT: If you ask that that's so open ended she's not even going to know what you're talking about and that's what I'm concerned is she doesn't know what --

MR. MOORE: Well, then maybe she shouldn't be on the jury, Your Honor. I mean, if she's having trouble understanding basic, which are pretty basic.

THE COURT: These are not pretty basic terms, that's my issue in this whole process. These are not -- if you just heard this the first time, there's no way these people would understand it, they've never been involved in this process before.

MR. MOORE: But the people we've discussed before we haven't had this much difficulty with before.

THE COURT: I disagree with that, there's been a lot of difficult --

MR. MOORE: There has been, but with her, I mean, she's -- I just see her either as not comprehending what we're asking or not being honest in her answers and I -- there's just something --

that why Mr. Lanning's spending so much time on her because there's something there that we're not getting at and I don't think we're getting at what really she is thinking. I mean, it's disturbing, that bothers me, and I think Mr. Lanning is in that position too because he keeps — he continues to ask. There's just something going on we're not getting at.

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection as to the form of the question. You're going to have to relate it to the penalty phase and give her more information. I can tell you at this time I'm not going to strike her for cause. So, if you want to explore it more, I'll give you the opportunity to explore it more.

MR. LANNING: All right.

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

MR. LANNING: Ma'am, having the beliefs that you have and that you believe that no mitigation, nothing could mitigate first degree premeditated murder as a penalty, would it be fair to say that you would not be able to follow the instruction to consider mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Well, I can follow the instruction for mitigation.

MR. MOORE: I can't hear. JUROR NUMBER 184: 2 I can. 3 MR. LANNING: You told me you couldn't consider --4 JUROR NUMBER 184: I said I could consider all 5 the facts, that's what I said. 6 7 MR. LANNING: But in your --8 JUROR NUMBER 184: And that's included also. 9 MR. LANNING: Okay. And if I'm wrong, correct me, but nothing in your, nothing in your beliefs 10 11 could mitigate a first degree murder, is that right, 12 first degree premeditated murder? While you say you could consider, you also believe nothing could 13 14 mitigate --JUROR NUMBER 184: I can consider, I can 15 16 consider, yes, I can consider, I can consider that 17 but I don't, you know. MR. LANNING: Nothing would mitigate in your 18 19 mind, you can consider it, but nothing could mitigate 20 a first degree premeditated murder, is that a fair 21 statement? THE COURT: Juror Number 184, his question 22 23 relates not to the quilt phase, whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of the charges, it relates to 24

the penalty phase when you're going to make a

25

recommendation of death or life in prison without the possibility of parole. I just wanted to make sure that was clear to you so you understood that.

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Do you understand the question?

JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. I mean, I can consider, I can consider, yes, I can.

MR. LANNING: Now, if I understand you correct saying I can consider it but nothing could mitigate the first degree premeditated murder. So, I may listen to it but I won't consider it.

JUROR NUMBER 184: No, I said that I would have to listen to all the facts, mitigation, I have to -- I can consider all of it. I can look at all the facts. I can hear it, yes, I can consider that.

MR. LANNING: You've already told me nothing could mitigate a first degree premeditated murder.

MR. BROWN: Judge, I'm going to --

MR. LANNING: I mean, would you agree that those positions can't square?

JUROR NUMBER 184: You can weigh, you can weigh, we would weigh the facts, I can weigh mitigation. I can weigh all of that, yes.

MR. LANNING: You can weigh it, but isn't it

true that in your mind nothing could mitigate a first degree premeditated murder?

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I'm going to object to this question.

THE COURT: Bench conference.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of Juror Number 184 as follows:)

THE COURT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Judge, I'm objecting because the form of the question is not clear because we're not mitigating first degree murder, it's the penalty. If somebody came up to me and said mitigate first degree murder, I'd be thinking along the lines her response was we going to run it down to second degree and he keeps using the same term and that's what I'm objecting to.

MR. LANNING: She knows --

MR. MOORE: He told her, he said penalty.

