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

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

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

versus

BRANDON LEE BRADLEY

Defendant,



VOLUME II OF XI

TRANSCRIPT OF DIGITAL RECORDED JURY TRIAL

VOIR DIRE

The transcript of the Digital Recorded Proceedings taken in the above-styled cause, at the Moore Justice Center, 2825 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera, Florida, on the 24th, 27th, 28th day of February, and 6th, 7th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th and 17th day of March, 2014, before the Honorable Morgan Reinman.

21

22

20

RYAN REPORTING REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS

23

24

1670 S. FISKE BOULEVARD ROCKLEDGE, FLORIDA 32955



25

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

THE COURT: Okay. And when did you know that information, at the time or afterwards?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Actually, it was about five days ago I think when it just popped up on TV.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you gained that information from what you heard on television?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

THE COURT: Any other source?

JUROR NUMBER 13: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 13: Absolutely, yes.

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

MR. BROWN: Juror Number 13, good afternoon.

Let me start with concerning your views on the death penalty. You indicated you were on the fence, could consider it, kind hesitating along those lines that you didn't initially have any views on it, what do you mean when you use the term you're on the fence?

JUROR NUMBER 13: I really don't know how to -the way I look at on the fence on this issue on the
death penalty is somebody having say that this person

must die and that's, that's it, that's the end of all, that's what I mean.

MR. BROWN: And how do you feel with about your being put -- potentially being put in a situation where you have to make that decision?

JUROR NUMBER 13: I feel like it's my duty.

MR. BROWN: Can you make that decision?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Can you make a recommendation of death?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Do you come in with -- do you have any preconceived ideas of, well, in order to make a death recommendation this would have to be this or that or something extreme?

JUROR NUMBER 13: I can't -- I don't.

MR. BROWN: Let me go through a little bit of process with you. I know the Court talked about it this morning but she did cover a lot of things and kind of gave you a lot of information in a condensed fashion. To start with, the defendant's charged with first degree murder and that's where if you sit on the jury, you return a verdict of guilt of first degree murder the death penalty comes into play. If you return a verdict of a lesser charge, for

1.3

instance, second degree murder or some other lesser, then the death penalty is off the table. You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: So, let me first ask you a question. The fact that you could avoid having to make that decision by returning a guilty verdict on a lesser charge, would that affect your deliberate at all?

JUROR NUMBER 13: You have to ask that again.

MR. BROWN: Nothing that the death penalty is on the table if you return a verdict for first degree, if you return a verdict for a lesser it takes the death penalty off the table, you're not going to be put in a situation where you have to make that recommendation to the Court.

JUROR NUMBER 13: If I got your question right, my answer would be the death penalty will not deem which way I would go.

MR. BROWN: So, in other words, when it comes to deciding guilt and guilt of first versus guilt of second versus not guilty, that would play no part in that decision?

JUROR NUMBER 13: No.

MR. BROWN: Now, if the verdict -- if the jury

came back with a verdict of first degree murder, we go into the penalty phase. The first step is State would present evidence of what's called aggravating circumstances and ultimately at the close of the case Her Honor will give you -- will read to you an instruction that lists what are the potential aggravating circumstances in this case that you can consider to impose the death penalty and you have to go back, evaluate the evidence and say has the State proven any of those. If there's only one given has the State proven that, if there's more than one has the State proven at least one aggravating circumstance beyond a reasonable doubt. You accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: If State fails to prove any aggravating circumstances, then your verdict is going to be a recommendation for life. You understand? If we've proven one or more, one can be enough, it's all up to you, but if the State has proven one or more than one aggravating circumstance beyond a reasonable doubt, the next step is look at those and decide do those aggravating circumstances justify the death penalty.

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

2.0

MR. BROWN: Obviously if they don't, then your recommendation is life. If you feel they do justify the death penalty, you move on to the next step in the process which is evaluating the mitigating circumstances. As the Court told you earlier if you recall, mitigation can be anything concerning the defendant, background, whatever it may be. You accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: The burden of proof for the mitigating evidence is a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. So, it's less than beyond a reasonable doubt. So, you look at obviously if there's mitigation they present but they fail to meet this burden, then you disregard that, right? It's not proven. You take the mitigation evidence that's been presented, that's been proven and you consider it.

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Now, you have to compare it to the aggravators and you have to go through what the Court's going to tell you is a weighing process.

Just like in any other type of a decision that you have where you make a decision in your life, you look at all the facts and you decide which ones will I

weigh and give great value to, which ones will I give little value to. Just because it's been presented and proved doesn't mean there's some weight that you have to give to it. You understand?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Consider everything, some you give weight, some you give some, some you may give a little weight to. So, you take that mitigation evidence, compare it to the aggravators and ask yourself does the mitigation outweigh the aggravation in this case, those aggravating factors. If you find it does outweigh, then your recommendation would be life. If you feel that the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravating circumstances, then you're in a position where you legally can recommend to the Court a sentence to impose the death penalty. You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: At that point you're not required to. The Court's not going to tell if you meet X, Y and Z that you must return a verdict of death, puts you in a position where you could legally return that verdict, a recommendation of death. Now, that you kind of have that understanding, we went through step by step the process, how do you feel about it?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Feel about?

MR. BROWN: That whole process, the weighing the aggravators and mitigators and put it all together.

JUROR NUMBER 13: I understand it and I agree with it.

MR. BROWN: With that, now that you know the process, can you make a death -- recommendation for the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Is there anything in your background, your religious background, moral beliefs work history, family history, whatever it may be that causes you to any concern and question your ability to be able to make that recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 13: No.

MR. BROWN: You started to hesitate there, I don't know if you were just reading in and thinking about it.

JUROR NUMBER 13: I was in Iraq.

MR. BROWN: We all appreciate your service there, sir. How do you think that might affect you or come into play at all, if it would at all?

JUROR NUMBER 13: I don't think it would because in this case I don't know (unintelligible)

deciding fact (unintelligible) shoot to be honest with you.

MR. BROWN: And you understand in this case obviously you have to base your verdict on the facts and evidence and the Judge's instructions?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Military service is a tremendous thing people do for our country but you have to kind of set that aside and base your verdict on what you hear and see in this courtroom. Any question, problems?

JUROR NUMBER 13: No.

MR. BROWN: You feel comfortable sitting on a jury with death penalty being an issue?

JUROR NUMBER 13: I have no problem.

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

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the Defense.

MR. MOORE: Where would you put yourself on a continuum of one to ten, ten being the strongest support for the death penalty, where would you put yourself on that?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Six or seven.

MR. MOORE: Can you think of reasons in support of the death penalty, why we have it? What would be policy reason or practical reasons behind it that you

think thing of?

JUROR NUMBER 13: I don't know if this would be the proper answer but any time a death of a child.

MR. MOORE: That sort of ties in with my next question, the types of homicides that you can think of that might set themselves apart as being especially warranting or deserving the death penalty. You mentioned the death of a child, can you think of any other types?

JUROR NUMBER 13: (Unintelligible) could possibly run into that, so.

MR. MOORE: Run into what? I'm unclear what your answer is.

JUROR NUMBER 13: As far as being killed, you know, it's a tough choice. I really don't know how to answer.

MR. MOORE: It sure is.

JUROR NUMBER 13: I just don't know if I can answer your question. I definitely believe that if a child was to die at the hands of somebody in a negligent way, I can see that being a death penalty case, I don't know any other situation.

MR. MOORE: All right. So, of course -JUROR NUMBER 13: But I'm open to it.

MR. MOORE: Getting into legal terminology,

we're talking about first degree premeditated murder, negligent act of first degree murder, I know this is all new to you, it's jargon you're not familiar with and what I'm getting at is there -- let's say -- let's pick your selection, your example of a death of a child, is that a case where a death sentence would be automatic?

JUROR NUMBER 13: I don't think anything solid.

MR. MOORE: So, then if the case, as this one does, involves the death of a police officer, if I understand what you're saying not being automatic, that you would then be able to go through the process and seek to find if there were aggravating circumstances, see if they are there proven by the State and then evaluate the mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And balance, so. You understand that life without parole means just what it says, that the person sentenced to life without parole does not get out a prison alive? You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. MOORE: You accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. MOORE: I mean, because I think you're a reflective gentleman --

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 13: Kind of suave, solid.

MR. MOORE: You read way more into that. It seems like you -- well, do you accept without question that life without parole means that a person dies in prison?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Can you think of, again, new terms to you and I don't want to assume more understanding than you have or comfort in terms of that you have, but I think you have understood by now aggravating circumstances are those that found which suggest -which have to be found, there has to be a finding of at least one of those before you can vote for death, but an aggravating circumstance is one that supports the death penalty, mitigating circumstance supports a sentence of life without parole as a more appropriate sentence. So, as to the mitigating circumstances, can you think of any off the top of your head that might mitigate a first degree murder conviction, any circumstances that could relate to a defendant or the defendant's background or the circumstances of the case which might suggest that a sentence of life without parole is more appropriate?

JUROR NUMBER 13: I don't know how to answer that.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Let me just throw some things out and see what you think. If you were to hear evidence of mental illness, for example, would you be open to considering that as a potential mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Absolutely.

MR. MOORE: What is your opinion or your view of the mental health profession, psychologists, psychiatrists, counselors, do you think they provide a useful, valuable service?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes, I do.

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

JUROR NUMBER 13: No.

MR. MOORE: Do you think that it's something that if somebody things positively enough or thinks the right way they can think their way out of that mental illness?

JUROR NUMBER 13: No, that's why they need medication. And I need to expound on that because my wife's daughter has a slight case of -- she's not mentally incoherent but she has to keep medicine to keep (unintelligible) in balance.

MR. MOORE: So, you see that there are factors that people have in their lives that they may not

1 have any control over? 2 JUROR NUMBER 13: Absolutely. MR. MOORE: How about evidence of -- offered to 3 you of brain damage, is that something that you could 4 5 be open to considering a mitigating circumstance? 6 JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes. 7 MR. MOORE: Are you familiar with neuro-imaging 8 technology called magnet resident imaging, MRI? 9 JUROR NUMBER 13: No, (unintelligible) MRIs but 10 I have no idea what it does. MR. MOORE: But you have a rough idea that it's 11 a one way of looking inside the body? 12 13 JUROR NUMBER 13: 14 MR. MOORE: How about PET scan, have you ever 15 heard of that technology? JUROR NUMBER 13: CAT scan? 16 17 MR. MOORE: PET scan. 18 JUROR NUMBER 13: No. 19 MR. MOORE: Would you be open to considering 20 evidence of neuro-imaging if it were offered to you in support of mitigating circumstances? 21 JUROR NUMBER 13: As long the judge says. 22 MR. MOORE: Let's assume that she does and then 23 24 you're sitting and listening to it. 25 JUROR NUMBER 13: Oh yes.

MR. MOORE: Would you be open to it? 1 2 JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes. MR. MOORE: What about drug addiction, drug 3 abuse? Let me ask this. Do you think drug addiction 4 5 is a choice? JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes. 6 MR. MOORE: You think it is in every case? 7 think everybody who's drug addicted can think --8 JUROR NUMBER 13: No. 9 MR. MOORE: -- the right way and stop being 10 11 addicted? JUROR NUMBER 13: No, because there's babies 12 13 that end up coming out that have drug addictions. 14 MR. MOORE: How about grown ups, do you think 15 that in every case that the drug addiction is a 16 choice? JUROR NUMBER 13: 17 Yes. MR. MOORE: Do you think that there may be 18 people who cannot choose to become un-addicted? 19 20 JUROR NUMBER 13: I guess if something is mentally not quite right, yes, but I mean straight 21 narrow person like me or you know, no, it would be a 22 choice. 23 MR. MOORE: So, would you be open to 24

considering drug addiction, drug abuse as a potential

25

mitigating circumstance or would you not?

2

3

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes

4

abuse, is that something that you would be open to

MR. MOORE: How about physical or emotional

5

6

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

considering?

7

MR. MOORE: Do you understand that you are, and do you accept, that regardless of what your findings

8

are with respect to aggravating circumstances and

9

what your findings are with respect to mitigating

11

circumstances and the whole balancing process, no

12

matter what the outcome of that is you are never

13

required to vote for death?

14

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

15

MR. MOORE: You accept that?

16

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

17

MR. MOORE: Do you understand that as a juror

18

in a penalty phase proceeding that you have the right

19

to have your views respected like other jurors and

20

not to be subjected to being browbeaten or

21

intimidated or anything like that --

22

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes, sir.

23

MR. MOORE: -- to get you to conform. In the

24

guilt/innocence part where the jurors -- jury's asked

25

to decide guilt or innocence, the jury -- the verdict

has to be unanimous. Everybody has to agree, all for not guilty, all for guilt, it has to be unanimous, but in the penalty face each juror can vote as he or she sees fit and you may -- you do not have to change your vote to conform to the vote of the other people, you understand? You accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And likewise, if your views are to be respected, can you give respect to the opinion of other people?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Absolutely.

MR. MOORE: Respect their decisions about what they think is a fair verdict?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Let me ask this. If the Court instructed you as follows as a potential mitigating circumstance, can you accept and follow this instruction? The capital felony was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance, would you be able -- would you, first of all, accept that as potential mitigating circumstances and be able to follow that instruction?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Secondly, the capacity of the

defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or conform his conduct to the requirements of law was substantially impaired, could you accept that and could you follow that instruction?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Could you reread that, please? For some reason I just.

MR. MOORE: I know, late in the day.

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yeah.

MR. MOORE: The capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or conform his conduct to the requirements of law was substantially impaired, could you accept that instruction and consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes, I could.

MR. MOORE: If I could have a moment.

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

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

MR. MOORE: I'd like you to clear up a little bit about when you made a connection between the death of Deputy Pill and her son Jeremy. You indicated that you first learned of -- I'm not sure what it was you learned about five days ago you heard on the news, what was it that you realized when you

heard something on the news five days ago? Was it that was it Jeremy's mother?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Oh, no, it was Officer Pill was killed in the line of duty and that's about all I pretty much got out of it because I was on my way out the door so, and then the name Pill stuck with me because he had come over to my house twice for things about five or ten minutes to pick up my girlfriend's daughter.

MR. MOORE: This was years ago?

JUROR NUMBER 13: This was many years ago.

MR. MOORE: And your feelings are that knowing that connection of Officer Pill years ago and that this involves his mother, do you feel confident a hundred percent that it will not affect your deliberations in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 13: Yes, I do, it would not affect me.

MR. MOORE: What was the last time you ran into any member of the Pill family?

JUROR NUMBER 13: The last time was ten years ago when he picked up the girl from my house. I don't even remember when it was but.

MR. MOORE: You've been very patient, thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Sir, at this time I'm going to ask you to -- we're going to release you for a few You still are being considered as a juror for days. this panel. So, I'm going to have you go downstairs, they're going to give you a phone number, you need to call that phone number between 1:00 and 5:00 on Wednesday. You'll be released tomorrow and Wednesday. You may have to come back Thursday, you may have to come back Friday, you may have to come back next week but next week won't be Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday because we don't have court Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday. So, just remember it will be Thursday, Friday this week, possibly, they'll give you information when you call on Wednesday, and if you don't come back this week it won't be until Thursday of next week. I'm trying to give you if you need to make plans you can make plans on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of next week.

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

During this break recess you must abide by your rules governing your rules as a juror. Specifically, do not discuss this case with anyone. You can tell people that you are coming here, like your family, you are coming here, that you're being considered for service on a jury. You can't discuss the case or the circumstances of the case. Do not discuss this -- do

not speak to lawyers, parties or witnesses about anything. You must avoid reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio or Internet comments about this trial, should there be any. Do not conduct any research yourself regarding this trial or its participants. So, you'll be released go downstairs, get that phone number and you can be on your way. Okay. Thank you, sir.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 13 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: I'm going to ask that we have Juror Number 14, 15 and 16, if they'll just come inside for just a few moments. They can just step inside the door. 14, 15 and 16. No, we released 17. 14, 15 and 16.

(Thereupon, Juror Numbers 14, 15 and 16 were escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Jurors Number 14, 15 and 16, one, I want to thank you for your patience this afternoon and today. We're not able to get to you this evening. So, I'm going to ask you to be back at 8:30 in the morning. You will be -- we're going to continue with the individual questioning and you will

be first, 14, 15 and 16, you'll be first heard in the morning. Now, during this break you must abide by your rules governing your service as a juror. Specifically, do not discuss this case among yourselves. Do not allow anyone to discuss it. not discuss it with anyone. Do not allow anyone to discuss it in your presence. Now, you can tell people that you're coming to the Brevard County courthouse, that you're being considered for jury service. You can tell about where it's at and what time you'll be here but you cannot discuss the case or the circumstances or anything involving the case. Do not speak to lawyers, parties or witnesses about anything. You must avoid reading newspaper headlines or articles related to this trial or its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio or Internet comments about this trial, and do not conduct any research yourself regarding this trial or its participant. Now, tomorrow morning 8:30 report to the jury assembly room. As soon as everyone is here and they know ever one is here we'll bring you up and we'll start doing -- continue with the individual questioning. I do apologize that we weren't able to get to you this evening. appreciate your patience, sometimes this takes longer

than we expect, but we appreciate you being here and 1 we appreciate your patience for waiting. Okay. 2 3 You'll be excused at this time. Bring your badge with you when you report in the morning. See you at 4 5 8:30 in the morning. Thank you. (Thereupon, Juror Numbers 14, 15 and 16 exited 6 7 the courtroom.) THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything that we 8 9 need to discuss before we recess on behalf of the 10 State? MR. MCMASTER: No, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Anything we need to discuss before 12 we recess on behalf of the Defense? 13 14 MR. MOORE: No. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Court will be in recess 16 until 8:30 tomorrow morning. Thank you. 17 (Thereupon, court was in recess for the day, Thereafter, court was reconvened on 2/25/14 and 18 2/24/14. 19 2/26/14 and the proceedings were previously transcribed. Thereafter, court was reconvened on 2/27/14 and the 20 proceedings were had as follows:) 21 THE COURT: Please be seated. We can bring out 22 23 Mr. Bradley. (Thereupon, the defendant was escorted into the 24

25

courtroom by the court deputy.)

2.0

THE COURT: How are we with regard to the jury panel?

THE COURT DEPUTY: They're on their way up.

THE COURT: Okay. If my count is correct, we have fifteen to go. I didn't order -- I released the jurors for today. What I think is going to happen is we'll get through these fifteen today, bring a new panel in tomorrow, get as far as we can, have them come back what we don't get to next Thursday, maybe have everyone come back on Friday and see how many we have and see if we have enough to go into the second phase. My goal is to get forty-one, I'm not sure we're going to quite get forty-one. And then if you all want me to bring in another panel, I can bring in another panel.

MR. BROWN: Judge, I don't know how soon you have to order a panel but if you need to do it ahead of time, I would suggest ordering one for Friday, next Friday and then we can -- they're probably easier to cancel than to order it late. Then we'll know where we're at.

THE COURT: What I was contemplating doing this morning rather than have them all wait the whole morning is releasing some and telling them to come back at 1:30. I don't think we're going to get

4 5

through fourteen, or fifteen I think it is this morning even on our best estimate.