THE COURT: I'm still not sure if she relates it to the vote for life or death, I'm not sure of that, and with all due respect, I think it's the way the questioning is that's confusing. So, I'm going to sustain the objection. Thank you.

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

1 MR. LANNING: Thank you, ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOORE: Shall we?

MR. LANNING: Can we approach.

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of Juror Number 184 as follows:)

MR. LANNING: Judge, we move to strike her for cause at this time. She's, she's indicated that while she can weigh -- she can consider mitigation on the one hand, she also very clear that nothing could mitigate a first degree murder and under Article 1, Section 2, 9, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 23 of the Florida Constitution and the 5th, 6th, 8th and 14th Amendments to the US Constitution, she's a -- she should be removed for cause. If she can't consider and -- I mean, it's like we had that gentleman earlier who said I can consider and weigh but I could never give death. This lady is the same. not be saying I could only give death but she is the same because she -- it's the reverse. She's saying she can't -- she could not consider evidence that could mitigate a first degree murder.

MR. MOORE: May I add that the Court paused and pointed out that what was being discussed here, what was being meant was mitigate a penalty for first

degree murder and did she understand that, she said she did. And so, I mean, since we're stuck with accepting what she says at face value, then the answers are inconsistent and my concern is this has been agonizing with this particular person that something -- we're not getting at what she's really thinking. I mean, I think she's confused and she doesn't get -- I know this is confusing. I know it's hard for all of these people, but with her it's especially difficult and if she's having trouble understanding this point, what more can we say to her that's going to dispel what appears to be her confusion. I don't think -- you know, the Court can read the instructions again and my feeling is she's still going to be confused. I mean, she's exhibiting either a non willingness to share with us what she's really thinking, I don't think that's it, or she's just confused and that's exhibited -- demonstrated in her answers which are inconsistent.

She's also -- we asked her specifically about all the mitigating circumstances and she said no to all of them. I wrote that down. Mr. Pirolo wrote that down. That's what I heard her say. So -- I mean, plus, she --

MR. LANNING: I didn't ask her about brain

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

damage.

MR. MOORE: I thought you did, but anyway all the ones you asked she said no. The problem is she's saying basically you should pay for your crimes and the way I read that is, and I think it's considering her answer, nothing will mitigate a first degree murder penalty for her as the Court cleared up, the Court asked her.

MR. BROWN: Judge, may I respond?

THE COURT: Response from the State.

MR. BROWN: Judge, first, as far as the specific mitigators they talked about, they asked about (unintelligible) and she said she sometimes sees abuse as a reason and it has to based on the circumstances of the evidence.

As far as the brain damage, the question as phrased have you seen it used. Because she had already talked about with mental illness I seen people use it. That's when she said no, she had not seen it used. Then they moved on to child abuse, and I wrote down the questions and answers, child abuse she said she'd have to look at the facts, weigh it all, she can look at it and weigh it and she went on later on to discuss about the child abuse that, which I think is a valid concern, she says I was whipped,

it's a degree. She keeps going back to she has to look at all the facts and weigh it. Drug abuse she says she doesn't know if it would have a role in her decision, hard to say, she has to look at it. That's the whole key and she's been adamant all along saying she has to look at all the facts and evidence. She said over and over she could consider what's been presented, she could consider these things, she has to hear it. I mean, she's met the legal standard.

MR. MOORE: When we got into do you consider these things excuses, her response was I hear these things all the time, I follow murder cases and I hear these explanations given all the time.

THE COURT: You know, with all you due respect, she says that if someone does wrong they need to be penalized but she hasn't really said what that penalty would be.

MR. MOORE: No, we're not asking her what the penalty would be.

THE COURT: She hasn't said that she wouldn't consider it. When you asked her the questions with regard to life or death, she said she could consider both possible penalties. She's talking in the abstract they need to be penalized.

MR. MOORE: But she also said nothing will

1.0

1.8

mitigate a first degree murder penalty for her, that's what she said. It's consistent with all the other things she said. Like when we gave her specifics she said no, that's what I got out of her. That's what I heard out of her.

THE COURT: She did say no, that nothing would mitigate that, but then when it was discussed in totality she didn't even say she would consider -- you talked to her and a lot of people get kind of stuck on this, if the aggravating outweigh the mitigating, does that mean death and she just said no, it means I can consider both, so.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, she can't have it both ways, she can't consider it and yet say there's nothing that would mitigate.

THE COURT: Actually, she can have it both ways. She can have it both ways. As long as she says she wouldn't consider the -- as long as she doesn't say that death is the penalty.

MR. MOORE: The specific mitigating circumstances we gave her she said no to. I mean, she danced around it, other times she said well, I have to hear all the facts but she said no to child abuse.

THE COURT: I got the impression when she

8

9

talked about child abuse she means degrees of child abuse. Okay. She didn't -- I mean, she's talking about degrees. If she heard to her, you know, a little whooping is not child abuse. So, she's talking -- and then she even said I have to hear that.

MR. MOORE: Mental health, drug addiction, she 7 was asked about that.

> THE COURT: Drug addiction we already know some people won't consider that, that's a pretty iffy one.

MR. BROWN: She said she doesn't know (unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: It fits with -- go ahead.

MR. BROWN: She doesn't know (unintelligible) in her decision, hard to say. Mental illness she said sometimes used as a reason and it had to be based on the circumstances.

THE COURT: She always got back to it would have to be based on the evidence.

MR. MOORE: Well, this is my view with her saying nothing would mitigate, nothing would mitigate. That's what she said. That's her -- it came out of her mouth and it doesn't square with the other things that she already said which are inconsistent, I think, at best. So, I think the

Court to be safe, not just be safe, it's clear to me
but I think to be safe the Court should strike her
for cause.

MR. BROWN: Judge, I would --

MR. MOORE: Her answers are too inconsistent.

MR. BROWN: I would point out when the Court instructed her that she would -- talking about penalty versus guilt and that's when she then went back to and I would say dispute or disagreement with Mr. Lanning as far as what she would think because she kept going back to I would consider it.

THE COURT: I'm going to deny the request to strike her for cause. Okay.

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

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 184, I'm going to release you for today. You're still under consideration for a juror in this case. I'm going to ask you to return Friday morning at 8:30.

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 see anything — avoid seeing newspaper headlines, articles or television or radio, anything about this case. Do not conduct any independent

research yourself. Don't look up anything about this 1 case or its participants. Now, any questions or 2 concerns? 3 JUROR NUMBER 184: No. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Friday 8:30 report to the 5 jury assembly room. Okay. Thank you. 6 (Thereupon, Juror Number 184 exited the 7 8 courtroom.) THE COURT: Okay. We're going to take a recess 9 ourselves. Okay. We're going to take a ten minute 10 recess. If you could be back at five after 4:00. 11 Court will be in recess for ten minutes. 12 (Thereupon, a recess was taken in the 13 14 proceedings.) 15 THE COURT: Okay. We can bring out 16 Mr. Bradley. (Thereupon, the defendant was escorted into the 17 courtroom by the court deputy.) 18 THE COURT: Okay. Are we ready to bring in 19 20 185? MR. MOORE: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Okay. We'll bring in 185. 22 (Thereupon, Juror Number 185 was escorted into 23 the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were 24 25 had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon Juror Number 185. First I want to thank you for being here. Thank you for being patient with us with regarding, regarding this process. It is a long process. It's a long process for you, it's a long process for us but we do appreciate you coming to serve. When I talked to you yesterday we talked about some rules that came into effect. Those rules kind of started at the time that I announced them. So, I'm going to ask you some questions about those. Since I talked to you, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants.

JUROR NUMBER 185: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 185: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 185: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 185: No.

THE COURT: The other day when we were sitting in court you were on the left hand side over here. The Judge -- when the attorneys were at the bench with me, with the Judge, there was a lot of talking out in the audience, did you hear anything that any of the jurors said around you about this case?

JUROR NUMBER 185: I don't pay attention.