MR. BROWN: Either that or -- I mean, we started up close to 2:00 o'clock, or actually at 2:00. So, in a couple of hours we can do twelve. We can try to fire away through it.

THE COURT: I don't have any -- I don't have any others ordered.

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. LANNING: Maybe at least the last five.

THE COURT: I was going to say, at least the last five. It's hard to say, sometimes we go get through them, sometimes --

MR. BROWN: Right.

THE COURT: -- we only get through a few.

MR. BROWN: I was going to suggest to the Court if we're close at the noon hour (unintelligible) and just keep going and work through lunch and we'll be done.

THE COURT: I can't let you be down before

6:00, that would not be. I wouldn't be doing my -
no, I'm kidding. I just don't -- you know, I hate

for them to be sitting around for hours. I mean, I'm

thinking at least the last five, let's just have them

come back at 1:30.

2.3

MR. MOORE: That's reasonable, that will keep us busy.

THE COURT: I mean, we'll definitely --

MR. MOORE: Keep us going.

THE COURT: Okay. The last five are, let me do this, one, two, three, four, five. I mean, if I'm right, it's 96 through 106. Okay. We'll do 96 to 106, have them -- and you can tell them we just didn't want them --

MR. BROWN: That's six.

THE COURT: One, two, three, four. That is.

Okay, so, it would be -- you're right. So, let's

do -- I must have miscounted. One, two, three, four,

five. So, it would be 101.

MR. BROWN: Judge, there were two of those, 100 and 102 that were checking on things. 100 was the business owner.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And 102 was financial, she was going to check to see if she was paid. So, we could bring those two in together.

THE COURT: If I bring them in then I have to start --

MR. BROWN: We can bring the two of them in together, check on their schedule. I mean, if they

both go then we're down to thirteen and then at that point...

THE COURT: You know what, usually I'm more optimistic but you all have changed my paradyne. So, I'm not as optimistic anymore about how far we're going to get through. I don't mind bringing them in but I just didn't want to question them out of order because I feel strongly that we have to...

MR. BROWN: I'm not suggesting -- I'm suggesting bringing the two of them to just adjust their schedule because if they -- if either one or both can't make it, then we send them home this morning and they're done and.

THE COURT: Okay. Any objection to that by the Defense?

MR. MOORE: No objection. Which two was that?

THE COURT: I think it's 100 and 102.

MR. MOORE: How about 96, I have a hardship there where (unintelligible) job.

THE COURT: On 96? I didn't write anything down for 96.

MR. BROWN: Sure you didn't mean 97? That was the gentleman.

MR. MOORE: This was a lady.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, but I don't think it was 96.

either. You know, I'd rather do it one at a time but I'll only address this issue. It seems that when we do it in a group I don't want them to hear what the other person hears and if they get off think that's benefiting them. So, let's go ahead and bring in 100.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 100 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Number 100, good morning.

JUROR NUMBER 100: Good morning.

thank you for your patience regarding this process.

When we spoke yesterday you talked about being a business owner and that you had an embroidery company and that, you know, you were in charge of customer service and scheduling and ordering and that was your single source of income. I mean, that you were single and that was your source of income and we talked possibly if you could get someone to cover and if you could work that out for the length of this trial. So, I want to follow up on that with you today. Have you been able to think about it and maybe figure out a way to get coverage or maybe able

to think about it and a way to get it worked? 1 Ι understand that you're the owner, so I'm thinking 2 3 that if you could get coverage you'd still make money 4 because it's your business as long as there's someone 5 manning the fort so that would help you with the source of income, but that's just my thinking. So, 6 tell me, tell me what -- where you're at today. 7

> JUROR NUMBER 100: I am very hands on in my business and I spoke with my employees last night and they actually (unintelligible) yesterday and I do not feel that my business would survive without me if I I believe I would lose a lot of business leave. without me being there.

THE COURT: Okay. Would that -- you feel that that would be a financial hardship for you?

JUROR NUMBER 100: Yes, ma'am. I also believe that I would be -- have my own (unintelligible) there at the shop and I would not be able to get my (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

No, Your Honor. MR. BROWN:

THE COURT: Questions by the Defense?

MR. PIROLO: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Bench conference.

MR. PIROLO: We'll stipulate.

23

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. BROWN: We'll stipulate.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 100, I appreciate you being patient with us regarding this process. I am going to release you. You can go downstairs, talk to the jury assembly room, I mean report to the jury assembly room, talk to the jury clerk, tell them you've been released from Judge Reinman's courtroom and they'll speak you and give you brief information and then you'll be on your way. Okay. Thank you.

JUROR NUMBER 100: Thank you so much.

(Thereupon, Jury Number 100 exited the

courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on one second. Okay. Just for the record, Juror 100 was released for hardship. Okay. We can bring in Juror Number 102.

(Thereupon, the proceedings were previously transcribed.)

THE COURT: Okay. When we left yesterday I did -- you know, they have been instructed of the rule and I do instruct everyone -- I mean, I do ask follow up on that when they first come in. So, I don't feel compelled that I need to go over that with them again. Do we want to perhaps release the last five until this afternoon? I know Mr. Brown's theory

is let's plow through it but we haven't been that successful and, you know, with all due respect, if they can -- I don't think --

MR. MOORE: I'm with Mr. Brown on this, I mean, it could go really fast and we could be done by then, it's possible that we'll be done early afternoon. I say let's just drive on and not be down.

THE COURT: Okay. We can do that.

MR. BROWN: Worse case scenario is we reassess at the noon hour and (unintelligible) left for comfortable lunch, so.

THE COURT: Okay. Then I'm happy with that, I was just going to give that option.

MR. MOORE: Last time I agree with Mr. Brown.

THE COURT: Last time Mr. Moore predicted accurately but I think it's just a gamble. Okay. I don't think there's any rhyme or reason to it sometimes. Okay. I mean, just how fast or slow it will go, it just depends on what happens.

All right. Any preliminary matters that we need to address on behalf of the State?

MR. BROWN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any preliminary matters on behalf of the Defense?

MR. MOORE: No.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll bring in number -- let me go back. Okay. My records show 80. Bring in Number 80. See, I released those jurors, maybe I should have had them come back this afternoon but I just based on how it went yesterday.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 80 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, Number 80.

JUROR NUMBER 80: 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. The first thing I want to ask you is when I spoke with you last we talked about some rules that all jurors have to abide by and those rules kind of came in place at that time. So, I'm talking about since I talked to you about what the rules were. So, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 80: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 80: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Have you conducted or been exposed

to any research regarding any matters concerning this case?

JUROR NUMBER 80: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 80: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you a few questions and talk to you about a few things, then the State will have an opportunity to ask you some questions and then the Defense will have an opportunity to ask you some questions. My first question is kind of a general question and that is what are your views with regard to the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 80: I believe the death penalty is a law to be followed. Personally, I have a hard time with it but I would definitely think that's the right thing I should do, I would do it.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I'm going to talk to you a little bit about the process and I'm going to follow up with some other questions. In this case we start with the guilt phase, that's what we call it, the guilt phase. In the event the jury returns a verdict of guilty on Count I, and it only pertains to Count I, that if the jury returns a verdict of guilty

on the Count I which is the premeditated murder of the first degree, if that happens, then we would move into the second phase and the second phase is what we call the penalty phase. In the penalty phase you would be instructed that as the jury you would be instructed to make a recommendation to the Court, to the Judge, to me, and that recommendation would be either death or life in prison without the possibility of parole and I give you detailed instructions about what you are -- how you can evaluate those choices and what you can consider for purposes of those choices. If you are for the death penalty, and I realize it's easier to say that out there than it is to be involved in a case saying that, if you are for the death penalty, do you think that the death penalty is the only appropriate 16 penalty for murder in the first degree and is that 17 opinion so strong that you would not consider life in 18 19 prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty 20 under any circumstances? 21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 80: The answer to your first question is yes, the answer to the second question is no.

THE COURT: Okay. So -- that's okay, I'm just trying to follow up with that. So, if I -- you say

the answer to the first question is yes, that you would think that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree?

JUROR NUMBER 80: My first response is yes, but am I open to other options, I am.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if I were to instruct you that you had to consider the option of life in prison without the possibility of parole, you would be able to consider that?

JUROR NUMBER 80: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And we do give you detailed instructions, we don't -- we give you kind of a method to follow to maybe help you come to that conclusion, which conclusion, one or the other.

Okay. I want to inquire about what you know about this case. Do you know anything about this case either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussion with anyone else, or from the media, radio, television, Internet or newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 80: I know a lot, I'm a news junkie.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate you being honest. The most important thing you can do in here is just tell us -- there's no right or wrong answers, so just be honest with us and tell us what you know.

JUROR NUMBER 80: I knew that the defendant was involved in some kind of a robbery, theft at a hotel I believe and him and his girlfriend got in the car because the owner called the police, the police pulled him over on John Rodes Boulevard, the defendant shot the deputy, killed her, drove his car to Parkway, wrecked his car and the police got him.

THE COURT: How did you gain that information?

JUROR NUMBER 80: It happened right by our work and I think it was around lunch time if my memory serves me right and we were doing the do we go get lunch, do we not go get lunch and we went on the Internet and it was all over Florida Today that our road by our work was shut.

THE COURT: So, you learned it at the time of the event from the Internet on Florida Today?

JUROR NUMBER 80: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay have you followed up or heard other things since then?

JUROR NUMBER 80: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, what do you know -- don't -- I saw that hesitation, don't hesitate.

JUROR NUMBER 80: I'm nervous, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Don't be nervous.

JUROR NUMBER 80: Like I said, I'm a news

junkie, I know that the girlfriend is going to be in 1 2 jail for twelve years and testify against him. 3 know a lot, I follow it. THE COURT: Okay. When you say -- let's talk 4 5 you say you're a news junkie, tell me what you do to 6 be a news junkie? 7 JUROR NUMBER 80: I e-mail, I follow people on Twitter, I read Florida Today a couple times a day. 8 THE COURT: You do that on the computer? 9 JUROR NUMBER 80: Yes. 10 11 THE COURT: I mean, it's Internet as opposed to 12 watching it on TV? 13 JUROR NUMBER 80: I just watch sports, I don't watch the local news but I do read it on the 14 15 computer. That's right, you're the UF fan. 16 THE COURT: 17 JUROR NUMBER 80: Yes, ma'am. 18 THE COURT: Yeah, we're happy -- I'm happy 19 about that, there's some people that are not happy 20 about it. We fight over sports in here a lot. Nice 21 that Gators are number one in basketball. We're a basketball school now. 22 23

24

25

So you say -- I think you said more than once or twice a day you're looking at the computer and following up on news stories?

JUROR NUMBER 80: I don't sleep a lot so I have a lot of time to hang out on the Internet and watch sports.

THE COURT: And hear the news?

JUROR NUMBER 80: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What I ask you to do and maybe you can do this, maybe you cant, I ask you if you can 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 evidence presented in this trial in this courtroom?

JUROR NUMBER 80: I would have a really hard time doing that.

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do is to come in here kind of with a clean slate, say I know that's out there but I'm not to consider that. Also, it may happen that something you learned out there may never come into evidence here, you may never hear that in this courtroom, are you going to be able to say okay, I know I heard that out there, I'm going to strike that from my thinking for the time being and I'm going to base this decision on only what I hear in this courtroom?

JUROR NUMBER 80: I would have a really hard time doing that.

THE COURT: You say I'm going to have a really hard time doing that, if I instruct you that that's kind of your duty, and there's no right or wrong answers, if I instruct you can you do that or can you not do that?

JUROR NUMBER 80: I don't think I can do that.

THE COURT: Okay. You think you just know so
much about the case?

JUROR NUMBER 80: I think I know enough, and another part, in my former life I was an ER nurse in Orlando and so to me law enforcement is part of our family, they're like part of us and I can't get past that.

THE COURT: Okay. Because one of the things you'll be asked to do is that the State has the burden of proof, they have to prove the case beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. The Defense does not have to prove anything and because — and so when you walk in you have to presume that the defendant is not guilty, is innocent, because when you walk in the State has all — they have to prove every, every element of each counts and the defendant doesn't have to prove anything. So, you can't give the State any extra credit until they start proving their case, then you

can, you know, if they prove their case beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt, then you have to look towards guilty as a verdict. If they haven't proved that case, then you have to look at not guilty. Do you think -- can you do that or can you not do that based on what you already know?

JUROR NUMBER 80: I don't think I can do that based on what I know is how I feel.

THE COURT: And how you feel because of it being a law enforcement officer and the information that you acquired?

JUROR NUMBER 80: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Questions by the Defense?

MR. PIROLO: No, Your Honor. Stipulate.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate -- thank you for being here. I'm sorry we couldn't get to you last night. At some point we just got to stop. You know, with all due respect, we have families, at some point we just have to say we can't do this anymore and you just happened to be the one that I had to let go. I wish I could have gotten to you last night so you didn't have to come back.

JUROR NUMBER 80: That's fine.

2.0

THE COURT: But I do appreciate you being here. Thank you for being patient with the process. I am going to release. You can go downstairs, you can report to the jury assembly room, they'll give you some brief instructions and then they'll send you on your way.

JUROR NUMBER 80: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Jury Number 80 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. For the record, number -Juror Number 80 has been released for cause. Okay.
We'll bring in Juror Number 82.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 82 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 82, one, I want to thank you for your patience, thank you for being here. When we left last time I gave you some rules governing your service as a juror, those rules kind of came into effect at that time. 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 82: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 82: Last night my other half had the television on and it flashed on the picture and I exited out and said change it, but I was exposed but I didn't hear what they said and he was very curious why and I said I can't tell you.

THE COURT: Okay. So, it came on and you exited the room and you didn't hear what they said.

Okay. Have you conducted or been exposed to any research regarding any matters concerning this case?

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

No.

JUROR NUMBER 82: No.

JUROR NUMBER 82:

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you a few questions, then the State will have an opportunity to ask you some questions and then the Defense will have an opportunity to ask you some questions. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions, we just ask you to be frank and candor with the Court and tell us what you're thinking. Okay. There's not anything you can say in here this morning that would

make it a wrong answer.

2 3

5

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

The first question I'm going to ask you is what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I have mixed emotions, I can't say yes, I cannot say no.

THE COURT: So, you're not philosophically opposed to you it but you have -- it causes you some concern?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes, because (unintelligible) to verify.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LANNING: Ma'am? Ma'am?

THE COURT: I think they're having trouble hearing you. What I'm going to ask you to do is sit back in your chair a little bit. There's a microphone on other side of you right on that side. So, if they can pick that up then they can hear it through the top but I do need you to speak up just a little bit. Mr. Lanning, did you hear that answer?

MR. LANNING: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 82, can you repeat that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I would like evidence to the possibility of the situation that (unintelligible).

> MR. LANNING: I can't hear you.

2

3

5

6

4

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 82: I'm sorry, I'm very soft spoken.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me talk to you a little bit about the process. We have the beginning phase of the trial which we call the guilt phase. quilt phase in the event the jury returns a verdict of quilty to Count I, and it only pertains to Count I, then we would move on to the second phase. I is premeditated murder in the first degree. So, if there is a guilty verdict in Count I, then and only then you move on to the penalty phase. penalty phase the jury would be instructed to make a recommendation to the Judge, to me, of either death or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Now, I would give you some detailed instructions on how you would -- on what you would need -- the thought process you would need to go through in order to consider death or life. So, you'll have detailed instructions about that, but if you are for the death penalty, are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree and is that opinion so strong that you could not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 82: No, it is not.

THE COURT: So, you would -- life in prison would be -- you could consider that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

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

JUROR NUMBER 82: When I became aware of this case is when I exited out of work and all the flags were half mast and then I realize when I turned on the news what had happened.

THE COURT: So, on the day of the event you heard it on the news?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes, I think everybody in Brevard County (unintelligible) information.

THE COURT: I mean, in this process a lot of people do know information about the case. And what information do you think you know about this case?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Not anymore than what I was originally read two years ago because it has been pretty quiet.

THE COURT: Okay. So --

JUROR NUMBER 82: So, I really -- to be honest

with you, I really have not paid that much attention to the case since it first happened.

THE COURT: So, what you -- when it happened, what did you learn? Be specific with what information you think you know.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Well, (unintelligible) officers and what happened, it was pretty tragic.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you say and the way it happened, tell me what you think the way it happened.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Just what I read in the papers and on the media.

THE COURT: So, it would have been what you read from the paper, and what paper would that be?

JUROR NUMBER 82: That is what, you know, we're not sure what the evidence was rightfully or wrongly displayed in the paper but it was, you know, described as she was shot outright and that's all I did read.

MR. MOORE: She was shot?

THE COURT: Outright. Okay. What we ask you to do if you are selected as a jury in this case is to set aside what 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?

2

3 4

5

7

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you can -- at this time, and I'm going to give you more instructions about this later, it is the State's burden of proof beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt and at this stage the defendant is considered to be not quilty or innocent because no evidence has been presented and we have to start out with a clean open slate, can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

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

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. Juror Number 82, good morning. You indicated concerning the death penalty that you haded emotions, can explain that a little bit more to me?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I would hate to see an innocent person put to death and (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: And if evidence is proven to you, could you return a verdict of death?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Now, you indicate that you -- the evidence you'd have to be positive to. The Court read to you a jury instruction if you recall yesterday and she used the term reasonable doubt.

JUROR NUMBER 82: And what?

and the context that she used it in was in the penalty phase having to prove up the aggravating circumstances, but it's also the same burden that you use to prove the case in chief, to prove whether or not he's guilty of first degree murder and we have to prove each element beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. When you use the term you have to be certain, do you mean that standard or are you looking at maybe a higher standard?

MR. BROWN: She used the term reasonable doubt

JUROR NUMBER 82: No, I just -- whatever documentation is given to the jury, I would weigh that (unintelligible).

process with you and what the process as a juror if you're selected you have to go through to get to that

Okay. Let me go through the

point of making a sentencing recommendation. Okay.

The Court talked about it yesterday but she did give you all an awful lot of information. So, the first

step is if you're selected for the jury you would

have to come back with a verdict of first degree

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

murder. You understand?

MR. BROWN:

MR. BROWN: If you come back with not guilty

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

then there is no sentencing. If you come back with a lesser charge, say second degree murder or something else, then sentencing is up to the Court, the death penalty is off the table and you guys -- as a jury you do not make a recommendation. You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

THE COURT: So, if you come back with that verdict of first degree murder, we would reconvene in court, the jury would receive additional evidence and then the Court would give you her instructions and the first step in those instructions what she's going to tell you is look at what are called aggravating circumstances. Okay. And what aggravating circumstances are, and she'll -- there will be a list of them, could be one, likely be more than one, but it's factors or circumstances that increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim and it's from those that you can base, and only those, that you can base the death penalty recommendation Okay. Kind of make sense that's why we use the term aggravating. Now, she's going to give you that list and then the State, we have to prove those to you beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. If we don't prove any, then you have to give

a life recommendation. If we prove at least one, and we may very well prove more than one, okay, whatever ones we prove, you'll look at those and ask yourselves do these justify the death penalty. If your answer is no, then you give a life recommendation. If your answer is yes, these aggravating circumstances that increase the gravity of the crime justify the death penalty, then you go to step two in the process.