THE COURT: Okay. I know Number 188 was sitting close to you, he was pretty verbal about not wanting or being confused about following the instructions, did you here anything that he may have said about the case?

JUROR NUMBER 185: No.

THE COURT: So, you weren't paying attention to what they were saying?

JUROR NUMBER 185: I'm not paying attention what they're saying.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Fair enough. I mean -- so, you didn't hear anything that anyone said?

JUROR NUMBER 185: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to talk about some things this afternoon, then the State will have an opportunity to talk with you, the Defense will have an opportunity to talk with you. There are no right

or wrong answers to the questions that we ask, we just ask you to be honest, frank and give us the full information. Some of the questions may be difficult, some of the questions may be hard. A lot of times people haven't thought about the answers to these questions or thought about this subject. So, take your time. If you -- if it calls for a yes or no answer and you can answer yes or no, answer yes or no, but if you can't answer it yes or no, I don't know is a proper response as well. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 185: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. The first thing I'm going to talk to you about is do you know anything about this case, and this means prior to coming to court, either from your even personal knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, or from the media, including radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 185: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Other than -- so, the other day I talked about the case, I told you what the name of case was, I talked about the charges, you have not heard anything about this case prior to that time?

JUROR NUMBER 185: Well, when the case came first in the news, that's the only thing I've seen in

the TV, but after that it's, I don't know, I don't really watch news. 2 THE COURT: Okay. So, at the time of -- the 3 case involves the death of a law enforcement officer. 4 JUROR NUMBER 185: Right. 5 THE COURT: So, at the time of the death you 6 7 heard about the case? JUROR NUMBER 185: Well I heard about what 8 happened and then the funeral and then after that I 9 haven't seen anything. 10 THE COURT: Okay. And how -- the information 11 that you heard about the case, how would that be, by 12 13 watching it on TV? JUROR NUMBER 185: Watching it on TV, right, 14 15 that's correct. THE COURT: And you say you don't really watch 16 the news. 17 JUROR NUMBER 185: No, because for me it's like 18 it's just a waste of time, there's no good news all 19 the time. So, I just, I just don't go to news. 20 THE COURT: Okay. So, what information do you 21 think you know about the case? I mean, you know 22 there's a death of a police officer. What other 23

specific information do you know?

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 185: I don't know anything

that's about it.

THE COURT: Did you watch the funeral or just know that the funeral was going on?

except, except for her death and just the funeral and

JUROR NUMBER 185: I just watched the funeral but I didn't, you know, get anything or stay until it's done.

THE COURT: You didn't stay until it's done or just saw that it was on TV?

JUROR NUMBER 185: I just saw it on the TV and that's it because I'm on my way out to work.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you ever see a picture of Mr. Bradley on the TV?

JUROR NUMBER 185: No.

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do if you serve as a juror in this case is to 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 and the evidence, and the evidence presented in this trial in this courtroom, can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 185: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, when you heard this on the news, did it stir up any strong feelings inside you?

I mean --

JUROR NUMBER 185: Yes.

THE COURT: -- obviously people feel bad about the death of a police officer but some people it was very emotional for, other people it wasn't as emotional for.

JUROR NUMBER 185: Well, I felt so bad for what happened because in my family there -- my father was, he was in the military.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 185: Something happen like that for a man in uniform got shot, it's just like it's bad.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you know that this case involves the death of a law enforcement officer. So, what we ask you to do, and this is what you have to do in pretty much any criminal case, is the State has the burden of proof. The State has to prove each element of each count beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt, and I'm going to talk more about this later. The Defense does not have to prove anything. The defendant does not have to prove anything. So, at this time the defendant is assumed — is presumed to be not guilty. In fact, the defendant is presumed to be innocent and any emotions or feelings that you have or opinions that

you have prior to coming to court you kind of got to 1 set those aside and you've got to as a juror require 2 the State to prove the case, prove the case, prove 3 each element of each count beyond and to the 4 exclusion of every reasonable doubt and presume the 5 defendant to be not guilty, presume the defendant to 6 be innocent. Can you do that? 7 JUROR NUMBER 185: I think it's hard for me to 8 9 do that. THE COURT: Okay. That's because your father 10 11 being in the military? JUROR NUMBER 185: Yes. 12 THE COURT: And that is a person in uniform. 13 14 JUROR NUMBER 185: Right, and I have, I have nephew in the Army and if something happen like that, 15 16 it's -- I don't think I can do any help. 17 THE COURT: Okay.

So, if -- would that mean that you would favor the State as opposed to the Defense?

JUROR NUMBER 185: What do you mean favor to the?

THE COURT: Would you give favoritism to the State over the Defense?

> JUROR NUMBER 185: Yes.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Now, let me talk about one other

22

23

24

25

issue and that's the issue of there would be law enforcement officers coming to testify. What we -- I give you some instructions about weighing the testimony of witnesses and tell you how you do that and I ask you to weigh the testimony of a law enforcement officer the same way that you weigh other witnesses. Once you hear their testimony, you can decide how much weight to give it but you can't give any witness extra credit over another witness such as a law enforcement officer just because of their profession. So, you couldn't give a law enforcement officer kind of extra credit, you'd have to listen to their testimony the same as you listen to any other witnesses testimony and then after you hear the testimony you could decide how much weight to give the testimony but you can't give them what I call extra credit just because they're a law enforcement officer. How do you feel about that? I mean, do you think that you would give, you would give more credibility to a law enforcement officer over other witnesses just because of their profession? JUROR NUMBER 185: I think I would give more

THE COURT: Okay. And if I instruct you you can't do that, would you be able to follow that

credit to the officers.

instruction? I mean, I know people want to do what I -- they want to please me and say yes, Judge, I can follow the instruction but really what we need you to do is be honest and tell us what you can do and what you can't do.

JUROR NUMBER 185: I don't think I can -- I don't think I can do that because you said follow these and it's against my, you know. I don't think I can do that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOORE: Stipulate.

THE COURT: Okay. Then Juror Number 185, I am going to release you from being considered as a juror in this case. What I'm going to ask you to do is go downstairs, report to the jury assembly room. They will give you some brief information and they'll send you on your way. Okay. Thank you for being patient with us regarding this process.

JUROR NUMBER 185: You're welcome.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 185 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. For the record, Juror Number 185 is released for cause. Okay. We can bring in Juror Number 187.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 187 was escorted into

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

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon Juror Number 187.

JUROR NUMBER 187: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Thank you for being here. Thank
you for being patient with us regarding this process.
Yesterday when we were in court I announced some
rules that govern your service as a juror. Those
rules started at that time. So, I'm going to ask you
some questions. Since I announced those rules, have
you read or been exposed to reading newspaper
headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or
its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 187: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 187: Not since yesterday, no.

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

JUROR NUMBER 187: No.

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

presence?

2

3

5

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2.4

25

JUROR NUMBER 187: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Yesterday when we were -during the process and you were in court and you were sitting over here to the left we had some bench conferences where the attorneys were up front There was a lot of discussions speaking with me. between the jurors at that time. You were sitting by Number 188 and Juror Number 188 was somewhat vocal. Did he -- after I announced those rules, did you all have any discussions about the case or the facts of the case or anything regarding the death penalty or anything of that nature?

JUROR NUMBER 187: No.

Okay. I know he made some comments THE COURT: about being concerned about the rules, did you -- did that cause you any concern?

JUROR NUMBER 187: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Was there anything that happened during that time period before you -- in the courtroom before you left the courtroom that would have violated any of those rules that I discussed with you?

JUROR NUMBER 187: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm going to talk with

you -- I'm going to have an opportunity to speak with you, I'm going to talk to you about your knowledge about the case prior to coming to court and I'm going to talk to you about the death penalty. The attorneys will have an opportunity to speak with you as well, the State and the Defense. In these discussions there are no right or wrong answers, we just ask you to be frank, honest, complete.

Sometimes people say Judge, can I say that? I assure you at this time you can say whatever you think is appropriate to say that you think would be important for us to know.