Step two is you look at what are known as mitigating circumstances. As the Court told you yesterday, those are things concerning the defendant, his background, life history, whatever it may be, but they concern the defendant and that's going to be presented to you as well. Those also have to be proven. Just because they're said doesn't mean They have -- but it's a lower standard of that's it. It has to be proven to the greater weight of the evidence. So, it's a lower burden than the aggravating circumstances but there still is a level If something is not proven, you disregard of proof. Whatever mitigating circumstances you found to be proven, you consider those. Court's going to tell you you go through a weighing process, weighing the aggravators versus these mitigators.

25

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

Now, in your lifetime personal decisions, work decisions, family decisions, you've probably had to make some important decisions along the way. you've made those decisions you look at all the factors involved, try to look at everything, consider everything, right? When you consider all those factors, some are pretty darn important when you're considering and you give them a lot of weight, right? Other factors when you look at everything you say this really isn't all that important, then you give that type of circumstance or that factor little weight, right? And that's how you arrive at your decision, by looking at all the circumstances. That's what you do here. You look at the aggravators and look at the mitigators and you decide -- consider it all, you decide what weight to give them and that's a personal decision, the Court's not going to tell you how much weight to assign, that's a decision you have to make in looking at the entire picture. So, you weigh those. If the mitigators outweigh those aggravating circumstances, then your recommendation would be life. However, if you find that those mitigator, the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh the aggravating circumstances, then you are in a position where you can legally recommend to

the Court the death penalty.

Now, the Judge is going to tell you that you're not required to. She's not going to tell if you find A, B and C that you must return a recommendation of death. Okay? You have to find those aggravators, find they do not outweigh the mitigators and in your mind they justify the death penalty and you feel that's the justified sentence. That's the step in the process you go through. Any questions about that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: No, I appreciate that the fact that you explained that.

MR. BROWN: I just want to make sure that you understand so when I ask you questions, it's hard, people haven't been through this process and you don't know the system, how we have to do it. So, knowing that process, are you comfortable with that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Do you think you can make a decision?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. BROWN: It's a lot we ask of jurors to come in and do and that's why we want to be certain. Do you come in with any preconceived notions of well, it better be either this A or this B before I would ever

recommend a death penalty?

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 82: I don't think I would be sitting here if I did (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: Well, you might be sitting here but I'd hope that you would tell me. So, you're going to look at the aggravating circumstances that the Judge is going to give you, right?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And one last topic I want to cover and I do this with everyone. Obviously, as we talked about it, the jury returns a verdict of something less than first degree murder, then you don't have to come back, you're not going to make that sentencing recommendation, you're not going to be faced with that decision. What I want -- my concern is and what I want to address with each person is knowing that, knowing that, well, if I just come back with second I'm not faced with that next decision to make, if we prove to you first degree murder, are you going to entertain any thoughts of saying, well, first degree murder is proven but I'm just going to come back with second so I don't have to make that decision on life or death? Pardon me?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes, I would (unintelligible).

5

4

7

8

6

10

11

12

14

15

13

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. BROWN: Okay. Would you return the verdict of first degree if that's what was proven?

> JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. BROWN: You understand the concern that we have that jurors with that situation may say, well, it's easier if I go second. You agree justice requires that you return the verdict that the evidence speaks to and proves?

JUROR NUMBER 82:

MR. BROWN: No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Questions by the Defense.

MR. PIROLO: Thank you, Your Honor. morning Juror Number 82, how are you? As the Judge said, there are no wrong answers. So, whatever you're thinking, whatever thoughts you have, just come out. Okay? Can you do that for us?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

THE COURT: Can you please speak up? going to have to speak up because everything's being recorded so we have to make sure we get you on the recording as well.

JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible)?

MR. PIROLO: Sure. As the Judge said earlier, there are no wrong answers.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Right.

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. PIROLO: And what we're just asking of you is if you can just give us an honest answer. Whatever it is you may be thinking or feeling, just come out, whatever it is. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: All right. Thank you. Let's start with you indicated earlier that the day of the event you were leaving work and you noticed flags were at half mast, right, and you said it was very frightening in the way we lost a police officer. You said something about that the officer was shot outright, could you be a little more specific? What do you remember the news saying on that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Just remember seeing pictures in the news video about it happened or how it came to, this is like two years ago, but quite evidence that (unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: Speak up a little, I can't hear you.

I'll try. The news media JUROR NUMBER 82: made it very clear that he shot and left the scene.

> MR. PIROLO: By he you mean Mr. Bradley?

JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: You have to be a little more

specific now. By he you're talking about Mr.

Bradley, this is the person that's on trial, you said that the media was very clear that he I believe you said deliberately shot the officer?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: And you take that as -- do you believe that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: As I said, I would need evidence to prove because I'm sure the media (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Well, when you heard that, did you form an opinion in your mind?

JUROR NUMBER 82: No, I was just upset about it losing a police officer.

MR. PIROLO: Have you -- since then, I know you followed up with very little from the day of the incident, you said there wasn't much on the media, did you follow up prior to coming here today --

JUROR NUMBER 82: No.

MR. PIROLO: -- in the newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible) touch base with the case (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Based on the feelings that you had back then when you first heard it which you said it was frightening, I know earlier you said the word

frightening, at least to me it sounded like you were getting a little emotional about it.

JUROR NUMBER 82: I think anybody

(unintelligible). I guess it was just automatic that

it was frightening but, you know, you see it, you

hear it and (unintelligible) why.

MR. PIROLO: Who did you get mad at?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I just was upsetting to me, yes, it was upsetting to have an officer shot in the line of duty and (unintelligible). I mean, I did not know (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Today as you sit here right now, do you have an opinion of guilt or innocence of Mr. Bradley?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I'm sorry?

MR. PIROLO: As you sit here right now based on what you've heard and the feelings you had when you first heard about the story, do you sit here today with an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of Mr. Bradley?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Well, there are always two sides to every story regardless of (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: What happens if you only hear one side of the story?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Well, (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: You will be instructed that at no time does the Defense need to prove or disprove anything, are you telling me right now that you would have a problem with that if you hear only one side? The State has the burden of proving the case beyond a reasonable doubt.

JUROR NUMBER 82: I'm sure when it comes to that (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Enough evidence, what do you mean by that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: By (unintelligible) witnesses.

MR. PIROLO: You indicated --

THE COURT: You have to speak up. I heard that but I just barely heard that. Can you say that again?

JUROR NUMBER 82: All right. I said there should be enough evidence filtered through this courtroom that will give enough information to the jury which decision and which direction they should go.

MR. PIROLO: Do you -- I'm going to get back to that but earlier on you said you had mixed emotions about the death penalty and the State asked you to explain that you said it was troubling that your

concerns are that an innocent person would be put to death, is that the only thing that gives you those mixed emotions is the possibility --

JUROR NUMBER 82: I have had in my lifetime had to make several decisions, you know, relatives (unintelligible) and that was really a different. I know this probably shouldn't be related to this situation but those are major decisions that you have to make (unintelligible) but the evidence is very clear that (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: You would agree that if you're selected for this jury this would be a very important decision to make?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: You are talking about another human being's life, you agree with that, right?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Yes?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: And we're specifically talking about Mr. Bradley's life who's sitting there, I was right next to him before I got up here. Where would you rank this with other important decisions you had to make in your life?

JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible). I've been

here for eighty years and I've had a (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: You said earlier that you needed evidence, getting back to the death penalty, that you needed evidence, and again I'm getting back to the statement you made that you would be concerned that an innocent person would be put to death, do you understand you only make -- we only get to this second part of the trial if and only if the jury returns a verdict of first degree murder, that's it? As the State said, it's not guilty, you believe the person's innocent, you don't ever consider the death penalty, he's innocent, end of story. If you find him guilty of something less, the death penalty is not a concern to you. You understand all that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I understand.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. So, once you've determined that -- let's say you determined that the person is not innocent, the person, again in this case,

Mr. Bradley, you determine Mr. Bradley is guilty of the first degree murder, correct me if I'm wrong, but from the comment you made about your concern about putting an innocent person to death, if you found

Mr. Bradley wasn't innocent, would you then -- you would have no problem imposing the death penalty

then, is that a fair statement?

2

JUROR NUMBER 82: No, I would be

3

(unintelligible).

4

MR. PIROLO: You would be okay with?

5

JUROR NUMBER 82: With guilty.

6

Right, but if -- we got to then MR. PIROLO: get to a second step. Step one would be if he's

7 8

quilty or not quilty of first degree murder. Okay.

9

Now, let's assume you find him guilty of first degree

10

murder, guilty part's done, you've found him guilty,

11

you feel he did it. You feel the State beyond a

only has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, no

12

reasonable doubt maybe in your mind which it doesn't

13

to reach this level, but you have no doubt, the State

doubt, can you -- at that point if you have no doubt

the person committed first degree murder, would it be

a fair statement to make that at that point that the

only sentence to deem appropriate would be the death

14

15

16

17

18

19

penalty?

correct?

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

So, your mind would MR. PIROLO: Yes?

essentially be off to considering a life sentence,

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: All right. So, you deliver a

first degree murder conviction, at that point the defendant, again in this case we're only concerned about Mr. Bradley, in your mind he would have to get the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Yes? And you could not be open to a life sentence?

JUROR NUMBER 82: No.

MR. PIROLO: You could not be open to listening to mitigating circumstances that could give a life sentence, right?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, may we approach?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

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

MR. PIROLO: Judge, I'm going to move to strike Number 82 for cause. I think it's clear that she could not consider a life without parole sentence if she returned a verdict of first degree murder. It is very clear that she understands that the only way she would not impose the death penalty is if they were innocent. I think once she realizes that we're done with the guilt phase of it, at that point a person's found guilty of first degree murder is the only

proper sentence death, she clearly said yes, it is.

She couldn't consider a life sentence. She couldn't

even consider mitigating circumstances to potentially

reach a life sentence.

THE COURT: Response from the State.

MR. BROWN: Judge, I think she's confused with Defense counsel's questions because she was quite clear with the Court that she would -- in fact, she said she has mixed emotions but that she would consider life and I went through the process and she clearly understood the process and said she would weigh everything and was appreciative of me going through the process and seemed to understand it. So, I think she's confused that once you're convicted of first degree murder, I think she's putting that together with the next phase because she's been pretty clear in her answers all along. So, I would ask for a chance to either myself or the Court to rehabilitate her.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, at this point I think it's very clear that the only penalty she would come up with is first degree murder. When the Court asked her about the death penalty she said mixed emotions. She then said she needed evidence, and then she said her mixed emotions would be that she would be

concerned that an innocent person would be put to death, that's it. Clearly if the jury thinks he's innocent we he never get to a conviction, we never get to a penalty phase. So, that's the only -- and she's very clear. I mean, I didn't mix any confusing words in there, if you find him guilty of first degree murder beyond a reasonable doubt, you think he did it, maybe even have no doubt that he did it, is the death penalty the only sentence you can come up? Yes. Could you be open to a life sentence? No. Could you be open to mitigating circumstances that could lead you to a possible life sentence? No.

2.0

THE COURT: See, once again, I'm not sure people know what mitigating circumstances are.

MR. PIROLO: But she won't even consider -- in her mind she's already -- she does understand a life sentence and she was very clear she could not consider the life sentence, the only sentence appropriate in her mind for a person who was found guilty of first degree murder is the death penalty. I don't see where there's a confusion in that. Think it's very clear.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask her a few questions, depending on her answers we can go back to bench conference and -- or you can continue to follow

up.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, with all due respect, I think we've established that there is a reasonable doubt as to this juror being able to even try to consider a life sentence and I would object to any kind of rehabilitating --

THE COURT: If you want me to inquire -- I'm not trying to rehabilitate. I mean, she answered his questions appropriately, she answered my questions appropriately, I don't know if she's confused about your question or I don't if she -- if what you're saying is correct. If what you're saying is correct I'm happy to excuse her for cause, but I think it's important to say if the Court instructs you and you -- normally we need to go that extra step. If the Court instructs you that you have to consider life even though there's a guilty verdict and if she says I wouldn't consider it then, then I would strike her.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, the problem is she's wavering clearly. She's telling the Court yes to what the Court's asking, she's telling the State yes to what they're asking, and then when she just full out said -- is asked if you find someone guilty of first degree murder, is that it, is that the death

,

penalty and she said yes. I don't understand how much clearer it can be.

she -- if that's her views or she's confused about the process. We're all so familiar with the process we take it for granted that everyone else is and I'm not sure if they are familiar with the process. A normal person has no idea about this process. So, I want to confirm that if the Court tells her you have to consider that if she would do that or if she was -- would be unable to do that. And I'm happy to allow you to follow up with that as opposed to me but I want you to say -- kind of go through and explain that decision is already, now if the Court instructs as part of the penalty phase you have to consider life and then you can go through the mitigating --

MR. MOORE: The question is can you, can you.

THE COURT: So, if you'll go --

MR. PIROLO: That's fine, I can ask.

THE COURT: In your questioning make that a part of that, if the Court instructs you, that's the one last step, and if she says I just can't do it, then I'm happy with striking her. Okay.

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

MR. PIROLO: All right. Juror Number 82, I want to follow up on something. You -- I asked you that if you came back with a -- if you found someone guilty of first degree murder, if you find Mr. Bradley guilty of first degree murder, you indicated that you would follow up with a death sentence with that, right?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Now, let's back up for a moment.

Let's say after you find the person -- you find

Mr. Bradley guilty of first degree murder, if you do

that, and then the Court instructs you that for the

second part of the trial you would have to consider

life without parole as a possible sentence, are you

saying that based on your feelings you could not

follow that instruction, that in your mind your

feelings are if a person is found guilty of first

degree murder, he's not innocent, he has to get the

death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I think I'm confused on the question. If he was found first degree murder (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. You have to talk louder, I have to be able to hear.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Life in prison.

THE COURT: Wait, I want you to repeat because I couldn't hear the first part of it. So,

Mr. Pirolo, I'm sorry to interrupt you, I just couldn't hear. So, if you'll repeat the question and you need to answer loudly.

JUROR NUMBER 82: If he is found guilty there is either life in prison or death penalty or it's automatically debt penalty if he's guilty.

MR. PIROLO: No, if he's found guilty of first degree murder, then you move on to the second part of the trial and the Court would instruct you that you would have to consider life as a possible sentence, life without parole.

JUROR NUMBER 82: I see.

MR. PIROLO: What life means, it means just that. If Mr. Bradley is sentence had to life in prison without parole, he dies in prison.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Right.

MR. PIROLO: He never, you know, walks in every day society ever again, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I understand.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Even though that's the process and even though the Court would instruct you that you would have to consider life, based on your earlier statements that you believe -- the mixed

emotions you have to the death penalty, you're concerned that an innocent person would be executed, are you telling us that you could not follow the Court's instructions and consider a life sentence because in your mind if they're guilty of first degree murder they get the death penalty?

MR. BROWN: I'm going to object to the multiple compound question.

THE COURT: Mr. Pirolo, if you'll break it down a little bit.

JUROR NUMBER 82: I just have a feeling you're putting words in my mouth and I'm not very comfortable with what you're saying. If it's found guilty I think it's (unintelligible) the jury could rule on the context of the (unintelligible). I don't think the jury (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: What we're trying to focus on is your ability to weigh --

JUROR NUMBER 82: I won't have no problem weighing one or the other.

MR. PIROLO: So, if we get to the second part, you understand you only get to the second part if you find Mr. Bradley guilty of first degree murder?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Once we get to that part the Court

would instruct you that you have to consider life as 1 a possible sentence, you understand that? 2 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 3 MR. PIROLO: Okay. And you're telling us that 4 you could do that, you could consider life without 5 the possibility of parole as a possible sentence? 6 7 Yes? JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 8 MR. PIROLO: Would you be able to come back 9 with a life without parole recommendation even if you 10 found Mr. -- you would have had to have found 11 12 Mr. Badly of first degree murder, can you come back -- if you deem it appropriate, could you come 13 back with a life sentence? 14 15 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. MR. PIROLO: Why do you favor the death 16 17 penalty? JUROR NUMBER 82: I'm sorry? 18 MR. PIROLO: Why are you in favor of the death 19 20 penalty? JUROR NUMBER 82: Why am I in favor of the 21 22 death penalty? 23 MR. PIROLO: Yes. JUROR NUMBER 82: I don't think 24 25 (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: You don't oppose it. Well, let me ask you this. Why don't you oppose it? Why don't just sit there and say I don't agree with the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I think if some evidence is found in that direction I definitely would have no problem going in that direction but I'm not going to sit here and say I will not or I will (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Speak up a little bit. What was the last part of that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I'm sorry. I really -- I'm not sure but I have no opposition to the death penalty or life in prison, whenever the evidence comes up the strongest, that's the way it's going to go.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. If we gave you a scale, just make things even more difficult for you, I'm sorry, gave you a scale, on one end it's ten and that means you strongly are in favor of the death penalty, the other end is zero, opposed to death penalty, where would you put yourself on that scale?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Probably about eight.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to summarize the process a little bit. Do you understand that during the

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

20

19

21 22

23

24

25

guilt phase you would have to come back with a unanimous recommendation, or unanimous verdict of quilty or not quilty?

> JUROR NUMBER 82: Right.

MR. PIROLO: All twelve of you have to have the same vote. When we go into the second phase, that vote, that verdict would not be unanimous, meaning not all twelve of you have to agree to the same thing, but whatever recommendation it is, when the Judge gets it she's supposed to give that great weight and that means that she can't just brush it aside and say, well, I don't care what the jury said or that's nice. Do you understand how important of a process this second part of the trial is?

JUROR NUMBER 82: A hundred percent, I understand.

> MR. PIROLO: I'm sorry?

JUROR NUMBER 82: It has to be a hundred percent.

MR. PIROLO: Well, it's -- the second part people can disagree, there could be some people that vote for life and some people can vote for death, it's a recommendation that the Court takes into consideration of what sentence to impose, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Within that second part of the trial you'll be -- the evidence that will be presented to you, the State will first present to you what are called aggravating circumstances. Do you understand what we mean by the word aggravating, makes things worse?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: State would have to prove one or more, but each aggravating circumstances would have to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. If they prove no aggravating circumstances, then you would have to return a verdict of life, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Could you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Now, let's just say,
hypothetically speaking, the State has proved
aggravating circumstances. Okay. Let's say they've
proved two. Would your mind at that point be shut
off to listening to any mitigating circumstances?
And before you answer, do you understand what we mean

by mitigating, it lessens something. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I understand.

MR. PIROLO: So, the State goes first, they try to put on aggravating circumstances, things that would make it worse. Now, let's say they've shown you at least two aggravating circumstances, at that point would you be unable to consider any mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I think os.

MR. PIROLO: When we hear the word think, that gives us some concern.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes, I know.

MR. PIROLO: If you don't know, you don't know. How about three, three aggravating circumstances, would you still be able to consider, you know, listen to with an open mind mitigating circumstances or would your mind shut off after hearing --

JUROR NUMBER 82: No.