JUROR NUMBER 187: Okay.

THE COURT: The first question I'm going to ask you is do you know anything about this case either from your own knowledge, rumor, by discussions with anyone else, or from media, including radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 187: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what information you believe you know.

JUROR NUMBER 187: I work for public cable company.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 187: A couple of years ago we had an officer from Crime Line come in and the cable company participated in a program called Operation Bright Eyes and basically what their intent of that was that as my job I'm throughout the community throughout the day. So, we're in the community, see a lot of things. They gave us a laminated sheet of all of the police officers numbers and fire, anything that we saw — they instructed us not to get involved but if we saw anything, we were basically another set of eyes out in the community, if we saw anything to report it.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 187: Through the years of the program there's been -- when we get e-mails or texts for like Satellite Beach one time there was a missing he elderly man and they sent out his description and actually one of our employees saw the man, made a phone call, it was an Alzheimer's patience, and helped get him home. The day of this particular event we did get an e-mail and a text message out of a description of a vehicle that they were looking for within this incidents and everybody was working in that neighborhood where this happened to be on the look out and if we saw anything to report it.

1 THE COURT: Okay. So, you received that e-mail or and/or text? 3 JUROR NUMBER 187: Yes, ma'am. THE COURT: Did you see anything? 4 5 JUROR NUMBER 187: No, ma'am, I was not in that particular area that day. 6 7 THE COURT: And were you involved in any 8 reporting of anything? JUROR NUMBER 187: No, ma'am. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. So, that happened. So, what 11 else -- I mean, have you seen anything on the 12 newspaper, have you -- okay. Tell me what you know. JUROR NUMBER 187: After we received that 13 14 e-mail, of course, that's part of my interest what 15 was going on and like I said the place I work for 16 owns a news station and, of course, we went to that channel and watched. 17 THE COURT: Channel 13? 18 JUROR NUMBER 187: Yes, ma'am. 19 2.0 THE COURT: Okav. JUROR NUMBER 187: And, of course, watched it. 21 22 And then I have a habit of after work coming home, my 23 wife's making dinner, I watch the evening news. And 24 I've never gone and searched for any information

regarding this case but any time that I've seen or

25

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 187:

Okay.

THE COURT:

Like we had discussions

heard as I'm watching my normal evening news I pay attention and have discussions with people at work about it, this, that and the other.

THE COURT: Okay. So, do you normally -- what channel do you normally watch?

Usually Channel 9 but like I JUROR NUMBER 187: say like the date of the incident I knew the Channel 13 was there so. Channel 13 seems to repeat their stories a lot sooner than the other local channels So, that evening of the incident I tuned into Channel 13 that night and it was on, but then generally I watch Channel 9.

THE COURT: And when you watch Channel 9, say what time to what time would you watch Channel 9?

JUROR NUMBER 187: Probably usually 5:30 to --I think it goes off at 6:00 or 6:30, I usually watch -- and it's usually on -- I watch it while dinner is being prepared and once we eat dinner the TV's still on and we can see the television from the dining room table and just, you know. We make it as part of our -- me and my wife and two children, you know, we discuss topics and things over dinner and everything, so.

about this case with my children. I have two teenage children and discussed it with them.

THE COURT: So, having said that, do you have -- some people watch -- or have heard about this case and, you know, it's unusual in that what happened but -- I mean, it didn't, it didn't spark any emotions in them other than they're sad for what happened. How did this case affect you, if it had any affect on you at all?

JUROR NUMBER 187: I would say just listening what the evidence and stuff that I've seen that I think I've already come to a conclusion.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 187: And I, you know, I think it would take a strong amount of evidence to change my opinion.

THE COURT: Okay. And what's your opinion?

JUROR NUMBER 187: I mean, it speaks for

itself. I know it's all been -- it's biased from the

news but, I mean, in my opinion what's happened is

what's happened.

THE COURT: You kind of got to put it on the record and say it. So, that's why I said there's not any right or wrong answers in here.

(CONTINUED TO VOLUME IX)