MR. PIROLO: I'm sorry?

JUROR NUMBER 82: No, I will not shut my mind off (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: How about four aggravating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I would continue to follow

the directions, yes, I would.

MR. PIROLO: How about six aggravating circumstances? I'm sorry?

JUROR NUMBER 82: It would still be the same.

MR. PIROLO: You gave a look like that's a lot.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yeah.

MR. PIROLO: All right. So, if you heard -- if the State proved to you six aggravating circumstances beyond a reasonable doubt, you would still be able to consider mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: And would you still be able to consider a life sentence?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: The mitigating circumstances don't have to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, it's less of a standard, you would have to be reasonably convinced. You understand that the aggravating circumstances, the beyond a reasonable doubt the State has to prove, their burden is a lot higher than reasonably convinced and can you appreciate that why?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes, this is friend who experienced (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Can you appreciate why the aggravating circumstances have a higher burden to

2 life

1.8

prove? Because we are talking about Mr. Bradley's life.

JUROR NUMBER 82: You're talking between life and life in prison, yes.

MR. PIROLO: We're talking about how we get to that. You're going to have to weigh what the State presents to you. They're going to try to present some evidence that makes this particular first degree murder worse than other ones, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: And then the Defense presents to you by way of mitigating circumstances why you should consider a life sentence, why this first degree murder, the sentence should be life without parole. The mitigating circumstances are unlimited. I mean, you can hear all sorts of mitigating circumstances from a person's background to any illnesses, and we'll get into some specific ones. The aggravating circumstances are limited. The law limits to what kinds of things a juror can consider as aggravating, as an aggravating circumstance. Would you be able to follow what the Court instructs you is an aggravating circumstances and limit it to only what the Court tells you are aggravating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: I don't know what type of TV shows

25

you watch but you understand that this would not be TV, this would be a real human being?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. If you were shown a videotape that depicts how Deputy Pill was killed, would you be able to remain open and consider mitigating circumstances or is that where you draw the line? Still give you little of that doubt that you have from the photographs?

JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible) photographs.

THE COURT: Okay. You're going to have to

JUROR NUMBER 82: The photographs to me would be (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Putting the two together, putting the photographs together and the video together, would that -- would you be unable to consider mitigating circumstances after viewing photographs

> JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Yes to?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes, I can.

MR. PIROLO: Can you still be able to consider?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

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

25

instruction that you may hear if you're selected. I'm going to explain some of it to you. One of the aggravating circumstances that -- well, we talked about aggravating circumstances and they're limited. I can't tell you what they could probably be in this case but there is something that's called victim impact evidence that is not an aggravating circumstance. I can tell you that right now, that it's not -- it's never to be considered as an aggravating circumstance, but I'm going to read to you a portion of the instruction and I want to ask you -- I'll have a follow up question. Okay. instruction reads is that you've heard evidence about the impact of this homicide on the family, friends and community of Deputy Pill. This evidence is present to show the victim's uniqueness as an However, you may not consider this individual. evidence as an aggravating circumstance. That's an instruction this Court will read to you at the end if we get to this phase. You would get that at the end of that before you begin to deliberate. Now, even though that's the instruction, would it be difficult for you if you hear members of Deputy Pill's family or friends or co-workers or all of the above talk about the impact that, you know, her loss means to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

them, would it be difficult for you to set that aside or would you considering that as an aggravating circumstance?

Because -- I'll just -- before you answer it, I understand, you know, you're given instruction, the Judge tells you this is the law, these are the instructions in here, but there's twelve people in a room and the door's closed and there is no judge in the room and there are no lawyers in the room and there are no deputies in the room. Human beings are human beings, they're life experiences take over. Would it be difficult for you to essentially not to consider what you've heard from her family or friends or would it just be too much for you to see her family and friends in here and testifying about the impact that this has had on them, too much for you that you wouldn't be able to weigh the mitigating circumstances?

> JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Yes to?

MR. BROWN: Judge, I'm going to object to that, that's a compound question. I think it needs to be narrowed just a bit.

THE COURT: If you could just -- I mean, I'm going to overrule it. She seemed to understand that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

8

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

1.8

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

Ma'am, did you understand his question?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I understand (unintelligible) might be on the family has made (unintelligible) and my emotions.

MR. PIROLO: Would that affect you? Would that affect how you weigh the aggravating and mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 82: No. I would say no.

MR. PIROLO: Going back to mitigating circumstances, I want to discuss some specific ones with you. Do you believe that mental illness is a choice?

> JUROR NUMBER 82: No.

MR. PIROLO: Do you consider the field to be legitimate, you know, psychologists and psychiatrists, do you consider them to be working in a legitimate field?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Could you repeat that? Consider? I'm having a hard time hearing you.

Sure. Do you have -- well, MR. PIROLO: psychologists and psychiatrists, do you consider them as being part of a legitimate practice?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes, I've dealt with (unintelligible) for the past forty years and (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. I didn't hear the last of 1 2 that. I've dealt with the mentally. 3 JUROR NUMBER 82: Mentally challenged 4 individuals for the last forty plus years. 5 THE COURT: And then what was the last part of 6 it? 7 JUROR NUMBER 82: There's professionals in that field deal who deal with that kind of person, yes, 8 9 (unintelligible). 10 MR. PIROLO: Is that your field of work? 11 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 12 MR. PIROLO: And what was that, what kind of work were you doing? 13 JUROR NUMBER 82: I have worked with -- it's 14 15 currently called right now, mentally challenged adults, and (unintelligible) 16 and I worked in New York State 17 (unintelligible). So, it's been many, many years 18 19 ago, forty years. 20 MR. PIROLO: So, if you heard evidence in this 21 case obviously from qualified experts regarding mental illness, would you be able to consider that as 22 mitigating in this case? 23 24 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to assume you've heard

1 of an MRI, right? JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 2 3 MR. PIROLO: Do you got evidence from, again, an expert that's qualified to give testimony, would 4 you be able to consider results of an MRI as 5 mitigating in this case? 6 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 7 MR. PIROLO: And how about a PET scan, have you 8 ever heard of a PET scan? 9 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 10 MR. PIROLO: If you heard evidence of that, 11 would you be able to consider that? 12 13 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. MR. PIROLO: How about brain damage or brain 14 15 injury? JUROR NUMBER 82: I've dealt with individuals 1.6 over the years (unintelligible) brain injury. 17 MR. PIROLO: And would you be able to consider 18 19 that? 20 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. MR. PIROLO: What about physical or emotional 21 22 abuse? 23 JUROR NUMBER 82: I've seen a lot of it 24 (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: So, you would be able to consider

2.4

that as mitigating?

You would agree that some people respond differently to things of that nature, someone may be in an abusive household and respond one way and another individual be in the same environment and respond in a different way. One can make it somehow a positive and some other people can't make anything positive because of that experience, would you agree with that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

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

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Not -- let's back up. If someone picks up, you know, a drink, a glass of wine or whatever alcohol, that's obviously a choice, they're pouring themselves a drink, they're drinking it and that's a choice.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Other times (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: And you believe that some people can have a drink and be fine and some people become addicted? Whether it's just alcohol or other drugs, could be prescription drugs, it could be marijuana, all the drugs that are out there.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Some --

how to answer that.

MR. PIROLO: Do you think drug addiction is a

3

choice as opposed to just --

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 82: It's A choice on the individual but it should not happen. I'm not sure

MR. PIROLO: What should not happen?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I would not want to see an approve of drugs.

MR. PIROLO: So, would you be able to consider drug addiction though as a mitigating circumstance? JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Would it -- now, drug addiction is never an aggravating circumstance but would you at any point think drug addiction would be aggravating? Even if it's never -- under the law it's never aggravating, but to you personally would you --

JUROR NUMBER 82: Well, I would say (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to read to you, do this twice. I'm going to read to you an instruction you may get, I'm going to ask you if you could consider that as mitigating in this case. Okay. The first one is the capital felony was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental

or emotional disturbance, would you be able to 1 consider that as mitigating? JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 3 MR. PIROLO: I'm sorry? 4 5 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. The capacity of the defendant to 6 MR. PIROLO: appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to 7 conform his conduct to the requirements of the law 8 was substantially impaired, would you be able to 9 consider that? 10 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 11 MR. PIROLO: Do you consider mitigation, and 12 you're kind of getting a feeling of what mitigation 13 14 is as we talk about these things? Yes? 15 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 16 MR. PIROLO: Okay. We've been talking about mitigation, if you heard that, would you consider 17 that as an explanation for someone's behavior or an 18 19 excuse? JUROR NUMBER 82: It certainly 20 21 (unintelligible). 22 MR. PIROLO: It would what? JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 23 MR. PIROLO: Yes to would it be an explanation 24

25

or an excuse.

JUROR NUMBER 82: I would say it would be an 1 explanation, (unintelligible). 2 MR. PIROLO: No excuse for? 3 JUROR NUMBER 82: Being (unintelligible). 4 5 MR. PIROLO: No excuse for any type of drug 6 usage? JUROR NUMBER 82: Unless it's (unintelligible). 7 MR. PIROLO: What if you hear evidence of 8 mental illness or brain damage or brain injury, 9 physical, emotional abuse, would you take those and 10 look at them as an explanation for someone's behavior 11 12 or would you look at those as an excuse? JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible). 13 THE COURT: It would be what? 14 JUROR NUMBER 82: It will be towards behavior 15 16 and not (unintelligible). MR. PIROLO: But you would have a problem with 17 drug addiction? 1.8 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 19 MR. PIROLO: Okay. I know we've had a couple 20 of times where I know you're very soft spoken, but 21 there were a couple of times I couldn't hear. 22 Is there anything we should know about you, have 23 24 difficulty hearing?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I am on hearing aids and the

batteries went out when I was sitting out there. 1 2 MR. PIROLO: Okay. JUROR NUMBER 82: I didn't have a chance to 3 replace so (unintelligible). 4 MR. PIROLO: That's okay, we just want to make 5 sure -- because there are accommodations. 6 JUROR NUMBER 82: Your voice is also soft 7 spoken, this gentleman over here I heard very well. 8 MR. PIROLO: Okay. I just want to make sure 9 there are no -- there's always an accommodation that 10 11 can be made. I'm sorry. 12 JUROR NUMBER 82: I said this is between your 13 mouth and the mic. MR. PIROLO: Okay. Given that we've talked 14 about aggravating circumstances a little more and 15 mitigating circumstances, would you be able to still 16 consider mitigating circumstances and return a life 17 without parole recommendation if you find it 18 19 appropriate? JUROR NUMBER 82: 20 Yes. MR. PIROLO: You understand that your --21 whatever your vote is, that's your individual vote in 22 this part of the trial? You understand that? 23 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 24

MR. PIROLO: No one should do anything to

change your vote?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 82: No.

JUROR NUMBER 82:

And the same turn term, you would MR. PIROLO: have to respect another juror's vote as well?

Yes.

MR. PIROLO: You don't seem like the kind of person but you're not going to browbeat anybody into changing their vote, would you? You would not, right?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I don't think that would be (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Judge, may I have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may. I just want to make an announcement that yesterday because we had the jury panel coming in it was more limited where people could sit, but there's no limitation today where you can sit other than the first row on each side. just want to make sure -- I'm just telling the court deputies and telling the audience that today we don't have that limitation on where you can sit. only yesterday for purposes of bringing in the jury panel. You can't talk to me individually. okay.

MR. PIROLO: Ma'am, earlier you indicated how upset you were when you first heard Deputy Pill was

killed the day you heard it. Now, to what degree were you -- I mean, you believe the media reports to a certain extent that got you upset, right?

JUROR NUMBER 82: I think the half masts probably upset me more than anything else. When I heard the story (unintelligible) something that to me (unintelligible)?

MR. PIROLO: Why did what happen. Can you be a little more specific?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Okay. You turn off the media and (unintelligible) newspapers and maybe the media, they zero in the family picture (unintelligible), it's just (unintelligible) be been shot outright, this shouldn't have happened.

MR. PIROLO: Now, I'm going to stay on that media coverage. Did you decide or have you decided that Mr. Bradley is the one that shot Deputy Pill?

JUROR NUMBER 82: That's what the papers indicate.

MR. PIROLO: Right, but let's forget about what you listened to, we're concerned about what's in your mind.

JUROR NUMBER 82: Well --

MR. PIROLO: After hearing that did you decide that Mr. Bradley was the one that shot Deputy Pill?

JUROR NUMBER 82: It was questionable. 1 I mean, according to the media he was the one 2 3 (unintelligible). MR. PIROLO: But again, have you decided that 4 5 or did you decide that then? JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible). 6 The question's for you. 7 MR. PIROLO: JUROR NUMBER 82: The question's for me is yes. 8 MR. PIROLO: And if you did decide that he was 9 the one that shot, it is fine, it's not a wrong 10 11 answer. JUROR NUMBER 82: Well, I was going to say I'm 12 not comfortable (unintelligible) question right now 13 14 the situation that I (unintelligible). MR. PIROLO: You understand you're going to 15 hear that again in this trial here. You're probably 16 going to hear and see a lot more than what the media 17 18 was able to show. JUROR NUMBER 82: My question is why, why was 19 20 (unintelligible). 21 MR. PIROLO: Can you put -- can you put that those very strong emotions you have aside and not 22 have those emotions --23 24 JUROR NUMBER 82: Well --

MR. PIROLO: -- dictate --

JUROR NUMBER 82: -- it should be (unintelligible) taking a life (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. You're going to have to talk louder. You're going to need to talk louder so everyone can hear you.

MR. PIROLO: Do you have any doubts of your ability to put aside Mr. Bradley --

JUROR NUMBER 82: Without --

MR. PIROLO: -- shooting Deputy Pill?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Initial shock time and then we have time to digest it and otherwise I don't think it would be a problem, (unintelligible) death penalty.

MR. PIROLO: But again, before we get there, we don't get there if there's a not guilty verdict, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: As you sit here today, are you already -- in your mind is it that we're going to penalty phase, we're going to find him guilty and we have to decide life or death?

JUROR NUMBER 82: If he's found innocent then the jury wouldn't have a recommendation.

MR. PIROLO: As you sit here today, in your mind is he guilty?

1 JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible). 2 MR. PIROLO: You read in the media said that 3 Mr. Bradley did it, right? 4 JUROR NUMBER 82: That (unintelligible). 5 MR. PIROLO: I thought earlier you said he was 6 the one that --7 JUROR NUMBER 82: It indicated that he was the 8 one. MR. PIROLO: Right. So, they haven't indicated anyone else did it, right, in the media? 10 11 JUROR NUMBER 82: (Unintelligible). 12 MR. PIROLO: And you would be able to -- would you be able to set that aside and come in here with a 13 clear mind and listen to the evidence that's 14 15 presented or --16 JUROR NUMBER 82: Yes. 17 Would any of those media reports MR. PIROLO: that you heard back then remain in your mind and 18 influence your decision before we even get to the 19 20 second part of the trial? JUROR NUMBER 82: 21 No. 22 MR. PIROLO: Judge, I don't have anything else. 23 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Number 82, what I'm going to ask you to do is to go downstairs and 24

speak to the jury clerk. You're going to get

released for today. You're still being considered as a possible juror in this case. I'm going to ask you to go downstairs, talk to the jury clerk, they're going to give you a phone number. You're going to call back next Wednesday, which is March the 5th, between 1:00 and 5:00 and they're going to tell you when to come the next time. It mostly likely will be Thursday or Friday of the next day. Okay. But you'll be in recess until now until then. Okay.

1.8

During that recess you must abide by your rules governing your service as a juror. Specifically, do not discuss this case with anyone. Do not -- avoid reading newspaper headlines or articles relating to this trial or its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio or Internet comments about this case, and do not conduct any research regarding this trial or any of its participants. Okay. Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 82: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Report downstairs, they'll give you further instructions and then you'll be released for today. Okay. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 82 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. What we're going to do is

1 take a ten minute recess and then go until noon. just haven't had a morning recess and it's been 2 almost two hours. So, we're going to take a ten 3 minute recess and then we're going to start with 4 5 Number 85. Okay. Thank you. (Thereupon, a recess was taken in the 6 7 proceedings.) .Okay we can bring out Mr. Bradley. THE COURT: 8 (Thereupon, the defendant was escort had into 9 the courtroom by the court deputy.) 10 THE COURT: Okay. Anything that we need 11 12 address before we bring in Juror Number 85? 13 MR. MOORE: No. 14 MR. BROWN: No. THE COURT: Okay. We'll bring in Juror Number 15 85. 16 (Thereupon, Juror Number 85 was escorted into 17 the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were 18 had as follows:) 19 THE COURT: Okay. Good morning Juror Number 20 85. 21 22 JUROR NUMBER 85: Good morning. THE COURT: When we broke the last time I told 23 you about some rules that were in place. Those rules 24

started kind of that day. So, I'm going to ask you

since that time period have you been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Has anyone -- have you seen or heard television, radio, or Internet comments about the trial?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No, ma'am.

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

JUROR NUMBER 85: No, ma'am.

JUROR NUMBER 85: No, ma'am.

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

THE COURT: Okay. How this process is going to work this morning is I'm going to ask you some questions and talk to you a little bit and then the State will have an opportunity to talk with you and then the Defense will have an opportunity to talk with you. The first question I ask is kind of a general question just to hear your general views. What are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 85: I really don't consider it

2

3

5

6 7

9

8

12

11

14

13

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

one way or the other, it just depends on the circumstances.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if you had to say you're opposed to it or for it, you would say that you're for it under some circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me explain to you the process a little bit and I'm sure the attorney's will explain this more in detail, but the process is that we have the first part of the trial which is what we call the guilt phase. In the event the jury returns a quilty verdict as to Count I, and it only pertains to Count I, then the guilty verdict on Count I, Count I is premeditated murder of the first degree. So, in the event there's a guilty verdict by the jury in Count I, then we move to the second phase which would be the penalty phase. In the penalty face the jury is instructed by me that it is your obligation to make a recommendation to the Court of either death or life in prison without the possibility of parole. So, if you were to sit as a juror in this case, are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree and is that opinion so strong that you could not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty

under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you would consider life in prison as a possibility of -- life in prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty if I instructed you that that was your job to consider?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Even if there is a guilty verdict on the premeditated murder in the first degree?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes, ma'am.

most people have heard or seen something about this case. So, that's not unusual. So, I'm going to ask you do you know anything about this case either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, discussions with other people, or from the media such as radio, television, Internet, newspaper? Do you know something about this case?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Just basically what I, you know, heard on TV when it first happened. As far as any details, no.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you -- when it first happened you heard something on the news, on TV?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Have you heard anything since then?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Just that they were going for 1 people for a jury, you know. 2 THE COURT: So, you did hear that. Have you 3 read anything about it or most of yours sources is 4 5 from the news? JUROR NUMBER 85: I don't read the paper. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. How often do you watch the 8 news? JUROR NUMBER 85: Maybe once a day. THE COURT: Okay. Is it part of your routine 10 to turn it on? 11 JUROR NUMBER 85: No, ma'am. 12 THE COURT: So, when would you normally hear 13 the news? 14 JUROR NUMBER 85: Probably around 10:00 15 16 o'clock, 10:30, you know, at night. 17 THE COURT: Oh, at night? JUROR NUMBER 85: Basically watching TV at 18 night, sometimes it goes to news and it depends on 19 what's on. 20 THE COURT: So, if it's on you listen to it? 21 JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah, my wife's got it on at 22 23 night. THE COURT: Okay. So, she controls the remote? 24

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do in here is to set aside what you may have learned about the case, serve with an open mind, kind of serve with a clean slate and reach a verdict based only on the law and the evidence that's presented in this trial and this courtroom, can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes, ma'am.

on the news, and the State in this case, in all criminal cases, has the burden of proof, they have to prove each element of each crime to you beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt, the Defense doesn't have to prove anything and Mr. Bradley is presumed to be innocent. So, if you may know some facts about this case from when you -- I mean, some information about this case from what you heard on the news and let's say the State -- you know that's out there and the State didn't -- no evidence came before you about that, could you set that aside and not consider that for purposes of determining this case?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah, really because I'll just, you know, I need proof of most everything if I'm going to believe it or not.

THE COURT: So, you would hold the State to

their burden and make them prove everything in this courtroom?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: All right. Then questions by the State.

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. Juror Number 85, good morning.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Good morning.

MR. BROWN: You indicated the first word I think you said when the Court questioned you about the death penalty your opinion was you said it depends.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Can you elaborate on that a little bit more for me? It depends, what does it depend upon, what are your thoughts?

JUROR NUMBER 85: It mainly depends on if -- I feel that if someone, you know, kills someone for no reason or, I don't know, you know, if they planned to do it or whatever, but if you kill someone, you know, and it's proven to me that you did it because, you know, then I would consider it.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Let me go through the process a little bit with you on how a jury gets to the point of making the recommendation of life or

death to the Court. Obviously, she mentioned the first step is the jury has to come back with a verdict of first degree murder. They come back with a lesser, then the death penalty is off the table and sentencing is up to the judge. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Um-hmm.

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

The next thing is if you come back MR. BROWN: with a verdict of first degree murder, the death penalty is not automatic, we go to the next stage which means we would come back in again, you would sit in the jury box again and additional evidence is presented to you. Okay. Ultimately the Judge would give you a new set of instructions on how to deal with making the sentencing recommendation to the Court and she would give you a list, maybe one, it's likely going to be more than one, of what are called aggravating circumstances. Okay. And what aggravating circumstances are is the circumstances that either increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim. Okay. So, you know, it's things of that nature, something that increases the gravity of the crime. You talked about under certain circumstances, these are the things the Court's going to tell you, this list is what you can look at and based on that list that you can legally justify and

recommend a sentence of death. You understand?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: Okay. So, when we talk about aggravating circumstances and from your position that's what you have to look at, can you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. You may have another idea and say, well, I think this ought to be an aggravator, but legally you're going to be limited to what the Judge tells you, can you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. And the next step is State of Florida has to prove those aggravating circumstances to you beyond and to the exclusion of any reasonable doubt. Okay. Now, some of the facts of that may have come from the main trial, there may be additional evidence presented to you in the penalty phase, but it would all come in and you have to look and say has the State of Florida proven one or more of these aggravating circumstances to you beyond any reasonable doubt. If we have, then you take those ones that have been proven and say do these justify the death penalty. If the answer is no, then your recommendation would be life. Make sense?

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 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: If your answer is yes you go to the next step in this process which is look at what is called mitigating circumstances. Okay. And what the Judge told you yesterday was that those -- that's circumstances or evidence based upon the defendant, his life, his background, things coming in concerning him.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: Okay. And by the term mitigate is they go toward trying to mitigate the sentence that you should give.

> JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

Okay. And they have to be proven MR. BROWN: as well. That's a lesser burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence, but you take that, something has not been proven to your satisfaction, you discard it.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: You take the aggravating factors that have been proven and the mitigating factors or the mitigating circumstances that have been proven and the Court's going to tell you that once you get to that stage you go through a weighing process.

Now, in your lifetime have you had to make some

important decisions?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And when you make those decisions do you try to look at all the factors involved?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: And when you do that some factors are pretty darn important and you give them great weight in your decision making process, right?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And other factors you look at them and say, you know, I'm considering everything but these aren't very important, I'm going to give them little weight, right?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Possibly.

MR. BROWN: Well, is that what you do? You try to look at everything and some things you say, you know, this isn't important, I'm gave this very little weight or very little consideration.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Oh, yeah.

MR. BROWN: All right, that's how we make decisions, right?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: Well, the Court's going to tell you that's the process that you're going to go through here. You're going to consider everything that's

been proven to you.

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 85: Um-hmm. Okay.

MR. BROWN: You decide how much weight you're going to give, how much reliance you're going to put on the aggravating circumstances and the mitigating circumstances.

> JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Now, it's been proven, you consider it, you determine how much weight, how important it is to you in your process to make your recommendation.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: Just like you do in your important decisions throughout your lifetime.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: So, you go through this weighing process and weigh the aggravators and the mitigators. If the mitigators outweigh the aggravators, then your sentence would be life. Make sense?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. BROWN: If you find that the mitigators do not outweigh the aggravators, then you're in a position where legally you can recommend to the Court the death penalty sentence. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Um-hmm.

MR. BROWN: Now, what the Court's not going to tell you is that you're ever required to do that. She's not going to say if you find A, B and C, okay, that you have to return a death penalty recommendation.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: In fact, she's going to tell you that you're never required to do it but we have to go through the process, find the aggravators, find the mitigators and weigh them and if you go through the weighing process the aggravators are still on the top and you feel that justifies the death penalty, that's when you can recommend to the Court.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: Sentence of death. Any questions about that process?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No.

MR. BROWN: You kind of understand --

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: -- the steps? You feel comfortable with that?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: Okay. If you hear -- you're selected, you go through the process and you hear the aggravators and hear the mitigators you feel the

1 death penalty is justified, can you return a recommendation of death? 2 3 JUROR NUMBER 85: If I feel it's justified, 4 yes. 5 MR. BROWN: And do you come in with any mindset of, well, you know, I'd consider either A or B to be 6 a death penalty type of case but if it's not one of 7 these couple of thing then that's it and I'm not 8 9 going to look at anything else? 10 JUROR NUMBER 85: I mean, I have to hear all 11 the facts. 12 Okay. So, you're not coming in MR. BROWN: 13 saying, you know, unless this is a mass murder I'm not going to consider the death penalty? 14 15 JUROR NUMBER 85: No. 16 MR. BROWN: You agree to listen to the 17 aggravating factors that the Court's going to lay out 18 as to the circumstances that can justify the death 19 penalty? 2.0 JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes. MR. BROWN: And follow those and listen to 21 22 those? 23 JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

24

25

I'm covering this with everybody that I get a chance

MR. BROWN: One last topic I want to cover and

to speak to. As we talked about earlier, to get to the position of being able to decide to make a recommendation to the Court on the sentence, the jury has to come back with first degree murder, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. BROWN: If you come back with a lesser such as second degree murder, you never get to that situation, the death penalty is off the table, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. BROWN: What I want to cover is if it's proven to you in the guilt phase, State of Florida proves to you this defendant committed first degree murder and you sit back, would you let this thought enter your mind to perhaps sway you of saying, you know, they've proven first degree murder but if I just come back with second I don't have to make that decision on life or death, would you let that happen?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No.

MR. BROWN: You agree that we ought to return the verdict that the evidence proves?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And that's what justice is?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. BROWN: So, you wouldn't let yourself or let other jurors be persuaded and say, well, it's easier for us if we just do second rather than what was proven?

JUROR NUMBER 85: If I believe that everything is true fact and I'm going to give the right answer.

MR. BROWN: But you understand my concern?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah, I do.

MR. BROWN: Good. Okay. So, you can agree to go through the weighing process, aggravating circumstances weighed against the mitigators and make your recommendation you believe to be justice?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

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

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the Defense.

MR. PIROLO: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning, sir.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Good morning.

MR. PIROLO: I want to first begin with a couple of things regarding the media coverage, just want to clear it up. When you heard it or saw it on TV, that was the day that it happened or close to the day that it happened? You saw that at night watching the news at night?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Well, first I heard it on the 1 radio and I watched a little bit on TV, you know, I 2 couldn't tell you what time it was. 3 MR. PIROLO: Okay. Do you remember what you 4 heard on the radio first? 5 JUROR NUMBER 85: Just that a police officer 6 7 was shot and similar things on what happened, never 8 any facts. 9 MR. PIROLO: Well, can you can you be aspect as 10 you can what you remember hearing? JUROR NUMBER 85: Well, what I remember is that 11 the officer was chasing him or stopping for a regular 12 routine stop, she walked up to the car and somebody 13 shot her. That's basically all I heard, no details 14 15 or whatever. 16 MR. PIROLO: Then was it later on that night you saw some, some coverage on TV? 17 JUROR NUMBER 85: It was all day. 18 19 MR. PIROLO: All day? JUROR NUMBER 85: 20 Yes. 21 MR. PIROLO: What do you remember? JUROR NUMBER 85: Just them saying the same 22 23 thing over again.

24

25

MR. PIROLO: Do you remember any peoples names being mentioned?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No. 1 2 MR. PIROLO: As possible suspects? JUROR NUMBER 85: No. 3 MR. PIROLO: And I'm not sure if you said this 4 5 or not, have you -- other than the coverage in the newspaper the other day about the jury selection 6 starting, did you see any other stories regarding 7 8 this case? 9 JUROR NUMBER 85: I said that I seen it on TV, 10 I don't read the newspaper. MR. PIROLO: Okay. Coverage on the news was 11 12 just about jury selection? 13 JUROR NUMBER 85: Right. MR. PIROLO: Do you come in here with any 14 opinions as to guilt or innocence in this case? 15 16 JUROR NUMBER 85: Not at all. MR. PIROLO: Do you understand we're here, 17 questions are going to be posed to you are about a 18 part of the trial that happens if and only if the 19 jury as a whole returns a verdict of guilty of first 20 21 degree murder? 22 JUROR NUMBER 85: Right. MR. PIROLO: You understand that? 23 24 JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

25

MR. PIROLO: And I think the Judge and the

State have already told you if your verdict is not guilty or something less than first degree murder, we don't even -- we don't entertain this second part of the trial, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah, I understand that.

MR. PIROLO: All right. Now, the second part of the trial called the penalty phase, State, they get to introduce, try to introduce some things that are called aggravating circumstances and by aggravating means makes things worse as the State explained.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. PIROLO: Now, earlier on you said regarding the death penalty it depended on if the person planned it or if the person, you know, there's no reason for it.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Or the circumstances.

MR. PIROLO: Right. If you determine after the first phase, at the end of first phase you determine that, and again we're not talking about just some person that's out there, we're talking about Mr. Bradley, Mr. Brandon Bradley sitting next (unintelligible), if you determine that he meant to do it or had no reason to do it, can you still be open to and consider mitigating circumstances?

2

3 4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19

20

17

21 22

23

24

25

on all the facts and what (unintelligible) and then I would weigh that and weigh the other.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Like I said, it just depends

MR. PIROLO: What --

JUROR NUMBER 85: I'm not going to sit here and tell you that no, I won't don't do it or I will do it or whatever.

MR. PIROLO: Well, my concern is that earlier you indicated that if the person -- if you felt the person had no reason to do it, that would be a time that you would, you know, be in favor of the death penalty, right?

JUROR NUMBER 85: I would consider it.

MR. PIROLO: Would you still be able to consider life without parole if you determine the person had no reason to do it?

JUROR NUMBER 85: It depends on the circumstances.

MR. PIROLO: What circumstances -- I know this is hard because we can't, you know, be very specific, but what kind of circumstances would you want to hear that if you felt the person had no reason to do it would still let you consider and come back with a life recommendation? What kind of things would you --

JUROR NUMBER 85: Here's the way I feel (unintelligible) that if someone is being threatened and the other person shoots them and kills them or if somebody shoots them, that's (unintelligible) one way or the other after hearing all the evidence, you know.

MR. PIROLO: You understand --

JUROR NUMBER 85: I'm just trying to say I'm not going to say, okay, he deserves to die because he shot an officer, you know, they would have to prove to me that he did it without thinking or whatever, just pulled a gun and shot her, you know. I don't judge anybody until I get all the facts.

MR. PIROLO: You understand if someone was defending themselves, if it's self-defense, that's not -- they wouldn't be guilty of first degree murder?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No, they would just, you know. I'm just saying that's the way I look at it. If I walk up to somebody and they pull a gun and shoot me, you know, that's wrong. I mean, that's not, you know.

MR. PIROLO: If that is the circumstance, let's say that is -- the person just shot and killed another person for no reason, would you still be able

instruct, the Judge instructs you that you have to consider life without the possibility of parole as a

to consider mitigating evidence, mitigating

JUROR NUMBER 85: If I had to, yes.

sentence, could you do that? Can you do that?

MR. PIROLO: Okay. And the Judge will

you consider it?

circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 85: I can consider it, yes.

MR. PIROLO: And if you found it appropriate, could you return that verdict? Could you come back with a life recommendation even if you found --

JUROR NUMBER 85: If that's how I feel, yes, you know, whatever I feel is right.

MR. PIROLO: In the State of Florida life without parole means life. If Mr. Bradley gets sentenced to life in prison, he will die in prison, he will never get out, do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: If we gave you a scale, on one side of it is ten, that would mean you strongly support the death penalty, on the other end is zero and you oppose it, where would you put yourself on that scale? It's hard.

JUROR NUMBER 85: And I would explain that to

you, you know, I'm in the middle (unintelligible).

2

MR. PIROLO: So, would it be fair to say five?

3

JUROR NUMBER 85: Five.

4

MR. PIROLO: And you could go down the scale or

5

up the scale as you --

JUROR NUMBER 85: Depending on the

6 7

circumstances.

8

MR. PIROLO: Could you envision yourself at a

9

ten?

10

JUROR NUMBER 85: I don't think if I could be a

11

ten or not, pending (unintelligible).

12 13

aggravating circumstances can be. I can't get into

MR. PIROLO: The law limits to what the

14

them with you unfortunately but they are limited.

15

And as the State said, an aggravating circumstance

16

has to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. My

17

question is going to be let's assume that the State

18

proves an aggravating circumstance to you beyond a

19

reasonable doubt. Let's say they proved three of

2021

circumstances and consider a life without parole

them to you, can you still consider mitigating

22

knowing that three aggravating circumstances have

23

been presented or is that too much?

24

JUROR NUMBER 85: You say the same thing over an over and over again, I already told you once, I

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

10

11

9

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

need all the evidence to tell you whether I can say yeah, he needs to go to life in prison or he needs to I'm not going sit here and say yeah, die. (unintelligible) and then when it comes time I can do it, you know.

MR. PIROLO: Well, we also got to know -- and it's okay --

> JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah.

MR. PIROLO: Some people say no, three's too much, five, six is too many, I'm done with six, I can't consider a life sentence if I hear six aggravating circumstances. That's fine, there's nothing wrong with that, we just got to make sure who we're talking to. And if you feel that, that's fine, but would you still -- the only question is would you still be open to it? Could you still consider first listening to the mitigating circumstances and a life without parole sentence if six aggravating circumstances have been proven?

JUROR NUMBER 85: I can probably. I'll say probably, I'm not going to say yes, I'm not going to say no. That's just how I feel.

> MR. PIROLO: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 85: I have to hear the evidence. I don't judge anybody or anything until I hear the

evidence.

MR. PIROLO: Now, if you're presented with photographs, and you will be presented with photographs, and the photographs are very graphic, they show what Deputy Pill looked like after she was shot, would you -- would that cut you off, would that stop you -- would that prevent you from considering a life recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No.

MR. PIROLO: How about a video tape that shows how she was killed?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No.

MR. PIROLO: You would still be able to consider mitigating circumstances and consider coming back with a life recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Now, the mitigating circumstances, they are not limited. The law doesn't say only certain, you know, circumstances can be considered by a juror, and also the burden is not reasonable doubt, beyond a reasonable doubt, it's less and I think you can appreciate why it's less because we're talking about someone's life.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. PIROLO: The burden is reasonably

convinced, you have to be reasonably convinced that the mitigating circumstances exist. Do you believe mental illness is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No.

MR. PIROLO: If you hear evidence obviously from a qualified expert, if you hear evidence of mental illness, would you be able to consider that as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: I would take it into consideration, yes.

MR. PIROLO: How about brain injury or brain damage, again you hear evidence of that, would you be able to consider that as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Probably, yeah.

MR. PIROLO: How about physical or emotional abuse, would you consider that as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Again, yes.

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

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: I want to differentiate drug addiction and someone just picking up a joint or some other kind of drug and using that and compare it to someone actually being addicted to it, they just can't stop doing it. Do you believe still addiction

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes, it's a choice, you can stop if you want, I was there.

MR. PIROLO: And did you have support to do it?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No, I just quit.

MR. PIROLO: Do you appreciate that some people may be stronger, stronger willed than others, that they just stop doing something or do something other people just?

JUROR NUMBER 85: If they don't want to, they won't. You got to not do it too.

MR. PIROLO: So, it would be fair to say that you would not consider drug addiction as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No.

MR. PIROLO: Flip side of that, you will never hear -- drug addiction could never be an aggravating circumstance, but in your mind would you consider drug addiction as aggravating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah, probably.

MR. PIROLO: Even though the law is it's not aggravating, never is? If you heard it, would you bring that in with you when you deliberate and consider it aggravating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: I don't understand what you're saying.

171819202122

23

24

MR. PIROLO: What I'm saying is the law is you're not going to be instructed that drug addiction is an aggravating circumstance, it never is. The judge will give you specific instructions on what you consider as aggravating in this case. All right. Knowing that the Judge will instruct you on limited aggravating circumstances and drug addiction will not be one of them, would you nevertheless still consider it as mitigating? I mean as aggravating, you don't consider it as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah, probably.

MR. PIROLO: You wouldn't be able to follow the Court's instruction pertaining to what is aggravating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Possibly -- say it again, I did not understand.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. What the Court will say to you what you can look at as the aggravating evidence, drug addiction will not be one of them?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Okay.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. So, you couldn't -- if you followed the law, you couldn't look at that as aggravating.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Okay.

MR. PIROLO: What I'm asking you is even though

that's the law that will be read to you, would you still look at it as aggravating? Could you set that aside and say, okay, I'm not going to find it as mitigating but I legally can't find it as aggravating either so I'm just going to set that aside, I'm not going to be pay any attention to it one way or the other?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Probably, yes, one way or the other.

MR. PIROLO: I'm sure you've heard of an MRI, correct?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Um-hmm.

MR. PIROLO: If you heard evidence of that obviously coming from, you know, qualified expert, would you consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 85: It would depend on what the results were.

MR. PIROLO: Right. Would you be able to consider that?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yeah.

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

JUROR NUMBER 85: CAT scan?

MR. PIROLO: A PET scan.

JUROR NUMBER 85: A what?

MR. PIROLO: A PET scan.

JUROR NUMBER 85: I don't know what that is.

MR. PIROLO: It will be another image of say someone's head, someone's brain. Okay. Could you consider that, again coming from a qualified expert?

JUROR NUMBER 85: I could consider it, yes.

MR. PIROLO: Would you be able to consider the following: I'm going to read to you an instruction that you might get and I'm going to ask you if you can consider it. The capital felony was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance, could you consider that as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Possibly.

MR. PIROLO: Another one, the capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law was substantially impaired, could you consider that as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 85: I could consider that. I'll consider -- I know what you're saying but I can't give you a yes or no answer because you want me to say yes to something that I don't know.

MR. PIROLO: I don't want you to say yes.

JUROR NUMBER 85: No, you want me to say yes or

no.

MR. PIROLO: No, I don't want you to say yes or no, I just want you to tell us --

JUROR NUMBER 85: It depends on the information that I receive, you know. I mean, if someone is ill, you know, they can prove to me that that's the reason why they did something to somebody or whatever, then I'll take it into consideration because (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: And that kind of leads me to the next question I had for you. Would you consider those things, say brain damage and mental illness and other things we talked about, as explaining someone's behavior or would you look at it as it's just an excuse?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No, I'd listen to it and determine if it was possible, it was happening.

MR. PIROLO: You would look at it as explaining someone's behavior, why someone did something?

JUROR NUMBER 85: If it (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: The second part of the trial, if we get there, you understand that your verdict is not -- doesn't have to be unanimous, doesn't have -- all of you don't have to agree on the same recommendation, life or death, you understand that?

2.0

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: But in the same respect, it's an extremely important recommendation because the Judge can't do her job, she cannot impose a sentence without it?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Right.

MR. PIROLO: I mean, she has to give it great weight. Can you assure us that whatever vote you have that you're not going to have somebody bully you into changing your vote?

JUROR NUMBER 85: No.

MR. PIROLO: Flip side of that, can you assure us that you respect the other jurors thoughts about it?

JUROR NUMBER 85: I'd respect their opinion.

MR. PIROLO: Now, just to summarize everything, if you -- if you form your opinion the first trial, you believe is a first agree murder and the person, Mr. Bradley, had no reason to do it, you can still be open and consider mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 85: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: And would you be still -- knowing all that, would you be able to return a life recommendation if you deemed it appropriate after hearing?

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21 22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 85: Very possible, yes.

MR. PIROLO: May I have a moment, Your Honor?

Yes, you may. THE COURT:

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

> MR. PIROLO: What does life without parole mean to you?

JUROR NUMBER 85: He's going to be somewhere where's he's going to be free (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: You consider that a, again finding that it would be appropriate, that it would be a just sentence?

> JUROR NUMBER 85: Um-hmm. Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, I have nothing else.

THE COURT: Okay. Number 85, you are going to be released for today but you are still apart of this panel and still being considered as a possible juror in this case. I say that quick. So, what I'm going to have you do is you're going to go downstairs, they're going to give you a phone number. You're going to call back next Wednesday. Okay. Wednesday between 1:00 and 5:00 and then they're going to tell you when you need to be here next. Most likely it's going to be Thursday or Friday. Okay. So, be ready for that, but you won't have to

courtroom.)

be ready to be in court Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Okay.

THE COURT: 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. Do not -- avoid reading newspapers or headlines or articles about this case. Avoid seeing or hearing radio or television, Internet, anything about the case as well, and do not conduct any independent research about this case or its participants. Okay. So, you are released for today and we'll see you sometime next week.

JUROR NUMBER 85: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 85 exited the

THE COURT: Now, I'm going to bring in Number 86 but I do remember what Mr. Brown disclosed and so I will ask some information about that.

MR. MOORE: I've been thinking about it, I represented Mr. Rose, the man who killed this gentleman's wife who happened to be his (unintelligible) and I remember taking his deposition and I would (unintelligible), ninety-nine percent sure I took this gentleman's deposition. So,

(unintelligible).

THE COUR

THE COURT: Okay.

-

MR. MOORE: Ask the Court to kind of go in that direction too, I mean, if he recognizes us or me.

And also, Your Honor, when describing the process, the way the Court's putting it is only if the defendant is not guilty for (unintelligible) murder do you decide (unintelligible), that's not accurate because it could be felony murder too and the State can go and will go to both on both of those theories.

THE COURT: No, I didn't see that the State was going on felony murder. They didn't charge that and it's not a lesser.

MR. MOORE: No, but the Court can. I mean the State can and will seek if there's a felony involved and the State could seek a conviction of first degree murder on the (unintelligible) of premeditation felony. They're not limited to premeditated murder. So, to say that they can only go to the second phase in the event of a conviction of first degree premeditated murder --

THE COURT: You know what, then we need to talk about that because I actually researched that and because the State --

MR. MOORE:

They don't have to charge it.

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. BROWN: If we charge it as premeditated murder, that includes felony murder. If we only charge it as felony murder in the indictment, that does not include premeditated. It's first degree murder.

MR. MOORE: So, the solution is to tell the jury that the only way that they get to the penalty phase is if there's a conviction of first degree murder, it's not qualified as either.

It's one charge, two separate MR. BROWN: theories.

The reason why I actually THE COURT: Okay. researched that because in the next part of the jury instruction I talk about premeditated murder and I didn't know if I needed to talk about felony murder or not, and because it wasn't charged and because it wasn't a lesser included offense, I wasn't going to talk about it, but it appears from what you're saying it still is on the table.

Yes. In fact, the jury doesn't MR. BROWN: have to be unanimous to one theory or the other, it could be six on premeditated, six on felony and unanimous on the first, s.

MR. MOORE: Just to avoid all the confusion.

THE COURT: I'll be happy to do that. The information I kind of received as a result of that was different, I'm a little concerned about that, but I will be happy to do that. Okay. We can bring in Juror Number 86.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 86 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Good morning Juror Number 86.

JUROR NUMBER 86: Good morning.

THE COURT: The first thing I want to do is thank you for being here, thank you for your service, thank you for your patience regarding this process. We know it's been a long process for you, it's been a long process for you that we're making our best effort to try to get through it as quickly as we can but it is, in all due respect, a long process. Okay. When we talked last, I gave some rules for jurors. So, I need to talk to you about that and then we'll have some other discussion. Have you -- since these rules became in effect, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles related to this trial or its participants.

JUROR NUMBER 86: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 86: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 86: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 86: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 20 -- I mean
Juror Number 86 we have some information that you
were previously involved in a case that involved a
homicide and so I'm going to direct some of the
questions with regard to that because I have the
opportunity because I have in here individually to do
that. Are you aware of what I'm referring to?

JUROR NUMBER 86: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. This case does involve the charge of first degree murder. As a result of your prior experience, is that going to be of concern for you?

JUROR NUMBER 86: No, long time ago.

THE COURT: Okay. I anticipate in this case

that there are going to be some graphic photos and perhaps a graphic video that depicts the event, is that going to be of some concern for you?

JUROR NUMBER 86: None whatsoever.

THE COURT: Okay. As a result of that prior experience, do you recognize any of the attorneys in this proceeding?

JUROR NUMBER 86: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Specifically, do you recognize anyone at the Defense table?

JUROR NUMBER 86: No.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm going to keep going with some other questions. If at any time you want to talk about anything with regard to that other experience, please feel free to do so. I don't want to limit you to that. There are no right or wrong answers in here, absolutely no right or wrong answers, we just want to get information from you.

JUROR NUMBER 86: I have a question, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 86: I noticed the Court did not address sequestering.

THE COURT: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 86: And I know that that concerns

me because I don't know how that's going to affect me and you're going through questions and answers in to eliminate people that have a difficult time.

THE COURT: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 86: And yet you've not addressed that and I just wondered why.

THE COURT: Because at this time we're not sequestering the jury and that's -- there are times when the jury may be deliberating that they would be sequestered, but that is not -- I mean, at this time I haven't made the ruling that the jury will be sequestered. Sometimes facts, circumstances may cause that to be an issue but it's not an issue at this time. And you say -- are you all out there discussing that with regard to sequestering?

JUROR NUMBER 86: Well, the question, you know, we see people asking about hardship cases and they know that will affect things and they were just asking, people are just talking I wonder if this is going to be a sequestered. So, that was (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. Can't -- my dad use to say if candy -- if ifs and buts were candy and nuts what a wonder full Christmas it would be, I can't address all the ifs and buts but it's not -- if that was an

issue, I would have addressed as part of the hardship.

JUROR NUMBER 86: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. So, that's not an issue at this time. All right. I'm going to talk -- I'm going to talk to you for a bit and the State's going to have an opportunity to talk to you and then the Defense is going to have an opportunity to talk to you. The first thing I'm going to talk to you about is what, and this is a pretty open-ended general question, what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 86: Well, I go by the bible, what the bible says.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you have to be more specific than that.

JUROR NUMBER 86: Okay. The number's 38, it says a murder, murder is to be by death. A manslaughter, no, no.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 86: I go by -- I don't make up my own rules, I use those that are in there.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me tell you how the process works and I'm going to ask you -- I'm going to follow up with some questions. There are

24

25

1

possibly two phases to this trial. The first phase is what we call the guilt phase and the guilt -- in the guilt phase the jury -- if the jury comes back with a guilty verdict on Count I, which is first degree murder, then we move to count -- to the second phase and the second phase is what we call the penalty phase and in the penalty face the jury is instructed to return a recommendation to the Court, which is me, of possible penalties and the possible penalty for a guilty verdict of first degree murder is death or life in prison without the possibility of Now, we give you detailed instructions about parole. how you go -- how you make that -- to assist you in making that recommendation. It's a weighing process, talks about aggravating circumstances and mitigating circumstances, and I talked about those before and the attorneys will talk to you about that a little bit more this morning, but are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree and is that opinion so strong that you could not consider life in prison without the possibility of parole as a penalty under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 86: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So, in the event that there

was a guilty verdict on Count I, first degree murder, then we would move into the penalty phase and I would instruct you that as part of your deliberations that you must consider life in prison without the possibility of parole as a possible penalty, could you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 86: I could consider it.

THE COURT: Okay. You could consider it. Now, you said this a few minutes ago that --

MR. LANNING: Judge, may we approach?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Thereupon, a benchside conference was had out of the hearing of Juror Number 86 as follows:)

MR. LANNING: Judge, I move to challenge for cause. He said -- he did the same thing that the gentleman said the other day, I wouldn't vote for death under any circumstance and then he said he would consider it. Well, he's still stricken for cause on motion from the State. This gentleman said death is the only possible penalty for first degree murder and then -- I understand the Court wants -- would like him rehabilitated, but he's very strong about his statement. There was no equivocation, he goes by the bible, a murderer shall die.

MR. MOORE: The number is 38.

consider it.

MR. LANNING: Quoted the verse.

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: But there's a difference between them saying that they will do that and then me telling them that I'm going to instruct them that

they have to consider it and then them saying they'll

Judge, the Court instructed the MR. LANNING: gentleman the other day that he would have to consider death as a possible and he said, okay, I'll

THE COURT: With all due respect, I can't go back to what happened the other day. I don't know which specific case you're talking about.

consider it but I still won't vote for death.

Judge, it's the juror that said he MR. PIROLO: was opposed to the death penalty and I questioned him and he said he would consider it, he would listen to aggravating circumstances, he would listen to mitigating circumstances, he would entertain -- would go through the weighing process.

I'm not going to go back and fight THE COURT: what happened before or have discussions what happened before because I'm not going to remember the details of that in order to have an informed conversation with you about that. We can talk about this juror.

MR. PIROLO: With all due respect, we have the same thing with this juror except on the opposite end, he goes by the bible, he goes by verse 38, as Mr. Lanning said, a murderer shall die, and then we're trying to rehabilitate him by saying, well, can you follow the law and when you're asked the question he flat out said no, the death penalty is the only remedy.

You know, we are so immune to this THE COURT: process, we forget that -- we misunderstand that jurors, this is the first time they've ever heard those words. This is the first time things have ever been put to them this way. This is the first time they've ever considered it. A lot of people may have strong opinions but if I tell them that I'm going to instruct them that they have to, they may have a different opinion because a lot of people want to be law abiding. I'm happy to let you explore this with him but, you know, at this time -- I mean, I had five more questions for him to see if that was really his opinion or no, I didn't get to those. I'm sure you'll have lots of questions. I mean, I think it's premature for a challenge for cause at this time. And even if it was, I'd always give the State an opportunity to question and always give you an

2425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

opportunity to question him before we do that unless you stipulate. I've been consistent with that procedure and I would always do that. I mean, if you stipulate, that's one thing. If there's no stipulation, I always give the State an opportunity to guestion and I always give the Defense an opportunity to question and we're not at that phase. We haven't gotten to that point. I mean, is there a stipulation on behalf of the State? MR. BROWN: Judge, I'm waiting for his answers 10 11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to the Court's questions and depending on how he answers I think I've been very fair in my stipulations. So, I think we need to -- the Court's only going to be going for another forty-five seconds or a minute that it takes you. So, I'm waiting to see his answers are.

THE COURT: The request for the juror to be stricken for cause at this stage is denied. you.

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

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 86, you previously said that you believed that you're of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree. Thereafter, I talked

to you about it is the -- it will be the Court's instruction -- okay. First of all, I want to say there's no right or wrong answers in here, we're just trying to get your views on these issues and obviously these are very important issues. This is a very important matter to everyone here. Then I told you that I would, the Court, would instruct you that if there's a guilty verdict on Count I, first degree murder, then we would move into the penalty phase and I would instruct you that as part of your consideration you would have to consider life in prison without the possibility of parole even though you have a guilty verdict on murder in the first degree, tell me your views on that.

JUROR NUMBER 86: Well, I would listen to what you have to say about the law and what the options are, you give me the options to choose one or the other, I would go by my faith.

THE COURT: Okay. And -- I mean -- so, if you would take that a step further and tell me what you would do. In going by your faith, what would you do?

JUROR NUMBER 86: The lord says the punishment is death.

THE COURT: Okay. So, is it fair to say that you wouldn't be able to, you know, you wouldn't be

able to consider life in prison without the possibility of parole even if I instructed you to consider it?

JUROR NUMBER 86: I would consider it, if I had the option, I'll take the other one.

THE COURT: Okay. Knowing that that will be the option, that that will be the option, and the only -- we only get to that second phase if there's a guilty verdict on Count I, okay, that would be the option that you would choose.

JUROR NUMBER 86: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 86: Knowing that that's a recommendation from the jury to you.

THE COURT: Right, it comes to the Court as a recommendation but the Court does have to give the recommendation of the jury great weight. Okay.

Questions by the State.

MR. BROWN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Questions by the Defense.

MR. LANNING: No. Stipulate?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

THE COURT: Then Juror Number 86, I am going to release you from this panel and from this jury consideration. I do want to thank you for being

here. I do want to -- I appreciate your candor here this morning, that's always important. You can go -- I'm going to have you report to the jury assembly room, they will give you some information and you can be on your way. Okay. Thank you, sir.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 86 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. For the record, just for the record, Number 86 has been struck for cause. Okay. We'll bring in Number 87.

(Thereupon, the proceedings had were previously transcribed.)

THE COURT: Okay. I've already released the people that are waiting. I released them until 1:30. Anything else we need to discuss before we recess?

MR. BROWN: The accuracy of my prediction.

THE COURT: Yes, that was -- you're right this time, Mr. Moore was not. Mr. Moore broke his glasses during the proceeding.

MR. MOORE: I brought another pair.

THE COURT: It's good you have back up. I did inquire about more jurors, they said our likelihood to get more is better on a Thursday than a Friday.

Some of the county court judges requests jurors for Friday. What I'm going to do is I'm going to request

jurors for both days and we'll get as many as we can 1 just to see -- we can always release them but I'm going to go ahead and make that request. Okay. So, 3 we'll be in recess until 1:30. 4 5 (Thereupon, a recess was taken in the proceedings.) 6 THE COURT: Okay. We can bring out 7 8 Mr. Bradley. (Thereupon, the defendant was escorted into the 9 courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had 10 11 as follows:) 12 THE COURT: Should be 88 through 106. Okay. Are they coming up? What's the status? 13 THE COURT DEPUTY: We're waiting on 14 15 (unintelligible). THE COURT: Okay, yep, there should be nine. 16 THE COURT DEPUTY: They're on their way up. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Any preliminary matters that 1.8 we need to address on behalf of the State? 19 MR. BROWN: No, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Any preliminary matters on behalf 21 22 of the Defense? MR. MOORE: No, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Okay. We'll wait until the jury 24 comes up and then we'll start with Number 88. 25

THE COURT DEPUTY: It's going to be just a second.

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

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 88, the first thing I want to do is thank you for your service, thank you for being here, thank you for being patience with us. This process is a slow process. It's long for you, it's long for us but it is something that we have to do. So, we do appreciate you being patient with us and we are doing the best we can to try to get it through as fast as we can. When I spoke to you last I talked about rules that have -- that are in place. Those rules kind of started at that time. So, I'm going to ask you some questions about those. Have you been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 88: He.

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

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you some questions, then the State will have an opportunity to ask you some questions and then the Defense will have an opportunity to ask you some questions. The first question I'm going to ask is a very general question, I kind of ask it that way on purpose. What are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 88: My views would be mostly against it.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 88: In the ninetieth percentile, but I would need a very, very telling argument to be convinced to go for the death penalty.

THE COURT: Let me discuss with you how the process works. We have the first part of the trial which we call the guilt phase. In the guilt phase, if the jury returns a guilt verdict on Count I, first degree murder, then we move to Count -- I mean to the second phase. The second phase is the penalty phase. Now, for purposes of the penalty phase you have to

22

23

24

25

presume that there's a guilty verdict on Count I because that's the only way we get to the penalty phase. So, there would be a guilty verdict on murder in the first degree. If we get to the penalty phase, then I instruct you that as the jury you would return a recommendation to the Court, to me, of possible penalties of death or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Now, if I instruct you that as part of the process you needed to consider the death penalty, and we give you a lot more instructions about that than just this, I'm going of giving you an general overview, the attorneys will actually be more specific, if I instruct you that you would have to consider the death penalty as a possible penalty, and I'll give you some guidance and how to consider that, would you be able to follow that instruction?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

THE COURT: And are you opposed to the death penalty such that you would not consider it as a penalty under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

THE COURT: And I'm just going to ask in the alternative. Are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first

degree?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if I instructed you that you had to consider both penalties, you would be able to do that?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Now, when you come in here most people know something about this case, that's not unusual, and I'm going to ask you do you know anything about this case either from your own personal information, rumor, by discussions with anyone else or from the media, radio, television, Internet, newspapers, whatever source, do you know something about the case?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No, I moved here fourteen months ago, I know nothing.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you hear anything recently about coming to the trial or anything about that?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you're saying at this time you know nothing about the case other than what you may have learned the other day when I was giving you -- when I was doing the introduction?

JUROR NUMBER 88: That's correct.

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

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor. Juror Number 88, good afternoon.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Good afternoon.

MR. BROWN: You indicated to the Court concerning the death penalty that you're mostly against it, you said the ninety percentile, how did you -- how do you come to the ninety percentile? Explain to me when you say mostly, what do you mean?

JUROR NUMBER 88: I'm catholic, so catholics are generally against the death penalty and I'm with them the whole step of the way. I would like to have to have a compelling reason for it but I try to consider if it had been one of my children as a child that somebody purposely killed, I think I would definitely (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: Okay. When you come in and you say would need a compelling argument, do you have in your mind a preconceived notion of what a compelling argument would be or what are you -- what factors are you looking at it for?

JUROR NUMBER 88: It would have to be the extenuating circumstances (unintelligible) the big picture that might bring that into consideration, or

if, you know, the other jurors were, you know, getting back and forth, then I would therefore consider looking at both penalties.

MR. BROWN: Sure. You know, obviously, you know, the other jurors, part of the deliberation is discussing and the give and take and the back and forth, obviously no one should be back there threatening you, doing anything improper, but part of the deliberation is the discussion back and forth pointing things out, pointing out weaknesses in your argument to their argument.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Correct.

MR. BROWN: Just a good healthy discussion, it should be a discussion versus an argument.

JUROR NUMBER 88: And I don't think people should, you know, arbitrarily say this is a death penalty case without being (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: Okay. Could you vote and return a verdict for a death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 88: I could if the (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: Let me explain to you a little bit about the process that a juror goes through to get to that situation to make a recommendation, and these are things that the Court ever covered briefly with

you just now but most of it she covered yesterday but that was obviously sometime ago. First step is the verdict. To even consider the death penalty the jury has to come back with a verdict of first degree murder. If they come back with not guilty, obviously there is no sentencing, and if the verdict is something less such as second degree murder or another lesser included crime, then the death penalty is the off the table and you're not going to be making any recommendation. You understand that?

MR. BROWN: Okay. Now, if the jury does come

Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 88:

back with first degree murder, what happens is additional evidence, we would reconvene, you'd be back in the jury box, additional evidence is presented and then the Court is going to give her final set of instructions to you. She's got to start off with — in those instructions tell you what are called aggravating circumstances, and she's going to give you a list of aggravating circumstances. It may be one, I expect it's going to be more than one, but she's going to go through and list what those circumstances are. Basically what aggravating circumstances are are circumstances that increase the gravity of the crime or increase the harm that was

25

done to the victim. Come up with a term aggravating increase the gravity of it. So, things that were done to increase the gravity of it and it's to those circumstances that you look to to see whether the death penalty is justifiable. So, she's going to give you that list and you have to determine whether the State has proven those beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. Now, that proof may come from the original quilt trial or there may be additional evidence in the penalty phase trial. It's all evidence that's before you. When you get to step two you don't forget everything that happened in step one. So, determine which, if any, aggravating circumstances the State of Florida has proven. If we haven't proven any, then your recommendation has to be life. If the State's proven at least one, we may prove more than one, we have to prove at least one, then you take those circumstances that we've proven and say do these justify the death penalty. the answer is no, you return a life recommendation. If the answer is yes, you go to the second part of this analysis and that's where you look at the mitigating factors, mitigating circumstances, and as the Court told you yesterday, those are circumstances that concern the defendant, his life, character,

things of that nature, things about him.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Okay.

MR. BROWN: There's a burden of proof for that as well. It's lesser than -- it's less than proof beyond a reasonable doubt, it's to the greater weight of the evidence is the standard there. So, that mitigating evidence is put forward and you have to determine what, if any, of that is proven.

Obviously, if something's not proven, you disregard it. You take that mitigation evidence that's been proven to you and you compare it and weigh it with the aggravating circumstances proven. The Judge is going to tell you that's the process you do.

Now, you've had to make in your life some, I assume, life, personal life, work life, some key important decisions?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And when you've made those decisions you try to look at all factors, all the circumstances involved.

JUROR NUMBER 88: When possible, yes.

MR. BROWN: That's what you try to do. When you do that, you obviously find some circumstances very important to your decision making.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And you give those great weight.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Other things you look at you determine, you know, this really isn't all that important and you give it very little weight, right?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Right.

MR. BROWN: And that's how most of us make important decisions in our life. It's the same process here. You look at those aggravators and you're going to look at the mitigation that's been provided and you determine the weight. What you need to assure us is that you're going to consider all that's been proven. You determine the weight. The Court's not going to tell you how much weight to give to everything, you may decide that a few things get great weight, most get little weight. You can weigh it, you determine the weight.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Okay.

MR. BROWN: And then when you go through that weighing process you have to ask yourself does the mitigation outweigh the aggravation. If it outweighs it your recommendation would be life. If you find that the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, then you're in the position where you can legally recommend to the court the death

sentence.

4 5

JUROR NUMBER 88: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Court's not going to tell you if you find A, B and C that you must return a recommendation of death, she's going to tell you you're never required to do that. You have to go through the weighing process, find the aggravating weighed with the mitigators, at the end of the day if the mitigation doesn't outweigh the aggravation, does that justify -- those aggravators justify the death penalty and if so you make a recommendation of a death sentence in this case. Any questions about the process that you have to go through step by step?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

MR. BROWN: Knowing that process, can you recommend, if you feel it's justified, a sentence of death?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Is there -- anything we talked a little bit about -- you mentioned that you're catholic. How would you feel if you go back to catholic church or family members, I presume your family members are catholic, go back to them having recommended a sentence of death?

JUROR NUMBER 88: I (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: Okay. So, if you had a conversation with your priest you'd be okay, wouldn't present you any extra issues?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

MR. BROWN: Anything else in your background, personal, other moral beliefs or philosophical beliefs that would cause you any concern, hesitation, being asked to make this type of decision?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

MR. BROWN: Do you come in here today or did you come into the case having a concept in your mind of the State of Florida has to show A or B or C to really even get you to consider death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 88: I would fall back on the reasonable doubt thing, I would definitely consider all of the evidence, yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. How about, you know, everybody thinks the classic thing is well, a mass murder should get the death penalty, but then some people say other than that, no, I wouldn't vote for death. Do you have any type of a standard like that?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Probably again as a mother when it would come to my children, I think of children being purposely murdered, yes, it would have (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: But if it's not that type of a circumstance, this is not a case involving the death of a child, are you limited just to that area?

No.

MR. BROWN: You can assure us that you're not?

JUROR NUMBER 88: I can assure you -- I mean,

that's the only thing that pops into my head at this

point that would justify it but, again, I have to

hear the evidence. Does that make sense?

MR. BROWN: And you understand what the Court when she gives you if you're selected a list of aggravators, those are things that are created that are set and we can't add to them, we're going to be limited to the list that she gives you, but those are things that legally can be used and are the only things that you are to use in considering that justify a death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 88:

MR. BROWN: Okay. And are you open to looking at those and saying this is legally, these are the factors that are laid out that justify the death penalty and considering those?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. BROWN: The other topic I want to cover is as we talked about if the jury comes back with a

lesser verdict than first agree murder, it would avoid the whole situation of having to make that recommendation. It's kind of the easy way out so to speak because we're asking jurors to come in and make this decision is asking an awful lot of our citizens. You okay with that?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yeah, I don't see (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: If you return a verdict for less than first, you're not going to be coming back and making that recommendation because the death penalty's off the table, you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. BROWN: So, my concern is, and I ask this of everybody that I talk to so I'm not just picking on you here, knowing that in the back of your mind, if I come back with something less I don't have to face that decision, do you think that would affect your verdict at all?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

MR. BROWN: So, you can assure us that if we prove, the State of Florida proves to you the guilt of first degree murder that you would a death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. BROWN: You wouldn't compromise down and say, well, you know, first has been proven, I'm just going to go with second because I don't want to have to make that next decision?

JUROR NUMBER 88: What's fair is fair.

MR. BROWN: You can assure us that you would do that?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. BROWN: You understand the concern that we have that people can look at that and say, you know, I'm just going to go because it's easier? You agree that justice would be to return the verdict that the evidence speaks to?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Exactly.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the Defense.

MR. PIROLO: Yes, Your Honor. Good afternoon.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Good afternoon.

MR. PIROLO: How are you?

JUROR NUMBER 88: I'm doing great. You?

MR. PIROLO: Great, thank you. I'm going to start with a question that I've recently been asking at the end, I'm going to ask it at the beginning for you. You mentioned earlier that if the jurors were

gang busters and you may consider what they're going to do, what we want to make sure is can you assure us that when in the deliberation room that you're not going to succumb to what any one or two other jurors maybe thinking and start yelling what's wrong with you, no, you can't vote that, can you stick to what your gut tells you based on you considering and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: And again, you can't do that and turn in the other person, you can't start pressuring them to vote your way. So, I just want to make sure. Do you have any doubt about that?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No, I don't succumb to anyone.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. All right. You've kind of been told a little bit of how this is all going to work. You know we only get to this second part if there's a conviction of first degree murder. The second part the verdict or the recommendation does not have to be unanimous the second phase but nevertheless it's a very important recommendation. The Judge has to give it great weight, meaning in fact that the Judge can't do her job, can't do the

0.0

step after that which would be imposing a sentence without the recommendation. So, it's very important. So, don't -- you understand it's not something you just brush aside and say whatever, I'll vote whatever, the Judge is going to do whatever she wants, she's not going to care about what I think, it doesn't work like that. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes, I would take it very seriously.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Just like any other court decision you made, probably unlike other court decisions you made, this particular decision has a face to it, it has a name to it, it's Mr. Bradley sitting here, sitting there, sitting next to him as you could tell when you first walked in. So, you understand that we're going to be talking about Mr. Bradley's life?

JUROR NUMBER 88: A human being, yes.

MR. PIROLO: Yes, another fellow human being but that human being has a name, are you comfortable doing that if chosen?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: What does life without parole mean to you? What do you think about that sentence?

JUROR NUMBER 88: I think that's a way for a

human being that's made a bad choice to redeem and have the life that's productive.

MR. PIROLO: And in this state, State of Florida, life without parole means that, life in prison, never getting out, that person dies in prison, you accept that that being the law here in Florida?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Correct.

MR. PIROLO: Again, it's a lot of assumptions because we're asking you these questions if there's a conviction phase one we go to the second phase. If we get there you've heard you're going to first hear about aggravating circumstances and you know that those are limited. State has already told you that. The Judge will instruct you as well that they are limited and you have to find that the State has proven at least one beyond a reasonable doubt. Now, after hearing that evidence if you're not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that there are no aggravators and that's it, ends of story, life sentence, you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: You accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: You do that if you find no

aggravating circumstances? Yes

2

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

3

MR. PIROLO: Everything is recorded so it has to be.

That's okay. Now, let's say you

4 5

JUROR NUMBER 88: Sorry.

MR. PIROLO:

6

find an aggravating circumstance. Let's say you find

8

multiple aggravating circumstances. Let's say you

9

find six aggravating circumstances. And you keep

10

hearing this term aggravating circumstances, I

11

unfortunately can't tell you what we mean by

12

aggravating circumstance. I can't give you the list

13

or anything like that but even if finding one or two or whatever the number is, you are never required to

1415

vote for death, do you understand that?

16

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

17

ever tell you if you found aggravating circumstances

MR. PIROLO: This Judge, no other judge will

18 19

you have to come back, you can always vote for life.

20

Okay. Regardless if you find mitigating

21

circumstances or not, you never are required to vote

22

for death.

Turning to the mitigating circumstances, you

24

23

seems to be a pretty intelligent woman, you

25

understand what aggravating means, it makes things

worse, mitigating lessens, and mitigating circumstances would be factors for you to consider a life sentence. Those are unlimited. So, there is no set list for mitigating circumstances. And the other factor's that the burden is less. You have to be reasonably convinced that the mitigator is present. And you appreciate why the difference, aggravator beyond a reasonable doubt, mitigator reasonably convinced, we're dealing with someone's life so it will be -- the burden is less in mitigating.

I want to go through some possible mitigating circumstances and what I'm going to ask you is would you be open to consider them as mitigating circumstances in this case.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: First one being is if you heard evidence of brain damage or brain injury, would you be open to considering that as a mitigating circumstance as a reason to impose a life sentence?

MR. PIROLO: Okay. How about mental illness?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. I was first going to ask you, do you think mental illness is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. So, if you heard evidence 1 obviously from a qualified expert, you'd be open to 2 consider that as mitigating? 3 JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes. 4 MR. PIROLO: Have you ever heard of PET scans 5 or MRTs? 6 JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes. 7 MR. PIROLO: Same question, would you be open 8 to considering that type of evidence as mitigating 9 10 circumstances? JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes. 11 MR. PIROLO: How about physical and/or 12 emotional abuse, are you open to consider that? 13 JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes. 14 MR. PIROLO: How about drug -- well, let me 15 back up for a moment. Drug addiction, do you think 16 that is a choice? 17 JUROR NUMBER 88: Do I think it's a choice? 18 19 Initially, yes, you choose to take drugs. 20 MR. PIROLO: Right. You --JUROR NUMBER 88: Addiction is not a choice. 21 MR. PIROLO: And would you be open to 22 considering drug addiction as a mitigating 23 circumstance? 24

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to read to you two specific instructions regarding mitigating circumstances. After each one I'm going to ask you again would you be open to considering it.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Okay.

MR. PIROLO: The first one is the capital felony was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance, would you be open to considering that as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: The capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law was substantially impaired, would you be able open to considering that as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Any -- and again, you understand that we went through a few but it's not limited to just these mitigating circumstances. Now, hypothetically speaking, just the ones that we talked about now, if you heard that, I know you said you're open to them as being mitigators, would you also be open to the notion that they are explanations for someone's behavior or would you look at them as an

excuse?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No, I would look at them as explanations.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to go back to what we called the aggravating circumstances. I'm going to tell you -- or talk about something that is never considered an aggravating circumstance but I want to make sure that despite that fact if you would think or you would consider it as an aggravating circumstance.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Okay.

MR. PIROLO: It's something that's called victim impact evidence. Again, it's never -- it's not an aggravating circumstance, but just to explain a little bit about what it is to you, I'll read you a portion of an instruction that goes with that.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Okay.

MR. PIROLO: You have heard evidence about the impact of this homicide on the family, friends, community of Deputy Pill. This evidence is presented to show the victim's uniqueness as an individual. However, you may not consider this evidence as an aggravating circumstance. And you would be told it's not an aggravating circumstance, you cannot treat it as an aggravating circumstance, do you think you

would treat -- if you follow the law and would not treat it as an aggravating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes, I could follow the law.

MR. PIROLO: Do you have any doubt about it?
Because you understand sort of what this kind of
evidence would be?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: You'd be hearing from friends or family.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes. It was pull at my heart strings but I would listen to the law.

MR. PIROLO: If you were to you see photographs that are graphic in nature, very graphic, and they show what Deputy Pill looked like just after being shot, do you think that would turn you off to mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No. No, I've seen -- my father was a deputy sheriff detective and (unintelligible) and I've photographs before (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Was that in another State or?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes, in Washington State.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. How about a video, if you see a video that depicts how Deputy Pill was killed, would that turn you off to mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 88: No, it wouldn't turn me off to mitigation, it would disturb me but it wouldn't turn me off to mitigation.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Would you be able to look at those pictures, look at the video and still keep an open mind to considering mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: And again after seeing pictures and the video like that, hearing mitigation, would you still be able to return a life sentence if you found it appropriate?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: I know you said you are -- you fall on the death penalty issue, can you say why you're not opposed to it a hundred percent?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Because I think there's always circumstances that there's never a hundred percent of anything. That's just my philosophy in life, there's always two sides to a story and there may very well be a reason for a death penalty. So, I wouldn't completely take it off my plate. I would not be opposed to it one hundred percent, I just think it would need a very extremely compelling argument to convince me that that's right.

MR. PIROLO: You would be willing to sit here

and listen and consider the aggravating circumstances and then listen and consider the mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Do the weighing that you're required to do by law and as we indicated earlier if you felt it appropriate you could return a death sentence, a death recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 88: I could, I would assume that the rules that are placed before a jury is to remove that emotional pull. So, yes, I would be very logical and would look at all of the evidence.

MR. PIROLO: In the same respect, you could be open to considering a life recommendation as well?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: May I have a moment, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

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

MR. PIROLO: I was just going to potentially ask you this later on but since we're here, your dad was a deputy sheriff in Washington State?

JUROR NUMBER 88: Um-hmm.

MR. PIROLO: Knowing that Deputy Pill was a deputy, was a deputy here, do you think that would

I have a

Т

cause you any concern being able to sit as a fair and 1 2 impartial juror in this case? 3 JUROR NUMBER 88: I don't believe so. 4 mean --MR. PIROLO: We always get freaked with I 5 believe. 6 JUROR NUMBER 88: I don't believe so. lot of respect for police officers, I have a lot of 8 respect for my dad but I don't view them as gods. 9 10 MR. PIROLO: Could you set that aside? JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes. 11 MR. PIROLO: And just look at the facts and 12 evidence in this case? If we move on to a second 13 14 phase, can you just keep that side and focus on what is presented to you in this case and make a decision 15 solely on the evidence in this case? 16 JUROR NUMBER 88: Honestly, I think that's what 17 you would expect me to do is be impartial. 18 19 MR. PIROLO: Thank you, ma'am. JUROR NUMBER 88: You're welcome. 20 MR. PIROLO: No other questions. 21 THE COURT: All right. Number 88, you're going 22 to be released for today but you are still being 23 considered as a potential juror for this case. What 24

25

I'm going to have you do is go downstairs, talk -- go

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

to the jury assembly room. They're going to give you a phone number, you're going to call that phone number next Wednesday, March the 5th, between 1:00 and 5:00 and they're going to tell you when to return. You won't be returning Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday. You may return Thursday or Friday. So, be expecting that for purposes of planning.

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. You can say you're here and, you know, you can say the what and when but you can't say the why. can't say why you're here, you can't talk about any of the charges and you can't talk about the case with anyone until you've been released as a juror in this case. You're released for today but you're not released totally. You must not speak to the lawyers, the parties or the witnesses. Avoid reading newspaper and/or headlines about -- relating to this trial or its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio, or Internet comments about this case, and do not conduct any research yourself regarding this case or any of its participants.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Any questions or concerns?

1 JUROR NUMBER 88: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you again for your patience and you can go downstairs.

JUROR NUMBER 88: Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 88 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. Number 89.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 89 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

want to do is thank you for being here, thank you for your service, thank you for your patience. This has been a long process. This has been a long process for you, it's a long process for us. We do try to go as fast as we can with regard to this matter but it is an important matter and so we're all doing the best that we can, I assure you that, but we do thank you for being here. Since I spoke to you last I talked about some rules, excuse me, those rules became in place when I first announced them. So, I want to ask you about that. Have you been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you some questions and talk to you about a few things, then the State will have an opportunity to ask you some questions and then the Defense will have an opportunity to ask you some questions. The first question I'm going to ask you is a pretty general question. What are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Honestly, I don't have any views about the death penalty. I honestly believe that the (unintelligible) death penalty but at the same time I do identify with it.

THE COURT: Okay. So, under certain circumstances you think that you could impose the

death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

THE COURT: And I take it it's -- and you say you don't like it, how come -- can you just tell me why you don't like it? And just so you know, there's no right or wrong answers in here, you can say whatever you want.

JUROR NUMBER 89: I don't like it because I don't we should impose death unless it is extreme but. When I say extreme, like a serial killer who like killed ten people, then, yes I would vote for the death penalty.

THE COURT: Okay. So, let me tell you how it works for purposes of the trial. In the first part of the trial, the first phase is what we call the guilt phase. In that phase if in this case the jury comes back with a guilty verdict on Count I, and it only pertains to Count I, then -- and Count I is murder of the first degree, if they were to come back as a guilty verdict to that count, then and only then we would move on to a penalty phase which would be the second phase. In the penalty phase you have to presume that the defendant is -- has -- I mean, not presume, the defendant has been found guilty of Count I, then you would be instructed as a juror to make a

recommendation to the Court, which would be to me, of 1 a sentence and the possible penalties that you would 2 be required to consider are death or life in prison 3 without the possibility of parole. So, if I were to 4 instruct you as part of your job as a juror in this 5 case you were to consider, and we're going to give 6 you lots more instructions than this, this is just the very tip the iceberg as far as instructions about 8 how to weigh and consider whether death or life is 9 appropriate, but if I was to tell you that as part of 10 your instruction you're to consider the death penalty 11 but you're also to consider life in prison without 12 the possibility of parole, would you be able to 13 consider both penalties? 14

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, I'm going to kind of ask this both ways. Are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree?

JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

THE COURT: And now I'm going to ask you it the other way. Are you of the opinion that you would not consider death as a penalty under any circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

THE COURT: Okay. We know that some people

2324

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

_ .

have heard information about this case, I'm going to 1 ask you about that. Do you know anything about this 2 case either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, 3 by discussions with others, from the media, radio, 4 television, Internet, newspapers? Do you know 5 anything about this case? 6 JUROR NUMBER 89: Only what I seen when it 7 8 first happened. 9

Okay. So, at the time that the THE COURT: event occurred, what did you hear -- be more specific about what you heard and how you heard it.

JUROR NUMBER 89: I seen it on the news with -just said something about a robbery and then said about the chase and then it said about the shooting on the news, but that's mostly all that I saw.

> THE COURT: So, that would be the news on TV? JUROR NUMBER 89: On TV, yes.

> THE COURT: And you saw at that at that time? JUROR NUMBER 89: At that time.

THE COURT: Anything else? Did you see or hear anything about coming here today?

> JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

THE COURT: Anyone say hey, you might on that jury?

> JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: Anyone talk about that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if you heard something else and you never heard anything about it in this courtroom, could you set that aside and not consider that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

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

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. Juror Number 89, good afternoon. I want to talk to you a little bit about your opinions toward the death penalty. I believe you indicated that you don't like it and you don't think people should be put to death.

JUROR NUMBER 89: Right.

MR. BROWN: Can you explain that a little bit more, your basis for that thinking, your reasoning, thought process?

JUROR NUMBER 89: I feel like if you're

murdering somebody (unintelligible) court of law,
it's still murder and I believe -- I oppose to the
death penalty unless it's, like I said, something
that's major like someone who's killed ten people,
then, yeah, the death penalty would be an option, but
if someone may have made a mistake, he accidentally
did something, didn't mean to do it but it happened,
then I wouldn't recommend death for that person.

MR. BROWN: Okay. So, we have -- when you indicate something extreme, you've mentioned now a couple of times lack of a better term mass murder, somebody killed ten people or something like that.

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. BROWN: In your mind is it if it's less than that then you would recommend life?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. So, in a situation where it's not a mass murder, then it's going to be a life recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 89: That's right. It depends on the severity of the crime. If it's say someone tortured someone and then kills them, then that's different than just someone being accidentally killed or somebody murdering them. If it was more than just accidentally killed somebody, it was torturing and

premeditated, then I would -- if it's extreme like that, then I would say death penalty because of the situation, but if, like I said, it was a mistake or it happened one time and it wasn't meant, then I wouldn't death.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Let me explain to you the process a little bit about what you have to go through to make that recommendation to the Court. The Judge covered this yesterday morning as a group but obviously she threw a let of information at you all in a short compressed period of time. To start with first, if you're selected as a jury, the verdict has to come back, to reach the next step you have to return a verdict of guilty of first degree murder. You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. BROWN: If it's a lesser charge such as a second degree murder, then the death penalty's off the table and you wouldn't -- there's no consideration, you wouldn't be making that recommendation to the Court. You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Likewise, if it was not guilty, then there is no sentencing, period. So, first hurdle is you have to return a verdict for first

25

degree murder. If the jury does that, then we would reconvene and come back to the courtroom on another day, additional evidence would be presented and the Court would give you a set of final instructions and the first step the Court's going to tell you is you have to look at what are called aggravating circumstances and what those are, and the Court will list them for, I expect that there will be more than one, that there will be -- I expect there will be several listed for you and those are circumstances as the Court indicate that increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim. And it's to those and only to those that you're to look for the justification for the death penalty. Okay. State of Florida has to prove them. Just like we have to prove the defendant's guilt, we have to prove those aggravating circumstances beyond and to the exclusion of any reasonable doubt. That proof may have come from the main trial, the guilt trial, or there may be additional evidence in the penalty Just because you reach the second step trial. doesn't mean you forget everything about the first step, it's all a continuation. So, you look at the proof from both of those trials, hearings, and you make a decision on whether or not the State of

Florida has proven any of those aggravating circumstances. If we have proven none, then your recommendation has to be life. Okay. If we've proven at least one, we may prove more than one but we have to prove at least one to either to get to the next step. You can look at the ones with we've proven and ask yourself do these justify the death penalty. If your answer is yes, you move on to the next step in the analysis.

The next step is you look at what is called the mitigating circumstances and mitigation evidence. the Court told you yesterday if you recall, that is evidence concerning the defendant, his background, his character, things of that nature, and that's That also has to be proven though presented to you. it's to a lesser agree, it's to the a greater weight of the evidence. So, if you look at mitigation evidence that's been provided, if you don't feel it's proven, you disregard it, just like the aggravators, if they're not proven you disregard it. At the end of that you have your aggravating factors, circumstances that have been presented and your mitigation circumstances and the Court's going to tell you you go through a weighing process.

Now, have you had to make in your life time

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BROWN: And when you look at that, try to consider everything, right?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

some key critical decisions and when you've made

those decisions you try to look at all the factors

MR. BROWN: Some of those factors you need to be pretty darn important and you give them a lot of weight in your decision making process, right?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

and circumstances.

MR. BROWN: Other factors you look at and you say, well, this just really isn't that important and you give it very little weight, right, and you arrive at your decision?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. BROWN: That's the way most of us make decisions. The Court's going to tell you that you do the same thing here. You go through that weighing process. You have to take and weigh the aggravators that have been provided and the mitigating factors that have been provided and you consider them. Some you may deem to be worthy of great weight, others you may look at and say this just isn't that important, I'm going to give it very little weight. No one can

tell you what weight to give those. The Court's not going to tell you aggravating factor number two give this weight, mitigating circumstance number three, give it this amount. Okay. You decide on your own how much weight to give it, consider it all and you determine the weight. Make sense?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. BROWN: So, then when you've made your decision as to weight, you weigh and you compare the aggravating circumstances versus the mitigating circumstances and if the mitigation outweighs the aggravating circumstances, your recommendation would be for life. Okay? If the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravating factors, then at that point you're in a position where you can legally recommend to the Court the death penalty. You understand?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Now, the judge is not going to tell you if you find A, B and C that you must recommend the death penalty. You understand that? In fact, she's going to tell you you're never obligated to. You have to find -- go through the findings, find the aggravators, weigh it against the mitigation, make a decision does this justify the death penalty and then that's when you can recommend the death penalty.

Okay? How do you feel about that process?

JUROR NUMBER 89: It's a process

(unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: Okay. Given that process, can you recommend the sentence of death?

JUROR NUMBER 89: If the aggravating outweighs the mitigation, then I could consider it. If the mitigation outweighs the aggravation, I would go with that.

MR. BROWN: Now, this particular case you heard the Court tell you the charge and this is not a, you know, this is it not a serial killer, this is not a mass murder, it's the death of one person, that being Deputy Barbara Pill. Given that and your earlier statements about, well, if somebody's killed ten people, do you think you could still fairly consider the death penalty or are you coming in with maybe a bias against it saying it's not ten people?

JUROR NUMBER 89: I'm open minded to both but without knowing the facts I can't say that I would choose one or the other.

MR. BROWN: Right. Right. Which I'm certainly not going to ask you at this point. It wouldn't be proper for me to do it and we can't, either side, this is not the time and place for us to tell you

what the facts are.

JUROR NUMBER 89: I would leave both options available. I would think about both options.

MR. BROWN: And would you fairly consider both options?

JUROR NUMBER 89: I would fairly consider both options.

MR. BROWN: Now, one other aspect that I do want to cover and I cover this with everyone. So, don't think I'm picking on you or pointing at you but I want you to be aware of it for yourself and then also if you're back there other jurors who may be entertaining this thought. As we talked earlier, if you return a verdict of less than first agree murder such as second degree murder, you're not going to come back and make that recommendation, it doesn't apply here, it's off the table. You understand that?

MR. BROWN: So, the concern that I have is that jurors go back there, or a juror, maybe more than one, hopefully none, say, you know, the State's proven first degree murder to you but I really don't want to be put in the situation of having to vote for life or death. Therefore, I'm just going to go to second degree so I can avoid having to make that

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

decision. What do you think about that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: I think your decision should be made based on the facts and the evidence and it should be decided in the light and weighed (unintelligible) and should do your decision by the facts and the evidence and not because you're scared.

MR. BROWN: So, if the evidence is there to prove first degree murder, then the verdict should be first degree murder?

JUROR NUMBER 89: If the evidence is there to prove it.

MR. BROWN: Right. And you would agree that what justice is that the verdict should be what the evidence speaks to?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Correct, the evidence and facts in the case and punishment should be.

MR. BROWN: Right. So, if the evidence is there to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt first degree murder, the verdict should be first degree murder, you shouldn't go down to something less simply because that's easier, right? That wouldn't be justice.

JUROR NUMBER 89: If there's evidence (unintelligible).

MR. BROWN: The verdict should be.

JUROR NUMBER 89: The verdict should be.

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

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Questions by the Defense.

MR. PIROLO: Thank you, Your Honor. Juror Number 89, how you doing?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Good.

MR. PIROLO: Let's start with the concept of life without parole. What does that mean to you and what do you think of a sentence like that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: A sentence of life without parole basically is that person has time to think about their actions compared to being sentenced to death so basically he don't have to time to (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: And in the State of Florida life without parole means life without parole, that person dies in prison, they never get out. Do you accept that, that being the law?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Now, we start talking about a person or like -- you understand in this case we're not talking about some outside, you know, make believe person but it's real, this involves a person

and the person has a name, has a face and that's Mr. Bradley who's sitting at our table, Defense table. Are you okay with that? Can you make a decision that it's based on a real person?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: This isn't, you know, make believe like on TV, it's involving a real human being.

JUROR NUMBER 89: Right.

MR. PIROLO: You've briefly been told on how this works and if there's a conviction for first degree murder and you go into this second part of the trial, would you consider either a death sentence or a life recommendation, death recommendation or life recommendation. That part of the trial, your verdict on that does not have to be unanimous. That means it does not have to be 12/0, it can be split up. I don't know how many different ways you can split up twelve votes but it doesn't have to be unanimous. You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: But that shouldn't in any way make you feel that your vote means nothing, it means a lot. The Judge has to take what your recommendation is, she's got to give it great weight and she can't just set it aside. In fact, she couldn't do her job

3

4

5 6

8

7

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23

25

without your recommendation. I just want you to understand and appreciate how serious and how much your vote counts in this. Okay? You okay with all that?

> JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: All right. You mentioned earlier that you don't like the death penalty. I don't think it's a subject that most people like to talk about. You did indicate that you could consider the death recommendation if the evidence presented it to you, you felt that the aggravating circumstances outweighed the mitigating evidence, the mitigating circumstances just aren't enough, you indicated that you could consider death recommendation, right?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Could you render a recommendation for death if you in fact felt that this was one of those cases?

JUROR NUMBER 89: If I felt it was proven.

MR. PIROLO: Right.

JUROR NUMBER 89: Then it could be an option.

MR. PIROLO: And proven we're talking about the aggravating circumstances, right?

> JUROR NUMBER 89: Right.

MR. PIROLO: Because remember, if in the first

phase it's not proven, you never get to the second phase. I just want to make sure we're on the same page. If it's not proven, we're talking about the aggravating circumstances. But in the same respect, if you find aggravating circumstances, if you find that the State proves to you beyond a reasonable doubt, because remember, the aggravating circumstances, they have to prove them to you beyond a reasonable doubt, and say they proved six of them to you, hypothetically, just throwing a number at you, six, and there's no mitigating circumstances, zero, you are never required to return a death recommendation. You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

2.0

MR. PIROLO: Okay. So, this Judge or any other judge will never tell you you have to vote for death. You never do. You understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: That's the way the law is. So, I just want to make sure you understand that, that you find a whole bunch of aggravating circumstances, there's no mitigating, or you somehow feel compelled, you're never compelled to vote for death, but you do have to get into this weighing process and listen first to the aggravating circumstances, you have to

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

consider that, if proven beyond a reasonable doubt then we move onto the mitigating circumstances. it's already been told to you the aggravating circumstances are limited, the Judge can only read to you certain ones. I can't tell you what they are or what they can possibly be, unfortunately we can't tell you that, but they're very -- they're limited in number. Mitigating circumstances are unlimited, there's no number to it. It could be as many as, you know, come forward. Okay. And also the burden is less. You would only have to be reasonably convinced that a mitigating circumstance is present. Okay? And you kind of appreciate why, we're talking about someone's life, aggravators beyond a reasonable doubt, mitigators reasonably convinced. Follow so far and accept all that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Now, again, mitigators being limited, or unlimited, I'm going to get into a few of them with you but I still want you to realize that we're not just limited to the few that we're going to talk about. Okay? And what I'd really like to know is would you be able to consider them as mitigating circumstances of this case. Okay. If you heard evidence of physical or emotional abuse, would

2

3 4

6

7

5

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

you be able to consider a life without parole sentence?

JUROR NUMBER 89: In my opinion?

MR. PIROLO: Right. Mr. Bradley, remember, the defendant -- in the abstract versus in this case if we ever get there we're talking about Mr. Bradley. If you heard that Mr. Bradley was physically or emotionally abused, could you consider that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: If you heard that he suffers from mental illness or illnesses, could you consider that as mitigating?

> Right. JUROR NUMBER 89:

MR. PIROLO: If he had suffered brain damage or a brain injury, would you consider that as mitigating?

> JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: How about -- well, before I ask you if you'd consider it, do you think drug addiction is a choice? Not drug use, somebody picks up a joint or pops a pill or drinks something, that's a choice, you're choosing to light up a joint and smoke it, but can you appreciate the difference between somebody using a drug and then somebody being addicted to a

drug or drugs, alcohol?

JUROR NUMBER 89: I don't feel that addiction is something that, you know, I would think that (unintelligible) chooses in a certain situation as abuse (unintelligible) sometimes the drug is your escape and it's not taken and it's they're way out basically.

MR. PIROLO: So, would you be able to consider drug addiction as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: I'm going to read you a couple of specific instructions, two specific mitigators, after I read each one I'm going to ask you if you can consider it as mitigating in this case. Okay. First one is the capital felony was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance, could you consider that as mitigating in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: The capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law was substantially impaired, can you consider that as mitigating in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Meaning that

(unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: Hands always get tied on how much explaining we're allowed to do but let me just read it one more time. The capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law were substantially impaired.

JUROR NUMBER 89: That one I can't say yes, I can't say no.

MR. PIROLO: You need to hear more explanation about it or evidence from somebody?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes, explanation.

MR. PIROLO: But you're not closed off to that, you can possibly consider it, you just need more information about it?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Now, again, getting back to these are just a few, mitigation is not limited to just what we just discussed, but based on what we've covered so far, would you consider them being an explanation to someone's behavior or an excuse?

JUROR NUMBER 89: An explanation.

MR. MOORE: If you're in the deliberation room and one other juror or more than one other juror disagrees with your vote, your recommendation, can

you assure us that you would be able to stick to your vote or do you think you're going to be forced into changing your vote?

JUROR NUMBER 89: I would stick to my vote.

MR. PIROLO: Flip it around. If you don't -if you disagree with somebody's vote, are you going
to try to browbeat them into changing their vote or
will you respect their recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 89: I would respect their recommendation, I would leave mine (unintelligible).

MR. PIROLO: It's always good and you got it, that's what we hope you would do in deliberations is have a healthy conversation, a discussion back and forth, but at the end I just want to make sure that your vote is not influenced by someone else's comments to you, and on the same respect you don't try to force somebody to vote your way as well. Can you assure us of that?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Can you tell us why you are not adamantly opposed to the death penalty, why you say that it's a possibility in some cases?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Some people are just evil and do things (unintelligible) to the extreme and those people like that I am not opposed to the death

penalty.

MR. PIROLO: Again, our case, you understand if the aggravating circumstances are proven to you, you could consider the death penalty as a recommendation in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 89: If it's proven.

MR. PIROLO: And again same respect, if you after considering and weighing both the aggravators and mitigators feel that you consider a life recommendation as an appropriate sentence, you could recommend that as well?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: Judge, may I have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

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

MR. PIROLO: Do you belong to a church?

JUROR NUMBER 89: Yes.

MR. PIROLO: And do you know if -- what their stance is or? As being a member of that particular church, does impact your view on the death penalty at all?

JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

MR. PIROLO: Do you know what their view is, if they have one? Some churches have a stance, some

don't.

JUROR NUMBER 89: They don't.

MR. PIROLO: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 89, at this time you're going to be able to leave for the day. We're going to have you go downstairs, talk to the jury clerk. The jury clerk is going to give you a phone number. I'm going to ask you to call that phone number next Wednesday between 1:00 and 5:00. You are still under consideration for a juror in this case. At that time she's going to tell you when you need to return. It will not be Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. It may be Thursday or Friday of next week, so make sure you're ready for that. So, they'll give you that information about when to return.

You must continue to abide by the rules governing your service as a juror. Specifically, do not discuss this case with anyone else. Avoid reading newspaper headlines and articles relating to this trial or its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio, or Internet comments about this case, should there be any, and do not conduct any research yourself regarding this case or any of its participants. Okay. Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 89: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you'll go downstairs and get that phone number. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 89 exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to try to go through one more before we take a break, is everyone okay with that?

MR. LANNING: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Number 93.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 93 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Number 93, the first thing I want to do is thank you for being here, thank you for your service, thank you for your patience. It has been a long wait for you, it's been a long day for us, I assure you. I'm going to ask you -- when we spoke last I implemented some rules. Those rules became in effect that day. I talked about certain things, I'm going to ask you about that. Have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants? That that's since those rules were in place.

(CONTINUED TO VOLUME III)